

The Evolution of English Morphemes: Sociocultural Perspectives and Future Trajectories

Ellisa Indriyani Putri Handayani¹

Agus Hari Wibowo²

^{1,2}Sebelas Maret University, Indonesia

¹ellisaindriyani@staff.uns.ac.id

²agushari67@staff.uns.ac.id

Abstract

This research observes at how English morphology changes over time, focused on the changes that happen because of new technologies and social upheavals. This study looks at some important issues related to how cultural changes can affect certain morphological patterns and what might happen in the future with the origins of English words. In this project, a qualitative study method is used to look into language data from academic discourse, digital media, and patterns of communication around the world. The results make clear three important events: the rise of neologisms caused by new technologies; the spread of digital communication morphemes; and the effect of global English on morphological structures. As part of this discussion, these facts are looked at, and it is shown that globalization and digitization encourage morphological innovation, which finally leads to the fast adoption of new morphemes. Another thing it looks at is how these changes affect and show the users' linguistic and cultural traits. The paper comes to the conclusion that English grammatical rules are changing because of how language and social interactions work together. It stresses the need for more research into how important this is for teaching languages and making policy, as well as how computer linguistics can be used to track changes in language in real time.

Keywords: *English Morphology, Technological Advancements, Neologisms, Digital Communication*

Introduction

Morphology is an important part of language analysis because it breaks down words into their morphemes to show how they are put together and how they form [Bauer, 2003; Aronoff, 1981]. Sager and Ndi-Kimbi said it well that morphology studies help academics have a solid grasp of how language forms and is structured [Sager & Ndi-Kimbi, 1995]. This field is based on morphemes, which are the meaning units that can't be broken down and are the building blocks of words. These parts, which include common prefixes and endings as well as less common infixes and interfixes, work together in complicated ways to make up a language's huge vocabulary.

English is a very interesting case study in morphology because it has a lot of different sounds that come from Germanic, Romance, and other languages. It has a huge collection of morphemes, and there are very strict rules about how they can be put together. These rules make the system for making words very complicated and detailed [Zeige, 2015]. This language's complexity makes it hard to analyze, but it also makes it interesting to study because it leads to research into the many ways that morphemes interact and add to the language's semantic and grammatical depth. The writer tried to put light on the complex nature of English morphology by looking at a few interesting events that show how each of its morphemes is different. Scholars like Bauer and Aronoff have done important work on the theoretical basis of morphological analysis [Bauer, 2003; Aronoff,

1981]. In this paper, we look at specific cases that show how complicated English word formation is.

One example is the difference between bound and loose morphemes, which is a basic idea that supports how English words are put together. Even though it seems clear, this difference isn't always clear-cut in reality because some morphemes have traits of both groups, which challenges traditional categorization and shows the need for more nuanced approaches [Van Der Meer, 2011]. The cranberry morpheme is an interesting example of this because it is a bound morpheme that doesn't have a clear independent meaning. It shows how language growth isn't always smooth and how rigid morphological rules can be [Ahn & Kiaer, 2020].

Looking into more than just individual morphemes, this study also looks into the bigger grammatical processes that shape the lexicon. Using the work of linguists like Halle and Lieber, who studied morphology using rule-based approaches [Halle & Marantz, 1993], the writer looks at things like morphological change, where predictable forms replace traditional patterns over time, questioning how regular morphological norms seem to be [Sager & Ndi-Kimbi, 1995]. This changing part of language, shown by methods like comparison and reanalysis, shows how language systems are always changing and the need for looking at things from different times in morphological analysis [Mair, 2002].

In addition, the ideas of allomorphy and zero derivation, which show how flexible and adaptable English grammar is, are also discussed in this article. Allomorphy which has been studied in depth by linguists like Carstairs-McCarthy [Carstairs-McCarthy, 2018] shows how language can show categorical differences through changes in morpheme form. Zero derivation, on the other hand, shows the changes in morphology that happen without overt affixation [Sager & Ndi-Kimbi, 1995]. These events show how important it is to look at both shape and function when doing morphological analysis.

Lastly, the article also tried to narrate at how English grammar changes as new words and ideas come into the language (Permatasari & Karjo, 2023) to show that language contact and borrowing are always changing. Using research on language contact and morphological borrowing [Haspelmath, 2015], we look at how existing morphemes are repurposed and recombined to make new phrases. This shows that language can change with the times and adapt to cultural and social changes [Ahn & Kiaer, 2020]. Researchers like Tagliamonte [Tagliamonte, 2016] have looked into the rise of internet slang and how it changes the structure of English words. This is an example of how language and social environment are always changing together.

The goal of this study is to give a full picture of the subtleties and complexities of English morphology by combining these different lines of research. We want to learn more about how words are formed, how they change over time, and how they show the complex connection between language, society, and cognition by looking more closely at certain morphemic phenomena and larger morphological processes.

Method

This paper investigates how developments in technology and society have impacted the way English words are arranged using a qualitative research methodology. The study attempts to comprehend how new morphemes emerge and adapt to the always shifting context of digital communication, global English, and technological innovation with reference to Patton's work on qualitative research and evaluation procedures [Castillo-Montoya, 2016]. Under the guidance of primary morphological theory-based

concerns, the study examines specific morphemes affected by sociocultural changes, how digital communication and technology affect the genesis of new morphemes, and potential future developments in word formation. In order to highlight the value of context in evaluation, the questions resemble some morphological paradigms as covered in the work of Benjamin P. Raysmith et al. on performance outcomes in athletics [Raysmith et al., 2019].

As recommended in "Doing Development Research" by Vandana Desai and Robert B. Potter, who emphasize the need of assessing data from many settings to create a strong analysis, several sources are used during the data collecting stage [Desai and Potter, 2006]. Digital media, particularly blogs and social media, being included as real-time data sources is consistent with Annamaria Kilyeni's analysis of how these platforms affect language evolution [Kilyeni 2015]. Worldwide trends influencing English morphology can be seen macroscopically through global communication patterns, such those seen through international news sources. The analytical framework is based in theme analysis, a technique that has been extensively studied in the qualitative data analysis work of Catherine Pope, Sue Ziebland, and Nicholas Mays [Pope et al., 2006]. The approach of methodically coding and developing themes is similar to that of Benjamin P. Raysmith et al., who establishes patterns that provide context to different performance metrics—morphological phenomena in this case, for example [Raysmith et al., 2019].

A paper by Milagros Castillo-Montoya and others, called "Interview Protocol Refinement Framework" [Castillo-Montoya, 2016], says that validity and reliability measures, like triangulation and peer review, are very important for the trustworthiness of qualitative research. This thorough process makes sure that the results are true and can be used in different situations. Concerns about ethics are stressed in "Ground Stone Analysis" [McBride & McBride, 2024], especially when it comes to the privacy and anonymity of data sources. To do ethical research, you need to be ethical when you collect and look at qualitative data, as Anne Baird says in "The qualitative research interview" [Baird, 1999].

