English Major Students' Use of the Computer and their Attitudes towards Internet English.

استخدام طلبة اللغة الانجليزية للحاسوب واتجاهاتهم نحو لغة الانترنت

By

Hala Abu Hejleh

SN: 2006314

Supervisor: Prof. Riyad F. Hussein

Faculty of Arts

Department of English

MIDDLE EAST UNIVERSITY

Amman-Jordan

Summer Semester: 2009-2010

Authorization

I, Hala Abu Hejleh, authorize Middle East University for Graduate Studies to provide libraries, organizations and even persons with copies of my thesis when required.

Name: Hala Abu Hejleh
Signature: Hala abu Hejleh
Date: 13/10/2010

Thesis Committee Decision

This Thesis "English Major Students' Use of the Computers was discussed and certified on …………, 2010

Thesis Committee   <u>Signature</u>

Prof. Riyad F. Hussein   Supervisor

Prof.   Member

Prof.   Member

Acknowledgments

Dedications

This thesis is dedicated to my beloved parents, Abdul Mutaleb and Wafa who have installed in me love, faith and patience. I am lucky to have wonderful parents like you, I love you so much.

This thesis is also dedicated to my husband, Jamal Abu Hejleh who lightened up my life and filled it with hope and continuous love.

I would also like to dedicate this thesis to my friend Ikram Al.Azzeh for her continuous support; she has been there for me whenever I needed her. I am really thankful to her.

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my grandmother Sarah, to my brother, Fares and his wife Jumana, my brother Mohammed and his wife Riham and my little brother Salah. This thesis is dedicated also to the memory of my father in law, Sameer Abu Hejleh and loving memory of my daughter Iman, to my mother in law, Samar Abu Hejleh and to my sisters in law Nawar and Hamsa and to my brother in law Mudar. I appreciate your sincere love and encouragement.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Appendices

Appendix	Title	Page Number
1	English major students questionnaire	111
2	Approval letter form the Middle East University	112
3	Panel of juries	113

English Major Students' Use of the Computer and their Attitudes
toward Internet English

By
Hala Abu Hejleh
Supervisor
Professor Riyad F. Hussein

Abstract

This study was an attempt to explore "English Major Students' Use of the Computer and their Attitudes toward Internet English language". It aimed to investigate English majors use of e-mailing, chatting and instant messaging. The study also examined students' attitudes toward Internet English, which is considerably different from Standard English.

To achieve the goal of the study, a questionnaire was developed and distributed to 245 English major undergraduate students from Al.Isra'a Private University and the University of Jordan. The sample represented different ages, genders and levels. The questionnaire consisted of three sections which covered the four dimensions of the study; the use of emailing, chatting and instant messaging, the systematic and orthographic aspects of Internet English language and students' attitudes towards Internet English.

The results of the study showed that Internet English language she does not have negative impact on Standard English. The Internet users sometimes ignore the Standard English rules, not because they phase lack knowledge but to save time and effort. The data also showed that Standard English is not threatened by using Internet English language. In general, students have positive attitudes towards Internet language, because as mentioned before it is a linguistic medium

students use to show how they are relaxed when they send informal e-mails and chat with their friends and colleagues.

استخدام طلبة اللغة الانجليزية للحاسوب واتجاهاتهم نحو لغة الانترنت

اعداد

هلا أبو حجلة

اشراف

الاستاذ الدكتور رياض حسين

ملخص الدراسة

هدفت هذه الدراسة الى الكشف عن استخدام طلبة اللغة الانجليزية للحاسوب واتجاهاتهم نحو لغة الانترنت، بما يتعلق ببرامج المحادثة والرسائل الالكترونية، لا سيما وأن لغة الانترنت تختلف عن اللغة الانجليزية الرسمية.

و لتحقيق أهداف الدراسة، تم توزيع 245 على طلبة جامعتي الأردنية والإسراء الأهلية، وقد مثلت العينة أعمارا مختلفة من سنوات دراسية مختلفة شملت كلا الجنسين. وتكونت الاستبانة من ثلاثة أقسام شملت أبعاد الدراسة الاربعة و هي كما يلي:

1- استخدام طلبة اللغة الانجليزية للحاسوب بما يتعلق ببرامج المحادثة والرسائل الالكترونية.

2- الجوانب اللغوية والاملائية للغة الانترنت .

3- اتجاهات الطلبة نحو لغة الانترنت.

وأظهرت النتائج أنه ليس للغة الانترنت أية انعكاسات سلبية على اللغة الانجليزية الرسمية، و أن الطلبة قد يتجاهلون أحيانا استخدام قواعد اللغة الانجليزية الصحيحة ليس بسبب افتقارهم للمعرفة وانما لتوفير الوقت والجهد فقط، كما بينت الدراسة أن الطلبة ينظرون نظرة ايجابية للغة الانترنت، باعتبار أنها توفر لهم حرية التعبير مع أصدقائهم وزملائهم بعيدا عن أية ضوابط رسمية وبشكل مسل وممتع.

Chapter One
Introduction

1.0 Background of the Study

The past quarter of the century has witnessed the emergence of computers as a vital force in governmental agencies, corporates, university contexts, homes and businesses. Ferris (1997) mentioned that the Computer – Mediated Communication (CMC) is relatively a new area of study, but as computers became an essential part of the society, education, industry and government activities, the field is going through rapid growth. He pointed out that the lowered costs of computer technologies have increased the users' number.

According to the Wikipedia, the term Computer - Mediated Communication is defined as any communicative transaction that occurs through the use of two or more networked computers. While the term has <u>traditionally</u> referred to those communications that occur via computer-mediated formats (e.g., <u>instant messages</u>, <u>e-mails</u>, <u>chat rooms</u>), it has also been applied to other forms of text-based interaction such as <u>text messaging</u>..

Undergraduate students use the (CMC) technologies widely; some of them use it for entertainment, while others may wish to benefit from the (CMC) technologies for academic reasons. Gates (1998) claimed that in 1983 computer users were mainly science and engineering majors. But the case changed in 1998 and all students needed access to computers regardless of their majors. The reason behind the wide usage of (CMC) among students is the increased reliance on electronic communication due to the convenience, speed, cost effectiveness and environmental advantages of CMC.

The researcher in the current study aims at investigating the computer use among English major students and how Internet English affects their Standard English. Internet English has unique features which differ from Standard English; so it is important to investigate the impact of Internet English on Standard English. Mann and Stewart (2000) suggested that "(CMC) is a new kind of discourse" (p. 182). This is because (CMC) language is historically unique; it combines features of both spoken and written language. Baron (2002) defined the Computer-Mediated Communication as "Any natural language messaging that is transmitted and / or received via computer connection, the term (CMC) refers to a written natural language message sent via the Internet" (p. 10).

The current study also sheds light on English major students' attitudes towards Internet English because it is known that the number of Internet users has rapidly increased in the last few years, especially among young generations. Wellman and Haythornthwaite (2002) discussed the importance of communication between people through the Internet. He reported that the Internet can lead people away from person – to - person and telephone encounters; it can increase the forms of contact and intensify relationships. Bakardjieva (2005) pointed out that in the process driven by powerful push from telecommunications industry, the Internet is gradually being incorporated into daily routines of people along with the telephone, the television, audio and video equipment.