Lastly, the qualitative research method used in this study gives us a solid and moral reason to look at how English grammar is changing over time. Finding the linguistic changes caused by social, cultural, and technological factors is a goal that fits well with the many data sources and complex research methods that are being used. This all-around method makes sure that the study results are real and trustworthy. They make a big difference in the field of morphology and help us understand how morphology is changing in the English language right now. The study's methods and moral standards are in line with what is known to be the best way to do qualitative research in this area [Pope et al., 2006; Castillo-Montoya, 2016; Baird, 1999; McBride & McBride, 2024]. The foundation of the study is strengthened by the fact that the research results are supported by well-known ideas and standard methods.

Results and Discussion

Cranberry Morphemes

Finding "cranberry morphemes" is one interesting phenomena in the study of English morphology. These morphemes are linguistic lexical anomalies; they are parts of the language that seem to have semantic promise but cannot stand alone as unique words with obvious meanings. Its name embodies the essence of these morphemes since it comes from the word "cranberry," where the component "cran-" does not exist

separately in English [Sager & Ndi-Kimbi, 1995]. The notion of cranberry morphemes is proof of the oddities in English word formation. Cranberry morphemes are not grouped like other morphemes, which can be separated and given a unique meaning or function. They are often misleading because where they are in a word suggests a possible meaning that linguists can't easily connect to a specific semantic role [Sager & Ndi-Kimbi, 1995].

Etymologists and historians of language find these mysterious morphemes to be a very interesting puzzle. Cranberry morphemes have been around since the beginning of English. They may be leftovers from a bigger vocabulary, old forms of the language, or borrowings from other languages that no longer have their own versions. These examples show how past events can affect the way language is used today. They may also be due to structural holdovers that still affect how language changes over time [Ahn & Kiaer, 2020].

Also, looking at the purpose of cranberry morphemes can help you understand the framework of English morphology in a more general way. Their appearance raises questions about how predictable word development is and pushes us to look more closely at the strange words that make up the English language. Cranberry morphemes are unique, which makes English morphology study more difficult because linguists have to think about how the lines between regular and irregular morphology can move [Sager & Ndi-Kimbi, 1995].

Their presence frequently indicates past linguistic processes, such the gradual loss of free morphemes, which leaves these components as morphological fossils inside the language and remains a puzzle to etymologists [Sager & Ndi-Kimbi, 1995]. Another way to see this idea is through the origins of "cranberry" morphemes. Though "cran-" has no meaning by itself in modern English, it might have been borrowed from a language where it did. For instance, it's possible that the word "cranberry" originated in Germanic languages, where "*kraan*" was used to describe the crane bird, which was believed to be connected to the plant. Within the changing fabric of a language, some morphemes, such as "cran-," are left behind, their original meanings hidden or lost completely.

Here are a few more examples of cranberry morphemes: (1) Cran in cranberry: As mentioned, 'cran' has no standalone meaning in English, whereas 'berry' does; (2) Rasp in raspberry: Similar to 'cran', 'rasp' does not have a separate meaning independent from 'raspberry' in this context; (3) Twi in twilight: 'Twi-' does not have a meaning outside of 'twilight' although historically, it comes from an old term meaning 'half'; (4) -ceive as in perceive, receive, conceive: While '-ceive' is not a full word on its own, it does carry a sense of obtaining or taking in within these words; (5) Hob in hobnob: 'Hob' appears in this word but does not have an independent lexical meaning outside of this context; (6) Luke in lukewarm: 'Luke' does not function independently in modern English, unlike 'warm'; (7) -lock in wedlock: 'Lock' has a meaning in English, but '-lock' in 'wedlock' does not stand as a word with an independent meaning. It's notable that some cranberry morphemes may appear to have historical meanings or roots in other languages, but within the modern English language, they have no separate semantic contribution apart from the words they occur in [Raflis & Mailiani, 2020].

Cranberry morphemes are not only interesting to look into, but they also show how languages store and use things that don't seem to have any use. That same word could also mean that a language tries to keep speech by keeping only the morphological complexity needed for understanding and communication. Cranberry morphemes may also help you organize words and understand how they sound, even if they don't add directly to meaning [Sager & Ndi-Kimbi, 1995].

There is a lot we don't fully understand about the history of cranberry morphemes yet. They did work that shows how hard grammatical evolution can be and how some parts of language don't change over time. English has changed a lot over the years, as shown by the fact that these words are still used. Linguists study unique parts of English morphology, like cherry morphemes [Sager & Ndi-Kimbi, 1995], to learn more about the complicated patterns that make language fun and sometimes surprising.

Bound and Free Roots

Understanding how words are assembled requires an understanding of the distinction between bound and loose roots in morphological theory. Free roots allow you to construct new, meaningful words. Frequently used instances in speech are "run," "book," and "quick." By contrast, bound roots are unable to produce whole words without the inclusion of morphemic components such as prefixes or suffixes. For example, although it is understandable in terms like "receive," "perceive," and "deceive," the bound root "-ceive" cannot stand alone [DeCapua, 2016].

This contradiction shapes the way that new words are formed and how English speakers understand already-existing words. Compounding and affixing are two easy word construction processes that free roots can do, quickly growing the vocabulary. But bound roots depend on pairings with other morphemes to bring new words into the language, and the many morphemic pairings affect minute changes in meaning [Lieber, 2010]. Liberman's observations clarify even more the way that morphological theory is affected by the difference between bound and free roots. When bound morphemes include latent semantic potential that is activated by combination with other morphemes, the existence of bound roots in a language indicates a rich capacity for internal complexity inside words [Rafli & Mailiani, 2020]. By contrast, free roots might be a more direct mapping between form and meaning, which would be consistent with theories that give semantic openness in morphological analysis top priority [DeCapua, 2016].

The way that bound and free roots interact in English not only broadens the vocabulary but also demonstrates the complex processes by which morphemes help to produce words. Theories of the morphological productivity and the ongoing evolution of language depend on these kinds of factors. Deeper investigation of polysemy and the semantic networks that could result from common etymological roots is invited by bound roots. Conversely, free roots present a problem for scholars in trying to comprehend the cognitive mechanisms controlling their autonomy and their tendency to produce new lexemes [Rafli & Mailiani, 2020]. All things considered, the difference between bound and free roots matters in linguistic theory as much as the study of English morphology. It affects ideas of mental lexicon, lexical access, and the processes by which new words are created and integrated into a live language [DeCapua, 2016; Lieber, 2010]. Knowing this difference facilitates the deciphering of the complicated word construction patterns that are characteristic of the morphological structure of the English language.

How much of these morphological processes are used can have a significant impact on communication effectiveness and language change. The directness of free roots facilitates the rapid identification and understanding of words, hence creating a dynamic environment for language development. However, bound roots offer a certain amount of morphological economy that improves the expressive power of the language by allowing a single bound root to take part in the creation of multiple related words, hence

reducing duplication [Rafli and Mailiani, 2019]. Based on his investigation of these concepts, Liberman demonstrates that there is a continuum as well as a binary relationship between bound and free roots. This continuum shows how fluid and malleable actual forms are. A sophisticated network of meaning connections derived from these roots makes up our language's "morphological DNA," claim Rafli and Mailiani [2010].

It is therefore beyond simple grouping to study bound and free roots. As so, we process and acquire language differently. Free roots are more often found in English and may help with memory and language learning. On the other hand, language processing could have to adopt a more analytical approach because bound roots require a complete understanding of the morphological principles directing their development and application [Rafli & Mailiani, 2020].

Suppletion

A fascinating feature of language is called suppletion. It happens when two different forms of a word come from different sources, going against the normal rules of inflection. At inflection or derivation; whole new morphological forms replace the old ones. This is called suppletion, and it is one of the most interesting things that can happen in morphology. This process doesn't follow the normal rules of morphology that control word building, so the final forms of words aren't always linked to their base forms [DeCapua, 2016]. Supportive forms are linguistic oddities in which a single grammatical idea is stated using more than one morpheme. These forms don't follow the usual pattern of adding "-ed" for past tense or "-er" for comparatives. Instead, they appear out of nowhere. Let's look at the word "to go." The past form of "goed" is "went," which has nothing to do with "went." This sudden change is a sign of suppletion.

English has a reputation for having simple grammar, but it actually has a lot of suppletive forms, especially in its most popular words. The most obvious examples are verbs. With "am," "is," "are," "was," and "were" all coming from different roots, "to be" is a great example of replacement. In the same way, some words use suppletion to change their comparative and superlative forms. For example, "good/better/best," "bad/worse/worst," and "far/further/furthest" are all exceptions. The adverbs' adverbial and superlative forms are notable instances of suppletion in the English language. In that "better" and "best," respectively, are the comparative and superlative forms of the adjective "good," it is irregular. These variants do not add the customary "-er" and "-est" suffixes to the basic adjective as is common [DeCapua, 2016].

Historically, complicated language evolutions frequently give rise to suppletive forms. Over millennia, as languages borrow from, combine, and split apart, certain words take on forms from several linguistic sources. With "good," "better," and "best," the suppletion's origins can be found in the language stages of Proto-Germanic and Proto-Indo-European, when distinct roots were utilized for these terms before they combined into a single paradigm in English [Lieber, 2010].

There are hints of supplementation in other parts of English as well, though verbs and adjectives are the best places to see them. Some nouns, like the old-fashioned "cow/kine," and pronouns, like "I," "me," "my," and "mine," show suppletion across different situations. However, cases like "high/height" or "wide/width," even though they mean the same thing, are usually thought of as derivational rather than purely suppletive because they involve changes in grammatical category (from adjective to word) along with the root change. There isn't always a clear line between extreme irregularity and real suppletion, which is why there are ongoing arguments about

language. Still, no matter how we describe it, suppletion shows us the interesting layers of meaning that are hidden in even the most basic words.

Since suppletion brings deviations to the typical word formation patterns taught as part of standard morphology, its existence is important. Learners of suppletive forms may have to memorize irregular patterns as separate lexical items rather than predictable affixation or internal changes based on a single root [DeCapua, 2016]. The need of studying the historical evolution of languages, or diachronic linguistics, in comprehending the current morphological environment is emphasized by supplementation. Basically, suppletion goes against morphological theory by giving us shapes that don't follow the rules of regularity and unity. These amazing structures help us understand how complicated language is and show how important historical views are for explaining current linguistic events [DeCapua, 2016; Lieber, 2010]. So, suffixation shows how the past development of language and the mental processes that allow for irregularities in the linguistic system interact with each other. The detail examples of suppletion are shown on Table 1.

Table 1 Examples of Suppletion in English, Encompassing Verbs, Adjectives, and A few less Common Cases

WORDS CLASS	NO	SUPPLETION	EXPLANATION
VERBS	1.	go/went	present/past tense
	2.	be/am/is/are/was/were	various forms of the verb "to be"
	3.	good/better/best	positive/comparative/superlative
	4.	bad/worse/worst	positive/comparative/superlative
	5.	much/more/most	positive/comparative/superlative
	6.	little/less/least	positive/comparative/superlative
	7.	far/further/furthest	positive/comparative/superlative
	8.	old/elder/eldest	positive/comparative/superlative - used for people, often family
ADJECTIVE	9.	fore/former/first	referring to position in a sequence
	10.	late/latter/last	referring to position in a sequence
	11.	good/well	attributive/predicative forms - "a good book" vs. "He reads well"
PRONOUNS	12.	I/me/my/mine	different cases of the first-person singular pronoun
	13.	we/us/our/ours	different cases of the first-person plural pronoun
	14.	person/people	singular/plural - though debated if truly suppletive
	15.	cow/kine	singular/plural - archaic, mostly poetic
OTHERS	16.	high/height	adjective/noun related by meaning
	17.	wide/width	adjective/noun related by meaning
	18.	long/length	adjective/noun related by meaning
	19.	broad/breadth	adjective/noun related by meaning
	20.	deep/depth	adjective/noun related by meaning

Allomorphy

Allomorphy is the change in shape of a single morpheme that doesn't change its meaning or purpose. It is an important idea in morphology research. Allomorphs are the name for these changes [DeCapua, 2016]. Allomorphy is a subtle but common phenomenon in language that shows how complicated a seemingly easy idea is: the morpheme. Some people think of morphemes as set pieces of meaning, but allomorphy shows that they can change shapes while still doing the same thing. Even though English's morphology isn't as complicated as some languages', it has a surprising

number of allomorphs that show how morphemes can change to fit their phonetic settings and grammatical roles.

The plural form is one of the most well-known cases. Often, these differences are controlled by complicated rules that have to do with how sounds work and how words are put together. Most of the time, the allomorph "-es" is chosen for pluralization when a word ends in a sibilant sound [DeCapua, 2016]. The normal plural morpheme, which means "more than one," can show up as "-s," "-es," or even a silent change, based on how the noun ends. These changes are "-s" in "cats," "-es" in "buses," and a quiet but important one in "sheep," which stays the same in its plural form. The past tense formation also changes in similar ways. The sounds "-ed," "-d," and "-t" are all allomorphs of the past tense morpheme, and the sound that comes before them determines their shape, like "talked," "melded," "burnt," and "went."

Allomorphy isn't just possible with inflectional morphemes, though. This also happens with derivational morphemes, which are used to make new words. The negative prefix "in-" can be "im-," "il-," or "ir-" based on the sound that comes after it, like in "impossible," "illegal," and "irresponsible." In a more subtle way, endings like "-ic" and "-ical," which both mean "having the quality of," change depending on the word they're attached to, like "electrical" for "electrical" and "magical" for "magical."