In this study, the researcher is fully aware that English is the prominent language of the Internet, and the dominance of English in the Internet needs no argument. Computers are English – oriented, the vocabulary of computing and of the Internet is English and most of the texts that are accessed though the Internet are in English, and the search engines are also in English.

The Internet World Stats presents its latest estimates for Internet users by language. English ranked number one in the top ten languages used through the web. The statistics which were updated on December,

2009 show that there are 499.2 million English speaking people using the Internet. This represents 27.7% of all Internet users in the world.

Previous research mentioned that Internet English is informal language which includes the use of emoticons, abbreviations, misspellings, grammatical errors, rich vocabulary, and one of the clearest features of Internet language is the lexicon which is used to fit Internet situation. (Kiato 1992, Angel and Heslop 1994, Danet 2002 and Crystal 2006). According to other researchers, such as Herring 1996, Randall 2002, and Harahsheh 2004, Internet English is a combination of spoken and written language, because the Internet users tend to use emoticons, asterisks and symbols replacing words in order to compensate the loss of paralinguistic features in real conversations, such as facial expressions, voice inflections and body gestures.

Generally speaking, students have positive attitudes towards Internet English. Students think that doing chatting and instant messaging is enjoyable, and some of the students find themselves free of language constraints, i.e., using the correct language associated with traditional writing.

The researcher of the current study attempted to investigate students' attitudes towards Internet English and their computer use by

focusing on e-mailing, chatting and instant messaging. The researcher decided to do so because computer use is significantly increasing. According the Wikipedia, the Internet penetration in Jordan is 36% (as of March 2009), and this is relatively a high figure. Internet usage in Jordan doubled from 2007 to 2009 with the rapid growth expected to continue. In addition, Internet language has special characteristics which differ from Standard English, so it is important to study those characteristics and students' attitudes towards them. But the Internet is only part of the world of computer – mediated language. Many new technologies are anticipated which will integrate the Internet with other communication situations, and they will provide the matrix for the development of further language varieties.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The use of English language on Computer – Mediated Communications (CMC) motivated the researcher to put an effort investigating the impact of Internet English on Standard English and the difference between them. The researcher attempted to investigate this issue in order to figure out students' attitudes toward using informal language on (CMC) communications, especially in personal e-mailing, chatting and instant messaging.

1.2 Objectives of the study

The researcher aimed to achieve the following main objectives:

1. To study English major students' use of the computer and how it affects their English.

2. To examine the systematic and orthographic aspects of Internet English.

3. To study the attitudes of English major students towards Internet English.

4. To examine the difference between Internet English and Standard English.

1.3 Questions of the study

The main goal of this study was to explore computer use among English major students, how it affects their English and their attitudes towards Internet English. More specifically, the study attempted to answer the following four questions:

1. How does the use of computer among English major students affect their English?

2. What is the attitude of English major students towards Internet English?

3. What are the systematic and orthographic features of Internet English?

4. What is the difference between Internet English and Standard English?

1.4 Significance of the study

This study is a useful attempt because it investigated the degree of computer use among English major students and their attitudes towards Internet English. So it will benefit the students themselves because it will explore an allegedly new language variety, namely Internet English, and how it differs form Standard English. As it is known, very few studies have been conducted in this area. It is therefore expected that this study will fill a gap in the Jordanian context.

1.5 Definition of terms

This study has some terms which will be used throughout the study; here are the definitions of these terms:

The Internet, sometimes called simply "the Net," is a worldwide system of computer networks - a network of networks in which users at any one computer can, if they have permission, get information from any

other computer (and sometimes talk directly to users at other computers. (Whatis.com).

Electronic mail (e-mail): is the use of computer systems to transfer messages between users – now chiefly used to refer to messages sent between privet mailboxes (as apposed to those posted to a chat group).

Chat groups : Chat groups are continuous discussions on particular topic, organized in ' rooms' at particular Internet sites, in which computer users interested in specific topic can participate. There are two situations here, depending on whether the interaction takes place in real time *(synchronous)* or in postponed time *(asynchronous).*

Internet slang (**Internet language**, **Internet Short-hand**, **Netspeak** or **Chatspeak**) is a type of slang that Internet users have popularized and, in many cases, have coined. Many people use the same abbreviations in texting and instant messaging, and social networking websites.

Computer – mediated Communication ((CMC)): refers to human communication via computers and includes many different forms

of <u>synchronous</u>, <u>asynchronous</u> or <u>real-time</u> interaction that humans have with each other using computers as tools to exchange text, images, audio and video. (CMC) includes <u>e-mail</u>, network communication, <u>instant messaging</u>, <u>text messaging</u>, <u>hypertext</u>, <u>distance learning</u>, <u>Internet forums</u>, <u>bulletin boards</u>, online shopping, distribution lists and <u>videoconferencing</u>. (Isp.webopedia.com the Glossary for Internet).

Microsoft's Instant Messaging (MSN): Instant messaging allows online conversation in real time with friends or acquaintances, it is possible to have conversation for just between two people. Today there are different instant messaging systems such as ICQ (I seek you), Yahoo Messenger and Microsoft's MSN/ Window Messenger. The most notable difference between IM and chat groups is that there is an increased level of intimacy between IM participants who know each other.

Bulletin-board system (BBS): is a computerized system used to exchange public messages or files. A BBS is typically reached by using a dial-up modem. Most are dedicated to a special interest, which may be an extremely narrow topic. Any user may "post" his or her own message, so that it appears on the site for all to read. (Free online Encyclopedia).

Internet Relay Chat (IRC): is an international computer network of Internet servers, using its own protocol through which individual users can hold real-time online conversations. (Answers .com).

American Science Code for Information Interchange (ASCII): is a term which can be referred to an America text format. For example ASCII artwork would be artwork created by using text character alone. Attachment – this is a file that is sent along with an e-mail message. An attachment can be a picture, a compressed Zib file containing images or other things, or a virus. (Basic Internet dictionary).

Emoticons (Smileys): an emoticon is a textual expression representing the face of a writer's mood or facial expression. For example, :), :(, and: D. They are often used to alert the responder to the tenor or temper of a statement, and can change and improve interpretation of plain text. (Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia).

Instant messaging (IM): is a form of <u>real-time</u> communication between two or more <u>people</u> based on the typed text. The <u>text</u> is conveyed via devices connected over a network such as the <u>Internet</u>. (Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia)

I Seek You (ICQ): is a popular instant messaging computer program which was developed by a specialized computer programming company. (en.wikipedia.org).

1.6 Limitations of the Study

The results of the study cannot be generalized to all English major students because they are limited to the subjects of the study. The limited time and resources available when conducting this study do not allow generalizing the results to the whole population.

Chapter Two

Review of Related Literature

2.0 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to review the related literature. This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section tackles the theoretical literature which includes systematic and orthographic features of Internet English discussed by different scholars and researchers. The second section deals with empirical studies that examine the features of Internet English, computer use and attitudes towards Internet English.

2.1 Review of Theoretical Literature

Below is a systematic review of the features related to Internet English which included e-mailing, instant messaging and chatting.

2.1.1 Systematic and Orthographic Features of Internet English.

There are numerous differences between Internet English and Standard English in orthographic and usage traditions, which may be due to a number of factors, such as typing speed and concern with the message (meaning) at the expense of the from. This part outlines the systematic and orthographic aspects of Internet English.

Kitao (1990) believed that since people who are reading messages in mailing lists or newsgroups cannot hear the tone of the sender's voice, it is common to indicate symbols like ☺ (a smile), or ;) (a smile with a wink). These emoticons or smileys are widely used in Internet communication to express feelings. Angel and Heslop (1994) as cited in Crystal (2006) talked about grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors in e-mail communication. They stated that:

> **For every grammatical mistake in an e-mail message there is an average of three spelling mistakes. If you think that you are saving time by not correcting spelling errors, think again. The time saved not checking your spelling is multiplied by the time that it takes for a reader to decipher the misspelled words. Misspelled words jar your reader's concentration by diverting attention away from the idea you are expressing. Not only are**

misspellings annoying and confusing, they also cause the reader to question your credibility. Misspellings make you look sloppy or, worse yet, incompetent (p 83).

Misspellings and grammatical errors in personal emails are very common, and they usually occur as a result of fast typing. Although most of spelling and grammatical errors do not distract from the content of the message, nonetheless some manuals are again misspellings of any kind.

Danet (2002) reported that e-mail messages are characterized by a combination of not only "oral "and "written" but also digital features. Some of the speech like features are contractions and slang, as in *"I'm gonna read this book"*. As far as syntax is concerned, she found out that sentences may be complex rather than simple or compound. Other writing – linked features are the use of lists and use of nouns instead of verbs as in *"to make a payment" instead of "to pay"*.

Baron (2002) mentioned that Computer- Mediated Communication (CMC), unlike traditional written communication, has a greater sense of immediacy. As a consequence, many (CMC) users argued that written (CMC) is inadequate for expressing nuances of meaning (e. g sarcasm, tentativeness, irritation) that facial expressions convey in face to face conversation. For this reason, Baron (2002) argued that the inadequacy of

writing to express conversational features led to the emergence of two linguistic features. The first feature is the use the emoticons (also known as smileys).The second is the phenomenon known as flaming. Emoticons are made by combining punctuation mark on the computer keyboard to express emotions or semantic nuances such as happiness, sadness, winking, crying. Flaming is the use of rude or profane language. Baron (2002) stated that the use of abbreviations or acronyms is prominent in (CMC). She claimed that saving time and effort is often a motivation to use abbreviations and acronyms in (CMC) communication.

Finegan & Richard (2004) discussed some characteristics of (CMC); they mentioned that (CMC) is characterized by frequent occurrences of linguistic features such as the verbs "feel" and "believe' and first and second person pronouns like (I, us, and you). In addition, (CMC) exhibits some features like the use of abbreviations as a time – saving strategy. Grammar in (CMC) communication is simplified with almost a telegraphic style often employed.

Okin (2005) argued that simplicity is the most important feature of e-mails. He added that both e-mail and chat allow people to be part of one – to – one communications, or one to – many group communications.

Both are used in personal and business communication and they are also accessed through easy and free tools. According to Okin (2005), the difference between e-mails and chatting is that e-mails lack the sense of immediacy and they are written and replied at with little or no concern when those messages will be read. In contrast, Internet chatting is immediate and spontaneous; it is fast, abrupt, rich in vocabulary abbreviations, acronyms and jargon.

Crystal (2006) talked about some features of Netspeak. He argued that one of the clearest features is the lexicon that belongs to the Internet which is encountered when someone enters any of the Internet situations. He mentioned that there are large numbers of words and phrases which have emerged in order to fit with Internet – restricted situations. He stated that the various types of abbreviations found in Netspeak have been one of its most remarkable features. Acronyms are so common; tiny examples would include bulletin board system (BBS), blind carbon copy (BCC), and Internet service provider (ISP). The letter – plus – number combinations can be also considered as one of Netspeak features. Some of the examples include World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), Platform for Privacy Preferences (P3P) (p. 89).

Crystal (2006) mentioned that chatgroups have their abbreviations and the acronyms are no longer restricted to words or short phrases, but can be sentence length: Are you stupid or something (AYSOS), Consider it done (CID), Check it out (CIO), What did you say (WDY). In addition, individual words can be reduced to two or three letters: please (PLZ), thanks (THX) whatever (WE). There are also rebuses, in that the sound value of the letter acts as a syllable of word like Bye for now (B4N), See you later (CYL) (p. 90). Chat groups also use non – standard spelling such as yep, yup, nope for expressing yes and no, and for the purpose of expressing shock and horror they use numbers of vowels and consonants like *"aiiiiiiiiiiiiiieeee, yayeeeeeeee"*. Teenagers also have their own spellings like cool (kool) and phone (foon) and the replacement of a lower case o by zero as in losers (l0zers) or percentage sign, as in (c%l) (pp. 93- 94).

Crystal (2006) argued that punctuation sometimes is completely absent from some e-mails and chat exchanges. The use of punctuation depends on personality; sometimes it is used strictly to maintain the traditional punctuation practices; on other occasions it is used when it is necessary to avoid ambiguity and some e-mailers and chatters do not use it at all, either because of typing speed, or because they do not realize that

ambiguity can be one of the consequences. Combinations of punctuation marks can also occur, such as *(…..)* to express pause, repeated hyphens may also occur *(-----)* in addition to the repeated use of commas *(,,,,,,,,)* (p.95). According to Crystal (2006), "The most general features of Netspeak distinctiveness are currently found chiefly in graphology and lexicon, the levels of language where it is relatively easy to introduce innovation and deviation" (p . 96).

The Language of E-mail Messages.

Crystal (2006) discussed different Internet situations. He started with the language of e-mail; he mentioned that the body of the e-mail should be visible within the screen view without the need for scrolling. This is because people usually use e-mails for brief and rapid communication. When the message in the e-mail gets longer, attention is paid to the importance of information and which paragraph should appear at the beginning. There is also the clarity of the message in e-mails, and clarity in this context involves both legibility and intelligibility. Legibility here refers to ways of enhancing readability. Writers of e-mails are highly recommended to highlight their points in bullets or numbering

facilities. This is considered to be an important stylistic feature of e-mails which is rare in letters and typewritten documents.

Crystal (2006) mentioned another important feature of e-mail language which is the use of short and simple sentences because long ones are difficult to read on the screen. Another important feature of e-mails mentioned by Crystal (2006) is the length of the text body of e-mails. He argued that it is relatively short especially personal ones. In addition to the above mentioned features, he mentioned other distinctive linguistic features which are the structure of screen, opening and closing of the messages, the length of the message, framing and dialogic strategies.