From small changes in sounds to different suffixes and even zero morphemes, allomorphy shows how sound and meaning change over time in language. It tells us that morphemes are not fixed things, even though they are basic units of meaning. Instead, they are flexible forms that change depending on their language environment. Morphological rules and patterns are very complicated and can change over time. Allomorphy helps us understand this. Form and function are not one-to-one, as these shows. Instead, there is a many-to-one link, where different forms (allomorphs) serve the same grammatical purpose [DeCapua, 2016]. Allomorphy gives linguists a more dynamic view of language rules and structure because it forces them to look at word morphological structure along with their phonological and grammatical context. Linguists study allomorphy to learn more about the cognitive and perceptual factors that affect how people use language. Because students have to deal with the different morpheme forms in a language, it also helps them learn how to learn and understand languages [DeCapua, 2016]. So, allomorphy is an interesting part of language morphology that shows how form, brain function, and the need to communicate are all connected. The detail examples of allomorphy are shown on Table 2.

Table 2 Examples of allomorphy in English, Covering Various Parts of Speech and Morphological Processes

PARTS OF SPEECH	NO	ALLOMORPHY	EXPLANATION
Plural Formation	1.	-s/-es: cat/cats, bus/buses	voiceless/voiced allomorphs
	2.	-en: child/children, ox/oxen	irregular plural
	3.	Zero plural: sheep/sheep, fish/fish	no change for plural
	4.	Vowel change: foot/feet, goose/geese	internal vowel shift
	5.	-ed/-d/-t: walk/walked, love/loved, want/wanted	assimilation to voicing
Past Tense Formation	6.	Vowel change: sing/sang, ring/rang, swim/swam	ablaut
	7.	-n/-en: break/broke/broken, speak/spoke/spoken	irregular past participle
Other Inflectional Allomorphy	8.	-ing/-in': work/working, go/going	velar deletion before -ing
	9.	-er/-est: big/bigger/biggest,	consonant doubling

	hot/hotter/hottest	
	10. a/an: a cat, an apple	indefinite article before consonant/vowel
	11. in-/im-/il-/ir-: inactive, impossible, illegal, irresponsible	negative prefix assimilation
Derivational	12. -ic/-ical: electric/electrical, magic/magical	adjective suffix variation
Allomorphy	13. -ity/-ty: active/activity, possible/possibility	noun suffix variation
	14. -able/-ible: drink/drinkable, comprehend/comprehensible	adjective suffix variation
	15. -s (plural/possessive/3rd person singular): cats/cat's/he eats	same suffix, different functions
Other	16. Zero morpheme (possessive): John's book	no overt marker for singular possessive
	17. Stress shift: con'duct / conduct'	con'duct (noun) / conduct' (verb)
	18. have/ha-: I have / I've	contraction as allomorphy
	19. will/wo-: I will / I'll	contraction as allomorphy
	20. not/-n't: cannot / can't	contraction as allomorphy

Zero Derivation

Zero derivation, which is also called conversion, shows how flexible the English language is [Vajda, 2017]. It makes it possible for words to move easily between types of grammar without changing their form in a noticeable way. Even though this process seems easy, it greatly improves the expressive power of English. Think about how simple it is for words to become verbs. We easily turn the names of these technologies into acts when we "google" information online, "email" coworkers, and "text" friends. Verbs like "walk," "call," and "guess" also easily change into names that describe the actions: a slow "walk," a quick "call," or a well-thought-out "guess."

This flexibility can also be seen in adjectives. Both "poor" and "rich" refer to different levels of income, but they also refer to groups of people who are in those levels. In the same way, "blind" and "deaf" can both describe things and name groups of people. The English language has a short and lively vocabulary because words can change their formal roles without changing their form. Zero origin is a great way for English to get new words quickly and easily. It's easier to come up with new words when users can change the meanings of existing words. This is because they don't have to make up whole new words or add morphological markers [Vajda, 2017].

From an academic point of view, zero derivation is studied by looking at how the process works and how it makes you think. There are ideas that zero derivation is the brain's way of being efficient and organizing things, which makes conversation easier by lowering the mental load that comes with learning and using new words [Vajda, 2017]. It can also be seen as a way for speakers to communicate based on the scenario and how they normally use language. One example of pragmatic language use is when someone turns a name into a verb to quickly describe an action without having to use a new word.

Besides, there are no extraction functions that work with the way English sounds and are put together. Some words are easier to change because of how they sound or how they are put together. Researchers have found patterns that can tell you which words are more likely to pass through zero derivation. This shows that the process is not completely random, even though it is useful [Vajda, 2017]. English changes over time. The example of zero derivation shows how structural economy and fluid categorization let the language change to meet the needs of its speakers. By changing the shape of words, the English language's vocabulary grows. It also shows how artistically people

can give existing forms new meanings [Vajda, 2017]. So, both linguists and language learners need to understand zero derivation because it explains the basic ideas that have shaped the development of English and how flexible it is by nature. Some examples of zero derivation are detailed on Table 3.

Table 3 Examples of Zero Derivation

CONVERSION	NO	WORD	EXPLANATION
Noun to Verb	1.	Google	(n) the search engine, (v) to search for something online
	2.	Email	(n) an electronic message, (v) to send an email
	3.	Text	(n) written words, (v) to send a text message
	4.	Hammer	(n) the tool, (v) to hit with a hammer
	5.	Silence	(n) the state of quiet, (v) to make someone or something quiet
	6.	Walk	(v) to move on foot, (n) a stroll
Verb to Noun	7.	Call	(v) to speak to someone on the phone, (n) a phone conversation
	8.	Guess	(v) to estimate, (n) an estimation
	9.	Doubt	(v) to be uncertain, (n) a feeling of uncertainty
	10.	Reply	(v) to answer, (n) an answer
Adjective to Noun	11.	Poor	(adj) lacking money, (n) poor people
	12.	Rich	(adj) having wealth, (n) wealthy individuals
	13.	Blind	(adj) unable to see, (n) people who are blind
	14.	Deaf	(adj) unable to hear, (n) people who are deaf
	15.	Daily	(adj) happening every day, (n) a daily newspaper
Adjective to Verb	16.	Empty	(adj) containing nothing, (v) to remove everything
	17.	Clean	(adj) free from dirt, (v) to remove dirt
	18.	Dry	(adj) free from moisture, (v) to remove moisture
	19.	Thin	(adj) not thick, (v) to make less thick
	20.	Calm	(adj) peaceful, (v) to make peaceful

Blending as a Process of Morphology

In a creative morphological process, parts of two or more current words are mixed together to make new lexemes. This led to the creation of a word that often mixes up the original ideas' meanings [Lepic, 2016]. One example is "brunch," a food that comes from both "breakfast" and "lunch." It is eaten between breakfast and lunch.

Particularly in the digital age when the rapid spread of knowledge and the humorous nature of online discourse encourage brief and memorable word combinations, blending has become considerably more popular [Kilyeni, 2015]. Technological and popular culture examples include "blog" (derived from "web log"), "smog" (derived from "smoke" and "fog"), and "meme" (derived from a combination of "gene" and the Greek word "mimeme").