Misspellings in E– mails page

Misspellings are also the natural feature in the body of e-mail, and they occur due to fast typing. Crystal (2006) argued that these misspellings do not usually disrupt the communication, and the message could be understood even when these misspelling exist as in this example: *"have eyou got the tickets yet", "I'll procede with the practical arrangements"* (p.116). On the other hand, there are some misspellings which are ambiguous and not understandable, like for example: *"Cab we*

reach by 9". Although there are spelling mistakes in e-mail writing, but the interference with the meaning is rare.

Use of abbreviations

Crystal (2006) discussed the use of informal features in e-mails, which are the use of abbreviation *"bye, cos, v slow, s/thing"* acronyms like *"LOL, CU, B4N"* and subject ellipsis *"Will let you know"*. However, these features according to Crystal (2006) are "not indicative of the variety as a whole, as many messages do not use them" (p. 127).

Features of Chatting

The Internet allows people to engage in online conversations, either synchronously, in real time, or asynchronously, in postponed time. Crystal (2006) has used chatgroups to refer to "worldwide multi – participant electronic discourse, whether real – time or not". (p. 134).

Asynchronous Chat Groups

The interactions of the chatters in asynchronous setting are delayed and stored in some format, they are available only if the chat groups demanded them in order to catch the previous discussions or add to it

after a period of time. Crystal (2006) stated that a typical feature of asynchronous chat groups is the length of the message which is relatively short. In addition, short responses make the conversations in chatting more dynamic. Another important feature related to the asynchronous chat groups is that chatters are always able to introduce new topics; however there is nothing in asynchronous chat groups resembling the randomness of subject matter in face – to – face communication. The use of rhetorical questions, either to express personal attitudes, or to give extra emphasis is another unique feature of asynchronous chat groups. Examples of asynchronous chatting include Bulletin Board System (BBS).

Synchronous Chat Groups

According to Crystal (2006), the utterances of synchronous chat groups are relatively short, and this enables the conversations to be more dynamic and real. He mentioned that the use of nicknames is an important feature of synchronous chatting, in addition to the use of one or two basic smileys. Abbreviations and colloquial elisions are also used for example, (are > r, You > u, and > n) (p. 170). Punctuation is usually missing except for the question and exclamation marks and the

apostrophe is commonly absent. The use of capitalization is mostly ignored in both synchronous and asynchronous chatting situations. Distinctive grammatical features are also present in synchronous chat groups which are the omission of the verb, non agreement between subject and verb, in addition to the substitution of one case for another. Internet Relay chat (IRC) is a chief example of synchronous chatting.

Jurkowitz (2008) asserted that (IRC) users employ words and visual images in order to incorporate gestural qualities in (CMC). For instance, they spell out an action, enclosed by asterisks, such *as **shake hands* or * hugs*.* The use of such gestural qualities is due to the inability to convey those features in face to face conversations, so chatters aim to interact freely and easily in order to be able to convey specific signs which are common to most of (IRC) users.

2.1.2 Empirical Studies

Obviously, many researchers were interested in the field related to computer use among students, the language of the Internet and its characterization. They conducted many studies each of which had a purpose, was based on collecting data by using suitable instruments and reached reasonable findings.

2.1.2.3 Empirical Studies in Jordan

Sa'de (2003) studied the linguistic and textual features of the English used in Internet Relay Chat (IRC) and Yahoo Messenger (Y!) chat rooms. His study relied on a 217 pages corpus for its analysis. The corpus which was recorded directly from online chat sessions can be divided into two types: private and public chat sessions, the former always performed by two people; the latter virtually shared by several hundreds of Cyber-chat users. He found out that most non – traditional linguistic features of e – English serve one goal: economy. In addition, most Cyber – sentences are short and simple and they are used in order to save time and effort. Abbreviations and acronyms are also utilized and taboo words are widespread. Sa'de (2003) found out that much of Cyber – English is slang, colloquial, or even deformed English. Moreover, Cyber – English can not be categorized as either written or spoken English because it shares number of characteristics with each, and secludes itself from both in other features.

Harahsheh (2004) conducted a study to investigate the aspects of the language used in the Internet and mobile phones as a new electronic written dialect at the syntactic and spelling levels. His study had two main sections: The first investigated some linguistic features of Computer -Mediated Communication (CMC) which were used in Short Message Service (SMS), e-mails and International Relay Chat (IRC); it discussed spelling, punctuation, and grammatical features. The data was collected from different sites on the Internet. Moreover Harahsheh (2004) treated the use of graphical shapes such as the asterisk, emoticons and symbols replacing words. In the second section, Harahsheh (2004) conducted a questionnaire to elicit the attitudes of native speakers of English toward using (CMC), as a new electronic dialect.

The main findings of Harahsheh (2004) regarding (CMC) communication concluded the following results:

(a) The language of (CMC) is a merging of written and spoken language.

(b) Subjects wrote letters in small and capital to express their feelings; that is when they are angry they may write words in capital letters and when they are relaxed they write words in small letters.

(c) Subjects used emoticons, asterisks and symbols replacing words to compensate the loss of paralinguistic features as in real conversations, such as facial expressions, voice inflections and body gestures.

(d) Subjects were not concerned about punctuation because they wanted to save capacity.

(e) Subjects used acronyms and abbreviations in order to save time, effort and capacity.

(f) The reduction of words in (CMC) communication enables people to interact freely and easily.

(g) Subjects used several verb phrase techniques such as omitting auxiliary verbs as a matter of key speed, or they focused on the meaning rather than on the grammar.

(h) Subjects tended to omit prepositions, the definite articles, relative pronouns and subject as a matter of speed and to save time and effort.

(i) The (CMC) is a new electronic written dialect used by (CMC) users to fit the situation in the Internet and mobile telephones. Moreover, (CMC) does not have a negative impact on English grammar and on handwritten English.

The two main objectives of Khatib's (2008) study were to determine the full extent of communication which was achieved via electronic mediated communication among Jordanian university students and to see whether e-mail, as a new medium of communication, signifies a new genre of writing. The corpus of his study consisted of 500 personal e-mail messages collected from the files of 50 English major students enrolled at Jordan University of Science and Technology. The study attempted to approach this phenomenon from a sociolinguistic point of view; it discussed the communicative functions of e-mail messages as used by homogenous group of students in terms of language mastery and socio- culture background. The subjects of the study were of both genders, their ages ranged from 18-22 years. Structured interviews were also used in order to get information about the way messages were framed by the socio - cultural background of the students.

The findings of Khatib (2008) showed that e-mail texts were written in a mode different from that in personal letter – writing, and that the texts served a considerable number of communicative functions. Moreover, the study showed that the content of e-mail messages is governed by sociological factors such as gender and religion, in addition to a number of other local communicative strategies. Therefore, the main argument developed by Khatib (2008) is that electronic mail messages have certain peculiarities of their own which are the by –product of using a new medium of communication. He argued that the e-mail is a new genre of writing, but it is in the initial stages.

Khatib (2008) found out that in spite of the fact that personal e-mail messages share some features with personal letter writing, they differ in considerable number of other features. The difference between letter writing and e-mail messages is mainly the use of computer as an electronic means of communication. Moreover, data revealed that 22% of the messages included some decorative devices, and most of such devices were happy emoticons, and the great majority of the used happy emoticons were smileys of different types.

Another remarkable observation made by students was the use of shortenings, contractions, acronyms and less capitalization. Students tend to use these non – standard forms in order to save time and effort.

Khatib (2008) concluded that 96% of the interviewed students reported that they prefer to communicate via e-mails because of the quick, simple and informal language. They find themselves free of the constraints of language which are the correct language use, a characteristic associated with conventional letter – writing.

2.1.2.4 Empirical Studies World -Wide

Many studies dealt with computer use among students, and their attitudes towards Internet English in addition to the linguistic and orthographic features of Internet English in different regions of the world. These studies are grouped as the following.

Herring (1996) conducted a study which aimed at describing Computer- Mediated Communication interactions. In her study of (CMC) interactions at the University of Texas at Arlington, she collected and analyzed (14) papers of scholarly works which report on empirical observation and analysis of (CMC), mostly in the form of case studies

focusing on (CMC) genres. Data examined the (CMC) collections, represented a broad range of (CMC) genres – synchronous and asynchronous, local and global, academic and recreational. Herring (1996) found out that (CMC) language is typed, and hence like writing, but the exchanges are informal and rapid, hence like the spoken conversation. Moreover (CMC) has unique features of its own, such as the use of emoticons, as well as special lexis ("lurking", "flaming", "and spamming").

Danet et al (1997) study investigated writing, play and performance on Internet Relay Chat (IRC). They analyzed a "virtual party" on IRC, whose highlight was a typed simulation of smoking marihuana. They adopted a qualitative, textual, and micro-sociolinguistic approach. Danet et al (1997) argued that "digital writing is strictly playful" (p. 1). They added that computer keyboard is something similar to the piano keyboard. On the computer keyboard, individuals can produce wonderful effects within options of upper and lower cases, numbers and typographic symbols. The authors also mentioned that "emoticons" such as ;), (: on computer screen are icons to express emotions.

Paolillo (1999) discussed the social network and language variation and change through qualititative and quantitative analyses of log files on the (IRC). Participants of the (IRC) channel were mostly Indian nationals living abroad, ethnic Indians and children of nationals living in other countries. There are no participants connected form India itself. The largest number of the participants connect from the US the UK and Canada; some also connect from other countries such as Indonesia and Thailand. Interactions of the Indian channel on (IRC) were recorded and the resulting file was imported on a relational database to enable the coding of linguistic and international features. Paollilo (1999) stated that since (IRC) messages are typed at a keyboard, there is a tendency to use English. So, a number of distinctive of (IRC) spelling practices have emerged. Some of these practices include substituting the letters *" u"* *and " r"* for the English words *" you " and " are",* and substituting the letters *" s" for " z" as in " becuz"* instead of *" because"*. All these spellings diverge from Standard written English

Stevenson (1999) examined the language of Internet chat rooms. He collected 100 pages from a chat program called "mIRC". He reported that the most dominant feature of the Internet Relay Chat is the use of acronyms, which are used in order to reduce the number of "key –

strokes" to an absolute minimum. Usually an acronym is used to replace a phrase such as oh my god into (OMG) or by the way into (BTW). Stevenson (1999) mentioned that the acronym (LOL), Laughing Out Loud has occurred with considerable frequency in his corpus. He argued that chatters are pressured to type quickly, and they use every method possible to keep up with the conversation. One example that illustrates this is *"btw, how many msgs did u just received from all the helpful mens in here? Lol"* He found out chatters use emoticons to express emotions like happiness as in *(:,* sadness as in *):* , winking as in *;)* , and being friendly as in *:-]* .

Lee (2002) investigated the linguistic features of text – based Computer Mediated Communication (CMC) in Hong Kong. He collected (70,000) – word corpus of e-mail and ICQ instant messaging texts from 72 bilinguals in Hong Kong, who were mainly secondary schools and university students. A questionnaire survey was also carried out to complement the textual findings. Some language – specific features were identified, which included Cantonese – based shortenings, common grammatical errors such as inappropriate verb forms and lexical choice, subject omission, code mixing and creative orthographic representations of Cantonese. Lee (2002) mentioned some examples of

verb form errors such *as "I have write you e-mail"* which should be *"I have written you an e-mail"*. Lee (2002) identified some of examples of (CMC) linguistic features provided by respondents such as (BTW) by the way, (CU) see you, (STH) something, (bi bi) bye bye, (Oic), oh I see.

Randall (2002) conducted a study which examined the new and creative language of the Internet. His study contained the results of a national telephone survey of 1,000 Canadians between the ages of 16 and 54, as well as the results of two focus groups, informal interviews of Internet users among the student population at that University of Waterloo in Canada, and observation of messages on Chat systems and Web discussion boards.

His study showed that the Internet is the first medium where communication combined key elements of written and spoken language in real way. Also emoticons and other indicators of emotion or reaction were attempts to represent the body, while the use of punctuation and grammar represented the spoken word. The acronyms and abbreviations served two functions: they allowed for greater speed, and they enabled the users to demonstrate their belonging to the communities that use specific abbreviations.

The results of Randall (2002) also showed that Internet users recognized the difference in formality, between the conventions of the spoken language and the written language. Over 50% of Randall's survey respondents regularly check their spelling in e-mail messages. Over 75% regularly include a salutation or other greeting; over 50% use a distinct closing. While recognizing that instant messaging and chat are simulations of spoken language, these numbers dropped considerably with instant messaging and Chat, according to the survey respondents. The results of the survey also showed that 27% of the respondents said they always use emoticons when using instant messaging; about 46% at least used them regularly. Only 22% of the respondents did not use emoticons at all. Among the people who joined chat rooms, emoticons are commonly used, with 46% using them frequently and another 32% occasionally. Emoticons were used much less in e-mail.

Only 16% used them always or often, with 59% claiming not using them at all. It seems that the e-mail is considered more formal mode of writing as only 11% of those surveyed used acronyms regularly in e-mails. And abbreviations were employed only by 16%. However, practical observation revealed stronger tendency to use emoticons in e-mails.

Warschauer et al (2002) examined English and Arabic languages use in online communications by a group of 43 young professionals in Egypt. Their study combined linguistic analyses, a survey and interviews. Warschauer et al. (2002) findings indicated that English is the dominant language used online among a particular group of early Internet adopters in Egypt, and a written form of Romanized Egyptian Arabic in also used in informal communication by this group. The authors concluded that the participants of their study stated that their use of English on the Internet is not indicative of embracing a western culture or an abandonment of Egyptian identity. In contrast, they described their use of English on the Internet in terms of Egypt proud history of being able to take the best from the abroad array of foreign culture and make it their own. The participants also mentioned that they use the Egyptian Arabic in informal situations on the Internet in order to express their thoughts and feelings.

Durham (2003) examined how the language situation in Switzerland affects, and may be affected by, the choice of languages for Internet use within the country. Her study focused on language choices on a mailing list for members of Swiss medical students' organization. She conducted qualitative analyses of comments by the members in the e-mails and in interviews. The total number of e-mail messages collected

for her study was 996. Durham (2003) argued that English has become the lingua franca, the preferred language of communication among this group. According to her, the importance of English in Switzerland is due to the fact that English appears to be most readily understood and acceptable in mixed language groups, the main reason behind this is that it is non – native language for all.