Often coming from particular social groups or subcultures, mixes can become popular on social media and find their way into common language [Ahn & Kiaer, 2020]. This trend shows how quickly new combinations are created and incorporated into everyday speech, hence expanding and changing the English language.

Blending involves linguistically speaking phonological and semantic problems. Usually, the words are connected and phonetically abbreviated at a natural place. The final combination should, semantically speaking, facilitate speakers' comprehension of the meanings of its component parts [Lepic, 2016]. Cognitive processes are significant; for example, the efficiency of a blend can be assessed by its ability to be connected to its parent words and by its ability to fill a language gap or satisfy a new communication demand [Lepic, 2016].

Researchers look at things like how easy it is to remember, how easy it is to pronounce, and the social setting in which a blend was presented to figure out why some blends become popular and become part of the language [Lepic, 2016]. Blending requires creativity, which shows how people can use language in creative ways and how cultural trends can change words.

English's grammar structure makes mixing a very valuable process because it lets people be creative with how words are put together and changed. This shows that the users are still actively creating and shaping new language, and it also shows how naturally funny language use is.

Also, terms are considered successful and assimilated based on how often they are used, the situations in which they appear, and how well they are accepted by important language users like journalists, celebrities, or people who have a lot of followers online. It is more likely to become part of everyday language if a blend is used a lot and noticed in different types of conversations [Ahn & Kiaer, 2020].

Linguists and cognitive scientists are still researching mixing to find out how the brain processes these new words and how they get from being made up by a creative person to being used by a lot of people. This means looking at how readers and viewers understand blends and how they are used and spread in written and spoken language. The mental process of making and understanding blends is so smooth that it fits with a natural ability to create and understand new, complex morphological forms [Lepic, 2016].

Taking everything into account, the process of mixing adds new words to the English language and teaches us how languages grow and change. As digital communication speeds up and shares new words around the world [Ahn & Kiaer, 2020; Lepic, 2016], studying blends becomes more important for figuring out the present and future path of English morphological change.

Lastly, blending isn't just a mechanical way to make new words; it's affected by phonological, meaning, and cognitive factors. It's also a natural part of how language changes because of changes in society and culture and the rise of digital communication [Lepic, 2016; Kilyeni, 2015]. So, blending has become an important and changing part of modern English, showing trends and quickly expressing changes in society. Some examples on English blending can be observed on Table 4.

Table 4 Examples of English Blending

TYPES	NO	BLENDING	EXPLANATION
Common Blends	1.	Brunch	Breakfast + Lunch
	2.	Smog	Smoke + Fog
	3.	Motel	Motor + Hotel
	4.	Infotainment	Information + Entertainment
	5.	Edutainment	Education + Entertainment
	6.	Webinar	Web + Seminar
Technology & Internet	7.	Netizen	Internet + Citizen
	8.	Malware	Malicious + Software
	9.	Biohacking	Biology + Hacking
	10.	Technophobe	Technology + Phobia
	11.	Mockumentary	Mock + Documentary
Popular Culture & Lifestyle	12.	Frenemy	Friend + Enemy
	13.	Sitcom	Situation + Comedy
	14.	Workaholic	Work + Alcoholic
Other Creative	15.	Chillax	Chill + Relax
	16.	Spork	Spoon + Fork

Blends	17. Turducken	Turkey + Duck + Chicken
	18. Bromance	Brother + Romance
	19. Mansplaining	Man + Explaining
	20. Sheeple	Sheep + People

The cultural and social impact of blending on the English language

Since blended words usually reflect philosophies, technological developments, or cultural trends, they are lexical markers that chart the development and changes of society throughout time. Adoption and durability of mixes are greatly influenced by cultural resonance. Widely relevant, funny, or distinctive works are more likely to stick around and enter the common vocabulary. On the other side, mixes that don't appeal to the general public or that are associated with fads could become outdated very fast [Ahn & Kiaer, 2020].

It's also important to think about how "sticky" blended words are—that is, how well and vividly they can convey a new idea or phenomena in a sentence that is shorter than a descriptive phrase. In media, social media, and advertising, where brevity is frequently valued, this linguistic economy is essential [Kilyeni, 2015].

One may also consider blending to be a mirror of the priorities and ideals of a society. For example, the term "infodemic" (derived from "information" and "epidemic") has just lately come into use, highlighting the worldwide worry about the disseminating of false information, particularly during health emergencies like the COVID-19 pandemic.

Frenemy, Spanglish, Brexit, Glamping, and infotainment are other examples of blending on the English morphemes influenced by the cultural and social impact. Frenemy is a blend of "friend" and "enemy", referring to someone you are friendly with, despite the fact that you dislike and/or compete with them. Meanwhile, for someone who has the ability to speak both Spanish and English and be called as "Spanglish", often mix vocabularies and linguistic event that transparently shows different culture mix. The other example is Brexit, blending from "Britain" and "exit", referring to the UK's choice to leave European Union. It is morphologically important because it set the pattern for other geopolitical names, like "Grexit" and "Frexit". Next, we have a viral trend of enjoying nature and outdoors leisure activities while still having the pleasure of home with the term of glamping, blending from "glamorous" and "camping". Lastly, the combination of "information" and "entertainment" forms infotainment which refer to media content that is meant to both teach and entertain. It shows how traditional media formats have changed and how consumer tastes affect the creation of content.

Finally, the morphological activity of blending demonstrates the flexibility and adaptability of language. Complex interactions of social, cognitive, and communicative elements create language. Its study demonstrates how linguistic patterns influence interpersonal communication and how language reflects more significant societal shifts. Blending not only increases the vocabulary of the English language but also modifies language use and speech patterns since language is always evolving to suit human needs [Ahn & Kiaer, 2020; Lepic, 2016].

The vague effects of mixing and bigger trends in language use

Blended words are a sign of linguistic creativity used by those who speak a language imaginatively to discuss novel ideas. Blending requires such creativity that language appears to be a living entity that is always adapting to new circumstances [Ahn & Kiaer, 2020]. Blends have advantages as well as disadvantages in educational contexts. On the one hand, they give teachers tools to look into language production and creativity. On

the other hand, they can be hard for language learners because they may have to deal with a lot of unusual words that change quickly [Lepic, 2016]. In a broader sense, mixing is part of the ongoing conversation about language and culture. People and groups are claiming the language by mixing it in new ways that show who they are and how they see the world [Atay & Ece, 2014].

Regarding linguistic theory, conventional ideas of fixed lexical categories are called into question by the acceptance and incorporation of blends into the language. These dynamic processes are reflected in the intricate link between the language system and its usage in social situations, hence linguists need to consider them [Lepic, 2016]. As the English language keeps becoming more international, the phenomena of blending is probably going to interact with code-switching and multilingualism to produce blended forms that include aspects of several languages, so enhancing English's status as a worldwide lingua franca [Auer, P. (Ed.), 1998]. Blending has been thoroughly discussed within the limitations of the material offered. After that, without more sources or references to direct the extension, we would have to go into speculative or interpretative domains.