Gras (2004) studied the Internet usage among Spanish university students. The research technique which was used to obtain the data was an electronic survey from a population of 29 students. He argued that the Internet is essentially used to search for academic, informative and commercial information as the encyclopedia, commercial dictionaries and newspapers or the specialized presses have been traditionally used. According to Gras (2004), the Internet is also used for entertainment in the same way the television has been traditionally used. In his study, he aimed to gain a full understanding of the habits and use of university students with regard to the ICTs with particular emphasis on the Internet.

The results of Gras (2004) also showed that the digital illiteracy among students is minimal, but in spite of that the majority of users display passive uses of the Internet. A more plausible reason of this would seem to be that large multinationals aim to control an open space

such as the Internet, establishing their own use agendas and indicating how the Internet should be used and with which contact. Regarding the habits of university students concerning the Internet use, he reported that almost all students 97% have more than one year's experience using the Internet. Likewise, it is interesting to highlight that more than 75% of them have been surfing the Internet for more than five years. In terms of how often they use the Internet, around 80% of students access the Internet everyday. All of university students surveyed owned a personal computer and the majority had Internet access.

Johnova (2004) who studied the language of chat in Czech Republic believed that Internet English is characterized by changes in spelling and grammar in addition to the wide use of acronyms and abbreviations. She added that informality is a typical feature of Internet English in addition to a specific use of punctuation, capital and lower case letters and emoticons. Johnova (2004) analyzed a corpus of over 10.000 words from several discussions on a British chat site. She found out that the use of nicknames is very common in chat rooms. The reason behind using nicknames is that it makes people feel free by obtaining a new identity. Moreover, she stated that acronyms are used in chat rooms to keep the messages short and brief. According to Johnova (2004),

describing actions and emoticons in chat is used to "compensate for the absence of the non – verbal dimension of electronic communication. It enriches the means of expression and makes chat conversation look more real, giving it the feeling of face – to face- conversation" (p. 15).

Poon (2005) investigated the notion of Hong Kong English, and language use in Computer - Mediated Communication (CMC). The aim of his dissertation was to distinguish between two varieties of Hong Kong English; one variety being the Hong Kong English in (CMC); and the other being Hong Kong English in other written forms. Firstly, the forms of these two varieties were discussed. Then using data acquired from online interviews with 16 Hong Kong adolescents, their attitudes towards both Hong Kong English in (CMC) and other forms of Hong Kong English were obtained.

The social function of these two varieties was also examined. After analyzing the difference between the two varieties, Poon (2005) argued that (CMC) Hong Kong English should be distinguished as a variety from other forms of written Hong Kong English. He continued in arguing that Hong Kong English in (CMC) has linguistic features that other forms of written Hong Kong English do not have. In addition Hong Kong English in (CMC) has social function that other written forms of

Hong Kong English does not have. The 16 locally educated Hong Kong adolescents, who were interviewed, recognized (CMC) Hong Kong English features and they use them as an identity marker on the Internet due to the unique nature of (CMC) communication and to the wide use of this type of (CMC) communication by the Hong Kong adolescents.

Jurida (2007) published a paper at the University of Tuzla in Bonsai and Herzegovina. She discussed some distinctive lexical features of Netspeak in the context of English as a global language, with particular focus on the language of chat groups (synchronous and asynchronous). She collected data from several Internet sites and analyzed it, bearing in mind the model used by David Crystal. The data analysis has proven that Netspeak displays a number of highly distinctive features classifying it as a brand new (electronic) medium of communication.

Jurida (2007) found out that Netspeak is notorious for its variety of abbreviations, and acronyms are quite frequently used. She concluded that chatters use creative, highly innovative language forms; they also preferred to use colloquial rather than literary language. In addition, chatters use acronyms and abbreviations, as a means to perform an active participation in the conversation. According to Jurida (2007) analysis,

chatters tend to use fewer words, and they modify spelling as to meet their needs, thus producing non – standard or perverse spelling. Chatters also like to use special fonts or styles when they wish to highlight certain ideas or questions. They also use lower – case letters and they use upper – case letters only when they wish to underline their points.

Denis and Tagliamonte (2008) analyzed the Instant Messaging (IM) which is one – to – one synchronous medium of Computer – Mediated Communication. Their analysis was based on a unique corpus involving 72 Canadian teenagers and over a million words of natural, unmonitored IM. In addition, a corpus of speech from the same teenagers was examined for comparison. They found out that "IM is a unique new hybrid register, exhibiting a fusion of the full range of variants from the speech community – formal, informal, and highly vernacular" (p.3). Moreover, the language of IM is full of emotional language, such as laughter and other sounds. The highest frequency form stereotypically associated with IM is (LOL), which stands for Laugh out Loud. The use of lowercase letters, particularly *I* and *u* for *I* and *You* is another cited feature of IM.

Chapter Three
Methods and Procedures

This chapter provides insight on the methods used in this study. It gives information about the population, the sample and the selection of participants. It also describes the instrument, its validity and reliability. Data collection procedures and data analysis are also described.

3.0 Population and sample of the study

The population of the study included all English major undergraduate students in Jordanian universities. From this population, a sample of 245 students, males and females were selected from two Jordanian universities, namely, the University of Jordan and Al. Esra'a Private University. The age of the subjects ranged from 18 to 27 and included freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors.

3.1 Selection of subjects

The following tables show the distribution of the sample according to age, gender and year of study.

Table 1: Distribution of the sample according to age

Age range	No. of participants	Percentage1%
18 - 22	210	85.7
23-26	28	11.4
27 or above	7	2.9
Total	245	100

Table 2: Distribution of the sample according to gender

Gender	No. of participants	Percentage1%
Female	180	73.5
Male	65	26.5
Total	245	100

Table 3: Distribution of the sample according to year of study

Year of Study	No. of participants	Percentage %
Freshmen	78	31.8
Sophomore	67	27.3
Junior	67	27.3
Senior	33	13.5
Total	245	100

Table 1 shows that 210 accounting for 85.7% of the sample were in the age group of 18-22, and 28 accounting for 11.4% were in the age group of 23-26 and seven accounting for 2.9% were in the age group of 27 or above.

Table 2 shows that 180 accounting for 73.5% of the sample were females and 65 accounting for 26.5% were males. It is noticed from Table 3 that 78 31.8% of the sample were freshmen, whereas 67 accounting 27.3% were sophomore and 67 accounting 27.3% were juniors. Thirty three of the sample accounting for 13.5% were seniors.

The sample is a purposive one and was selected on convenient ground. Furthermore, the sample covered a homogenous group of students chosen in terms of language mastery. Students were of varying years of study and different age categories.

3.2 Instrument of the study

The researcher developed a questionnaire to collect data for the study. The questionnaire was suitable for the purpose of the study because it helped the researcher to collect data from students who were in different years of study, varying age groups in two different universities. In addition, the researcher was fully aware that the questionnaire will be a great opportunity to obtain the data needed because it will be acceptable by the subjects and will give no problems during the analysis and interpretation stage.

3. 1. 2 Questionnaire

The questionnaire was based on Lingwood and Hussein (forthcoming research study). Some items were dropped and some modifications were made to suit the sample of the study. The questionnaire was divided into three sections. In the first section, subjects

were asked to provide demographic data, i .e, age, gender, year of study, department and university. The second section was designed to investigate the computer use among English major students and orthographic and systematic aspects of Internet English. The use of computer included personal e-mailing, chatting and instant messaging. Moreover, they were asked about the use of some of the orthographic and systematic aspects of Internet English.

The third section of the questionnaire was designed to collect data about students' attitudes toward Internet English based on a series five – point likert scale(5=strongly agree, 4=agree, 3= neutral, 2=disagree and 1=strongly disagree). This section consisted of nineteen questions which were included to elicit data about students' vision and attitudes toward using Internet English, how it differs from Standard English, and if they think that Internet English will have a negative impact on Standard English in the future. (See Appendix 1).

Three hundred copies of the questionnaire were distributed by the researcher and an assistant. The researcher's assistant was a friend who works at Al.Israa Private University; he was given 150 copies to be distributed at Al.Israa University and was given clear instructions prior to administration of the questionnaire. The researcher distributed 150 copies

to the participants at the University of Jordan accompanied by a letter of approval from the University of Jordan. Furthermore, the questionnaire was accompanied with a covering letter that had an explanation of the purpose of the study.

The official approval to conduct the research was given to respondents (See Appendix 2) and finally 245 copies of the questionnaire were received. One hundred and forty three copies of the questionnaires were collected from the University of Jordan and one hundred and two copies were collected from Al.Israa Private University. The distribution of the questionnaire to the respondents was performed during the last two weeks of April (15th – 28th), 2010.

3.2.2 Validity of the instrument

To the validity of the instrument, the researcher asked a panel of experts whose participation was requested for establishing content validity of the questionnaire (See Appendix 3). The jurors were asked to review the phrasing, suitability, thoroughness and ease of use of the instrument. Some comments and suggestions were received and slight modifications of the questionnaire were made. For instance, one of the professors suggested replacing the word "applauded" by the word

"thanked" in the section which investigated students' attitudes towards Internet English. In addition, he suggested adding two more questions to that section. Another professor suggested adding a question in the second section which is related to the computer use among students. The question which was added is whether students give a subject in the subject line in their e-mails.

Moreover, one of the jurors commented that the researcher should take into consideration the language that is used by most of young people today, i.e. ,the use of Latin letters to send Arabic messages via the Internet like for example *" 2na bokra ray7a 3la 2l.jam3a" " Tomorrow I'm going to the university"* . Although his recommendation was important, implementing it is beyond the scope of this research. The jurors' comments and notes were taken into consideration in writing up the final version of the questionnaire. Then the researcher asked her supervisor to double - check the questionnaire after the modifications were made to ensure the appropriateness and the phrasing of the questionnaire items.

3.2.3 Reliability of the instrument

The researcher conducted a pilot study to achieve the reliability of the instrument as much as possible. The questionnaire's reliability was determined by means of test-retest. A group of twenty of English major students who had the characteristics of the whole sample of the study were asked to fill the questionnaire within twenty minutes. The test was performed in the first week of April 2009. Furthermore, they were asked to pinpoint the exact time needed to finish the questionnaire. Their views were useful and constructive for the distribution of the questionnaire. They were excluded from the main sample of the study and they were selected randomly.

After ten days the questionnaire was distributed to the main sample of the study. The results matched those of the first test. In addition, Cronpanch Alpha was used to test the reliability of the scale and alpha was (0.777) which is a reliable result because it is greater than the accepted percent which is (0.60).

3.3 Data collection and statistical analysis

Data was collected by means of a questionnaire. Students answered the questions in English according to their use of computers, use of systematic aspects of Internet English and their attitudes towards Internet English. They were asked to finish the questionnaire in time ranging between 20- 30 minutes. Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data collected. The researcher categorized, classified and analyzed the data by putting it in tables and calculated the frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviation. The researcher interpreted data and made comparison between the current study and previous studies. As stated earlier, the researcher used a five- point licker scale type where " strongly agree" corresponded to five, " agree" corresponded to four, "neutral" corresponded to three, " disagree" corresponded to two and " strongly disagree" corresponded to one. The means was calculated for all the items in section three by adding the response values and dividing them by the number and the respondents.

\

Chapter Four
Results of the Study

4.0 Introduction

This chapter reports the findings of the questions raised by the researcher in the current study. The questions are:

1. How does the use of computer among English major students affect their English?

2. What are the systematic and orthographic features of Internet English?

3. What is the attitude of English major students' towards Internet English?

4. What is the difference between Standard English and Internet English?

4. 1Findings Related to the First Question.

How does the use of computer among English major students affect their English?

The answer to this question is divided into two parts; the first part discusses computer and Internet access and the use of e-mailing and it

consists of seventeen questions. The second part discusses the use of chatting and instant messaging and it consists of nine questions.

It was found that 73.5% of the respondents have a personal computer at home and 71.8% of them have access to the Internet at home.

Table (4)

Frequencies and percentages related to respondents' access to the Internet

Choice	Frequency	Percentage
University Internet Center	**50**	**20.4**
Internet Café	**15**	**6.1**
Other	**9**	**3.7**

Only 64 respondents answered this question and 181 did not answer it. University Internet center is used by the majority of the respondents who do not have access to the Internet at home. About 20.4% of the respondents use the university Internet center; whereas 6.1% use the Internet café and only 3.7% use the Internet at other places.

4.1.1 Students use of Computer Mediated Communication (e-mails):

Table (5)

Frequencies and percentages related to respondents' use of Netspeak

Internet use	Frequency	Percentage
E-mailing	104	42.4
Chatting	67	27.3
Instant Messaging	29	11.8
Other	134	54.7
Total	244	99.6
Missing	1	4
Total	245	100

The results in Table 5 show that e-mailing is used by 42.4% of the respondents. Chatting is used by 27.3% and 11.8% use instant messaging. About 54.7% of the respondents use the Internet for other purposes.

Table (6)
Frequencies and percentages related to the distribution of e-mail accounts among the study respondents

E-mail account	Frequency	Percentage %
Yahoo.com	146	59.6
Hotmail.com	132	53.9
Google.com	16	6.5
Other	14	5.7
Total	244	99.6
Missing	1	4.6
Total	245	100

Table 6 shows that Yahoo is used by 59.6% of the respondents. Hotmail is used by 53.9%, while Gmail is used by 6.5% of the respondents. Only 5.7% use other e-mail accounts.

Table (7)
Frequencies and percentages related to the e-mail distribution as to the parties respondents write to

Party	Frequency	Percentage
Friends and colleagues	188	76.7
Relatives	69	28.2
Corporation	13	3.5
Other	30	12.2
Total	244	99.6
Missing	1	4
Total	245	100

The findings in Table 7 show that 76.7% of the respondents send e-mails to friends and colleagues. Results indicated that 28.2% of the respondents send e-mails to their relatives. Thirteen respondents send e-mails to corporations and about 12.2% send e-mails to others.