However, if we're talking about bigger effects and possible futures, we might think about how mixing is connected to other ways of making words, like compounding, clipping, and making acronyms. Each of these steps shows a different side of language change and the balance that exists between using new words and preserving old ones. It's important to think about how blending affects programs that try to revive and protect languages. Because English is always taking parts from other languages and mixing them together, other languages are more likely to adopt and change English blends, which makes their vocabulary bigger but also makes it harder to keep languages pure.

As English spreads around the world and technology changes the way people talk to each other, there are many chances for mixing to become a way for people from different cultures to interact in the future. More study needs to be done on how blending adds to global Englishes—different forms of English that have developed in different cultural settings—by combining and assimilation parts of regional languages and dialects.

Furthermore, the role computers play in identifying, forecasting, and perhaps even creating new combinations could develop into a fascinating field of research and revolutionize automatic language generation and translation. Blending is a fascinating field of English morpheme study where language growth, linguistic innovation, and cultural contact meet. It shows how expressive and versatile human speech is [Lepic, 2016; Ahn & Kiaer, 2020]. Probably how creative the English speakers are and how swiftly technology develops will determine how much the English language will change in the future.

For instances, there are an explosion of blending on the English morphemes affected by the advancement of technology – computer and internet, like blog, netizen, email, spam, vlog, podcast, malware, screenshot, cybersecurity, webinar, netiquette, infographic, wi-fi, emoticon, mashup, e-commerce, micro-blog, webisode, edutainment, fintech, chillax, and many more.

Lastly, one important feature of the English morphological landscape is mixing. That shows how language can grow. Its research helps linguists and language aficionados understand how words emerge, become popular, and change over time since words reflect how communication and society develop [Ahn & Kiaer, 2020; Lepic, 2016].

The Interplay of Morphemes and Phonology

Combining phonology, the study of sounds, with morphemes, the smallest units of meaning in a language, forms words and builds linguistic systems. Phonological principles show how morpheme form and behavior can be merged or changed in speech and also support those [Lane et al., 2019]. Phonetic processes like assimilation, dissimilation, epenthesis, and deletion frequently create and modify morphemes inside words. An English plural morpheme -s sound progressively resembles a sound that is close by [Lane et al., 2019]; following a voiced sound, as in "dogs," this sound is pronounced as /z/; following a silent sound, as in "cats." Conversely, dissimilation is the process by which a sound becomes less like a nearby one. The Latin term "peregrinus" does not, for instance, replicate the /r/ sound in the English word "pilgrim."

Epenthesis and deletion are two further methods for morpheme modification. Speaking the past tense morpheme -ed reveals that you are eliminating a sound when you say "walked" instead of "walkt." The word "walked" comes from this sound being absent from regular speech. "Thunder" has the sound /ə/ added for pronunciation convenience. That becomes, for example, /t̚ ðn.dər/ instead of /t̚ ðn.dɹ/. Some phonetic processes and the morphological structure could not line up. Morphemes, for example, can retain their own personality and meaning even in cases when phonological processes can completely change their appearance to make them unrecognizable. This can make language learning and usage more difficult as well as users' ability to understand word morphological components [Lane et al., 2019].

These arguments take on considerably greater weight when one takes into account studying languages in addition to reading and writing. Teaching reading and writing calls for knowledge of how phonological processes change morpheme pronunciation and how this changes morpheme writing [Lane et al. 2019]. More research on the connection between morphemes and pronunciation shows how complex and flexible language is. Published not too long ago was "Writing about Reading and Speaking: A Glossary of the 'Phon' Words and Some Related Terms". This equilibrium is exhibited in allomorphs, morpheme changes caused by phonological limitations. The phonological context of a morpheme dictates its sound, but allomorphy does not essentially change the morpheme's meaning. English indefinite articles are written "an" before a vowel sound (like "an apple") and "a" before a consonant sound (like "a book"). According to phonological principles, making use of a certain morpheme form might help with fluid speech [Scarborough & Brady, 2002].

A further thing to think about is how morphological change over time can be influenced by phonological regulations. Many times, historical linguistics shows that while the morphological makeup of words has remained the same, their phonological composition has changed dramatically. One such process is lenition, in which consonants gradually lose their force or completely disappear in some morphemes, therefore affecting the morphological structure of words [Scarborough & Brady, 2002].

Notably, morpheme and phonology interact in a language-specific manner rather than universally. The variety of linguistic structures worldwide will be shown by the various patterns of interaction and limitations that different languages will display. Different languages may treat morpheme combinations using rather different phonological rules than English [Lacková & Leláková, 2014].

Furthermore, research on the relationship between morphemes and phonology is very beneficial to disciplines like language instruction and speech pathology. Through knowledge of these exchanges, teachers and therapists can help people overcome

difficulties with language understanding and speech [Scarborough & Brady, 2002; Lane et al., 2019].

All things considered, morpheme structure and phonological processes are related in a dynamic and complex way that reflects the flexibility and development of languages. It is the focus of continuous research as linguists work to identify the fundamental ideas guiding this interaction and so advance our knowledge of language as a sophisticated cognitive and communicative system [Scarborough & Brady, 2002].

Sociolinguistic and Language Evolution Perspectives

Technological advances, societal transformations, and cultural interactions introduce new morphemes into language morphology. Fresh technology often requires fresh terminology to describe distinct ideas and devices [Kilyeni, 2015]. Since the Internet's invention, many new terms including "blog," "hashtag," and "emoji" have emerged. These concepts start as fresh expressions but become root morphemes for subsequent derivations and compounds [Kilyeni, 2015]. Social factors including demography, attitudes, and values can cause morphological change. As gender awareness grows, languages may become more inclusive or produce gender-neutral morphemes. Honorifics like "Mx." have replaced Mr. or Ms., and the singular "they" has become a gender-neutral pronoun in English, changing morphological paradigms and increasing lexicon [Koshal, 1987].

Morphological adaptation during cultural exchanges is further complicated by languages acquiring and integrating foreign morphemes. English's fabled history of borrowing from other languages is shown by naturalized loanwords like "safari" from Swahili and "bazaar" from Persian [Ahn & Kiaer, 2020]. Morphology's adaptability to social changes shows language's flexibility and strength. Society generates, steals, and eliminates morphemes, changing language. Since linguistic expressions reflect the times, this vibrancy highlights the link between language and cultural identity [Koshal, 1987].

Since language often reacts to or predicts social changes, sociocultural variables will likely continue to impact morphology. AI and machine learning may demand new morphemes to characterize cognitive processes and digital interactions, expanding the morphological repertoire [Ponomarova & Chudnova, 2020]. Global networking and social media access may speed up the invention and spread of new morphemes. Broad communication creates universal terminology and localizes borrowed morphemes, which may promote global language convergence and divergences [Kilyeni, 2015].

Fanspeak, especially in internet forums, reveals how morphologically creative specialized groups are at inventing jargon and slang. There is a lot of morphological creativity in fan language on online communities and platforms. Fans often make up their own specialized jargon and slang that shows who they are as a group and what they like. The first example is "headcanon". It comes from the words "head" and "canon," and fans use it to talk about their own, unofficial beliefs or stories about people or places that aren't part of the official story. Next, short for "relationship," "ship" can be used as both a term and a verb to describe how much fans want or believe that two characters will fall in love. This idea led to the creation of compound words like "shipping" and "shipper." In addition, the term "fandom" comes from the combination of "fan" and "-dom," and it refers to a group of fans who are all deeply devoted to the same show, series, or character. Similarly, fanfic is short for "fan fiction," which means stories about well-known characters or places that were written by fans instead of the original authors. Additionally, a "drabble" is a short piece of fiction, usually around 100 words

long. The word comes from fan fiction. Feels is slang for "feelings," and fan groups often use it to talk about how strongly they feel about stories, characters, or events. Moreover, when a fan or group believes in only one perfect romantic pairing for a character, this is called "One True Pairing," and it shows how much they care about those relationships. Collectively such phrases show how fan communities, which are brought together by a love of the same thing, change language by making their own unique words.

Since micro-cultures are linguistically inventive, their specialized vocabularies often incorporate new morphemes from blending, clipping, and acronyms [Permatasari & Karjo, 2023]. Multilingual populations increase linguistic hybridity and morphological language blending. In bilingual and multilingual communities with frequent language borrowing and code-switching, new morphological patterns may emerge. Interactions between language systems can lead to unique morphological structures and hybrid morphemes that reflect fluid intercultural communication [Auer, P. (Ed.), 1998].

Educational policies and language planning can encourage or ban morphemes, affecting morphological development. Language education becomes a furnace for morphological innovation and transformation, where language authorities and educational institutions shape neologisms and archaisms [Atay & Ece, 2014]. Globalization has made morphology's preservational component increasingly significant; efforts are undertaken to keep native languages alive. To preserve unique linguistic phenomena, record and encourage their use in communities [Fortes, 2022]. Thus, morphology considers both language structure and sociolinguistic context. Integrating sociocultural studies with morphological analysis offers insights into language evolution and adaptation within a societal context, predicting future linguistic expression [Koshal, 1987; Permatasari & Karjo, 2023; Auer, P. (Ed.), 1998; Atay & Ece, 2014; Fortes, 2022].

The malleability of morphology shows that language changes as society does, mirroring changes in technology, culture, and society. Language changes to meet new needs in the areas of technology, the environment, and politics [Kilyeni, 2015]. New morphological forms, like acronyms and shortenings from Twitter and other digital platforms, may make their way into official language [Kilyeni, 2015]. New ideas and technologies are added to the academic lexicon all the time, which makes it hard for second-language learners to adapt [Loi & Lim, 2015]. Language forms that are inclusive, like non-binary names, show that morphology is in line with social values [Koshal, 1987]. Looking into how new morphemes come about through derivation and compounding shows bigger changes in language [Vajda, 2017]. Through loan translations and convergent grammar [Auer, P. (Ed.), 1998], multicultural cultures add to the variety of languages spoken. Overall, the way anatomy has changed over time is similar to how people's lives change as society changes and new technologies come out [Koshal, 1987; Kilyeni, 2015; Auer, P. (Ed.), 1998; Loi & Lim, 2015; Vajda, 2017].

Migration and changes in population have a big effect on morphological development because languages trade parts when people move and talk to each other. According to Auer, P. (Ed.), [1998], when immigrants mix their home languages with local ones, they can create new morphological patterns that may have an effect on the language as a whole over time. Power relationships in societies determine which morphemes become common. Strong groups create specialized jargon, and social movements create new phrases that reflect social awareness [Koshal, 1987]. Language groups accept morphemes based on how well they fit in with their culture, how often they are used, and how useful they are [Vajda, 2017]. Not all new forms will stick around, though. Language policy and education also affect morphology by setting and teaching

standards. Grassroots groups often work to protect certain morphological features, which shows how language and cultural identity are connected [Atay & Ece, 2014].

Linguists and language educators can use morphology's adaptability to decide how to teach and learn languages as globalization connects different places. English's global influence is seen in how non-native speakers learn its morphology. Thus, teaching methods may emphasize global morphological processes like compounding and affixation [Loi & Lim, 2015]. Future morphology is tied to digital innovation. Large text corpora may reveal new morphological innovation patterns that human researchers miss as artificial intelligence and computational linguistics improve natural language processing. Machine learning can follow real-time morphological change in numerous languages [Ponomarova & Chudnova, 2020]. Morphological evolution study is dynamic and diverse, requiring consideration of social, technical, educational, and computational factors. Language change observation and research forecasts future language directions as well as human communication history. Language morphology will evolve due to globalization, technology, environmental concerns, and social change, influencing human culture [Kilyeni, 2015; Koshal, 1987; Auer, P. (Ed.), 1998; Atay & Ece, 2014; Ponomarova & Chudnova, 2020].

The talk included teaching, educational policy, new technologies, sociolinguistics, and the dynamics of global language change. This showed how complicated morphological growth is when educational, technological, and social factors are taken into account. Language use that is new and the need for clear communication in a world that is changing quickly are two things that lead to these changes. Globalization and new technologies make it faster for morphemes to be added and changed. Computational linguistics is also having a bigger effect on morphological studies. Academics and linguists need to be aware of and able to adapt to changes in society. This will help them understand how language mirrors and changes with human experience. Because morphology is heavily affected by social factors, it is important to keep track of changes in culture and society along with changes in word form. This makes studying language users and their societies even more important.

Conclusion

Conclusion of the Research

This conclusion shows how social changes, technical progress, and cultural exchange have had a big effect on the development of English morphology. It shows how new morphemes are made when these things happen. Language and societal norms are always changing. Trends like the rise of internet-related language and inclusive linguistic forms show that morphology is flexible and language changes to meet the communication needs of its users. These small changes in morphology can have a big impact on the language landscape and tell things about modern pressures, values, and technologies. This knowledge shows that linguistic patterns are always changing which means that language is a responsive reflection of human society. These changes in morphology present both chances and problems for linguists, teachers, and policymakers to understand and sometimes direct the development of language [Kilyeni, 2015; Koshal, 1987; Auer, P. (Ed.), 1998; Atay & Ece, 2014; Ponomarova & Chudnova, 2020].

Research Limitation

English morpheme studies have come a long way, but there are still some problems that need to be fixed before we can fully understand. Focusing only on English leaves out useful cross-linguistic studies that can show how morphemes are used and how they have changed over time in other languages. The study may also miss some historical stages of language change, and the corpus data may not include all the latest morphological advances, especially in digital communication. Some of the theories that were used, like Nolasco's stem-based hypothesis and Payne's morphosyntax framework, might make it harder to come up with other explanations. Also, because of the limitations of qualitative research methods, the complex sociocultural factors that affect the growth of morphemes are often only briefly looked into. Conclusions are not always reliable because thematic analysis is subjective and data sources may be biased. To improve the study of English morphemes, future research should address these issues by using cross-linguistic analysis, bigger data sets, and a variety of methods.

Recommendations for Further Research

Cross-linguistic and longitudinal methods can be used to look at morphological structures across languages and find both general and language-specific trends. Comparative studies help us learn more about how morphemes are used and how they have changed over time. Longitudinal studies, on the other hand, look at how morphemes change over time and show how languages change and adapt to meet new communication and cultural exchange needs. Researchers can find a wider range of morphological changes caused by pop culture, technology, and social norms by collecting data from sources other than academic books, such as everyday speech, internet conversations, and multimedia.

To get a full picture of morphological phenomena, future study should use a variety of methods, such as experimental designs, corpus linguistics, and statistical analysis that combine qualitative and quantitative approaches. Looking into the social and cultural changes that happen in language is also very important because it shows how morphological growth is linked to social change. Language evolution and morpheme change are affected by global forces such as international migration and the media. These strategies will help us learn more about how complicated language is as a social tool. They will also help linguistic study move forward by using approaches from different fields and being open to new information and ideas.

References

- Ahn, H., & Kiaer, J. (2020). Pop culture words. *English Today*, 37(3), 178–187. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266078420000292>
- Aronoff, M. (1981). *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*. The MIT Press.
- Atay, D., & Ece, A. (2009). Multiple Identities as Reflected in English-Language Education: The Turkish Perspective. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 8(1), 21–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348450802619961>
- Auer, P. (Ed.). (1998). *Code-Switching in Conversation*. In *Routledge eBooks*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203017883>
- Baird, A. (1999). The qualitative research interview. *Practice Nursing*, 10(9), 8–14. <https://doi.org/10.12968/pnur.1999.10.9.8>
- Carstairs-McCarthy, A. (2018). *An Introduction to English Morphology: Words and Their Structure*. <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA5513044X>

- Castillo-Montoya, M. (2016). Preparing for Interview Research: The Interview Protocol Refinement Framework. *the æQualitative Report*.
<https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2016.2337>
- DeCapua, A. (2016). Morphology: Words and Their Parts. In *Springer texts in education* (pp. 21–43). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-33916-0_2
- Desai, V., & Potter, R. (2006). Doing Development Research. In *SAGE Publications Ltd eBooks*. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849208925>
- Fortes, A. C. (2022, October 1). *Morphological Paradigm of Nouns and Verbs: Meaning and Functions in Bisakol, a Philippine-type language*. ACL Anthology. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.paclic-1.26>
- Halle, M., & Marantz, A. (1993). Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. In K. Hale, & S. J. Keyser (Eds.), *The view from building 20* (pp. 111-176). The MIT Press
- Haspelmath, M. (2015). Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues (2009). Eva-mpg. https://www.academia.edu/3453003/Lexical_borrowing_Concepts_and_issues_2009
- Jaspal, R. (2020, January 1). Content analysis, thematic analysis and discourse analysis. <https://dora.dmu.ac.uk/handle/2086/18643>
- Kilyeni, A. (2015). Likes, Tweets and Other “Friends”: Social Media Buzzwords from a Terminology Perspective. *Procedia: Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 430–437. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.059>
- Kim, L. C., & Lim, J. M. H. (2015). Hedging in Academic Writing - A Pedagogically-Motivated Qualitative Study. *Procedia: Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 600–607. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.200>
- Koshal, S. (1987). Honorific Systems of the Ladakhi language. *Multilingua*, 6(2), 149–168. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.1987.6.2.149>
- Lackova, M., & Lelakova, E. (2014). Interlingual Homonyms of Polysemic Origin in Related Languages. *Komunikácie*, 16(3), 29–35. <https://doi.org/10.26552/com.c.2014.3.29-35>
- Lane, H. B., Gutlohn, L., & Van Dijk, W. (2019). Morpheme Frequency in Academic Words: Identifying High-Utility Morphemes for Instruction. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 58(3), 184–209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2019.1617375>
- Lepic, R. (2016, July 22). *Lexical blends and lexical patterns in English and in American Sign Language*. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2mt6j2qg>
- Lieber, R. (2010). *Introducing Morphology*. Cambridge University Press.
- McBride, B., & McBride, B. (2024, June 4). *Ground Stone Analysis | The University of Utah Press*. The University of Utah Press |. <https://uofupress.lib.utah.edu/ground-stone-analysis/>
- Permatasari, S. C., & Karjo, C. H. (2023). The Influence of Fandom Language in the Word Formation of Indonesian Internet Slangs. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 388, 04040. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202338804040>
- Ponomarova, L. V., & Chudnova, Y. (2020). STRUCTURAL FEATURES OF THE COMPUTER TERMS OF THE UKRAINIAN AND RUSSIAN LANGUAGE. *Nova Filologiã*, 2(80). <https://doi.org/10.26661/2414-1135-2020-80-2-22>
- Pope, C., Ziebland, S., & Mays, N. (2006). *Analysing Qualitative Data*. 63–81. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470750841.ch7>
- Rafli, R., & Mailiani, M. (2020). Morphological Analysis on Cranberry Morpheme Found In Mark Twain’s Selected Works. *Jurnal Ilmiah Langue and Parole*, 3(2), 57–69. <https://doi.org/10.36057/jilp.v3i2.436>

- Raysmith, B. P., Jacobsson, J., Drew, M. K., & Timpka, T. (2019). What Is Performance? A Scoping Review of Performance Outcomes as Study Endpoints in Athletics. *Sports*, 7(3), 66. <https://doi.org/10.3390/sports7030066>
- Sager, J. C., & Ndi-Kimbi, A. (1995). The conceptual structure of terminological definitions and their linguistic realisations. *Terminology*, 2(1), 61–85. <https://doi.org/10.1075/term.2.1.04sag>
- Scarborough, H. S., & Brady, S. A. (2002). Toward a Common Terminology for Talking about Speech and Reading: A Glossary of the “Phon” Words and Some Related Terms. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 34(3), 299–336. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15548430jlr3403_3
- Tagliamonte, S. A. (2016). So sick or so cool? The language of youth on the internet. *Language in Society*, 45(1), 1–32. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43904632>
- Vajda, E. J. (2017). Making new words: Morphological derivation in English. *Word*, 63(4), 286–288. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.2017.1386896>
- Van Der Meer, G. (2011). “Nonmorphological Derivations” and the Four Main English Learner’s Dictionaries. DOAJ (DOAJ: Directory of Open Access Journals). <https://doi.org/10.5788/11--852>
- Zeige, L. E. (2015). Word forms, classification, and family trees of languages—Why morphology is crucial for linguistics. *Zoologischer Anzeiger*, 256, 42–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcz.2015.02.003>