Table (8)
Frequencies and percentages related to the number of e-mails sent by respondents weekly

Number of e-mails	Frequency	Percentage
6	94	38.4
3	36	14.7
1	34	13.9
4	33	13.5
2	30	12.2
5	14	5.7
Total	241	98.4
Missing	4	1.6
Total	245	100

Responses in Table 8 show that 38.4% of respondents send six or more e-mails weekly and about 14.7% send three e-mails weekly. Thirty four of the respondents send one e-mail weekly, whereas 12.2% send two e-mails weekly and 5.7% send five e-mails weekly.

Table (9)
Frequencies and percentages related to the umber of e-mails respondents receive weekly

Number of e-mails	Frequency	Percentage
6	163	66.5
3	20	8.2
4	15	6.1
5	15	6.1
2	14	5.7
1	13	5.3
Total	240	98.0 %
Missing	5	2.0%
Total	245	100

Responses indicated that 66.5% of the respondents get six or more e-mails weekly, while 8.2% get three e-mails weekly. Similar percentages were found as respondents get between four and five e-mails weekly with frequency of 15 and 6.1%. About 5.7% of the respondents get two e-mails and 5.3% get one e-mail weekly.

Table (10)
Frequencies and percentages related to the period of time respondents used an e-mail account

Number of years	Frequency	Percentage
Four years or more	117	47.8
One year or less	52	21.2
Two years	39	15.9
Three years	29	11.8
Missing	8	3.3
Total	237	96.7
Missing	8	3.0
Total	245	100

One hundred and seventeen respondents stated that they have been using an e-mail account for four years or more. Respondents who have been using an e-mail account for one year or less were 21.2%. With regard to the respondents who have been using an e-mail account for two years, results indicated that 15.9% have been using an e-mail account for two years and only 11.8% have been using an e-mail account for three years.

Table (11)
Frequencies and percentages related to checking grammar when composing personal e-mails

Grammar Check	Frequency	Percentage
Sometimes	74	30.2
Always	73	29.8
Often	45	18.4
Never	28	11.4
Rarely	25	10.2
Total	245	100.0

Results in Table 11 show that the highest percentage of the respondents 30.2% indicated that they "sometimes" check their grammar when they compose personal e-mails, whereas 29% indicated that they "always do so. It is noticed that about 18.4% of the respondents "often" check their grammar and 11.4% "never" do so. Only 10.2% "rarely" check their grammar.

Table (12)
Frequencies and percentages related to checking the spelling when composing personal e-mails

Spelling check	Frequency	Percentage
Always	80	32.7
Sometimes	72	29.4
Often	50	20.4
Rarely	23	9.4
Never	20	8.2
Total	245	100.0

Findings in Table 12 indicated that about 32.7% of the respondents "always" check their spelling when they compose personal e-mails, whereas 29.4% "sometimes do so. It is noticed that 20.4% of the respondents "often" check their spelling and only 9.4% "rarely" do so. Finally 8.2% "never" check their spelling.

Table (13)
Frequencies and percentages related to giving a subject line when composing personal e-mails

Subject Line	Frequency	Percentage
Sometimes	74	30.2
Often	73	29.8
Always	45	18.4
Rarely	37	15.1
Never	16	6.5
Total	245	100.0

Table 13 shows 30% of the respondents "sometimes" give a subject line when they compose personal e-mails, while 29.8% "often" do so and about 18.4% "always" do so. Table 13 also shows that 15.1% "rarely" give a subject line and 6.5% "never" do so.

Table (14)

Frequencies and percentages related to putting greetings when composing personal e-mails

Use of greeting	Frequency	Percentage
Sometimes	95	38.8
Always	90	36.7
Often	36	14.7
Never	14	5.7
Rarely	10	4.1
Total	245	100.0

Responses in the above table show 38.8% of the respondents "sometimes" put greeting when they compose personal e-mail and about 36.7% "always" do so. The table also shows that 14.7% "often" put greeting and about 5.7% "never" do so. Only 4.1% "rarely" put greeting.

Table (15)
Frequencies and percentages related to writing a formal closing when composing personal e-mails

E-mail closing	Frequency	Percentage
Sometimes	79	32.2
Rarely	51	20.8
Never	43	17.6
Often	39	15.9
Always	33	13.5
Total	245	100.0

Table 15 shows that 32.2% of the respondents "sometimes" write a formal closing and 20.8%" rarely" do so. It is noticed that 17.6% "never write a formal closing, while 15.9% do so. Finally, only 13.5% "always" write a formal closing.

Table (16)
Frequencies and percentages related to putting the name down when composing personal e-mails

Using the sender's name	Frequency	Percentage
Sometimes	57	23.3%
Always	52	21.2%
Rarely	51	20.8%
Never	48	19.6%
Often	37	15.1%
Total	245	100.0

Table 16 shows that 23.3% of the respondents "sometimes" put their names down when they compose personal e-mail, while 20% "always" do so. About 20.8% "rarely" put their names down when they compose personal e-mails, whereas 19.6% "never" do so. Finally 15.1% "often" put their names down when they compose personal e-mails.

Table (17)
Frequencies and percentages related to the use of dots (…..), question marks (???) or exclamation marks (!!!!) in personal e-mails

Use of marks	Frequency	Percentage
Always	97	39.6
Often	53	21.6
Sometimes	48	19.6
Rarely	24	9.8
Never	23	9.4
Total	245	100.0

Responses in Table 17 show that 39.6% "always" use punctuation marks in their personal e-mails, while only 21.6% "often" do so. Responses show that 19.6% of the respondents "sometimes" put punctuation marks in their personal e-mails, while 9.8 % "rarely" do so. Only 9.4% "never" put punctuation marks in their personal e-mails.

Table (18)
Frequencies and percentages related to the use of capitalization in personal e-mails

Use of capitalization	Frequency	Percentage
Always	102	41.6
Sometimes	54	22.0
Rarely	37	15.1
Often	31	12.7
Never	21	8.6
Total	245	100.0

Table 18 shows that 41.6% of the respondents "always" use capitalization in personal e-mail, while 22.0% "sometimes" do so. About 15.1% "rarely" use capitalization in their personal e-mails; whereas 12.7% "often" do so and only 8.6% "never" use capitalization in personal e-mails.

4.1.1.2 Chatting and Instant Messaging

The results show that 85.7% of the respondents use the chat rooms; therefore, it seems that the majority of them have been using different chat programs. The questions in this part asked about the chat programs used by the respondents, the amount of time they spend on chatting and if they apply the Standard English writing rules when they send and receive messages via chatting and instant messaging. Results related to the use of chatting and instant messaging are shown in tables 19 through 27.

Table (19)
Frequencies and percentages related to the period of time respondents have been using chatting and instant messaging programs

Number of years	Frequency	Percentage
One year or less	43	17.6
Four years or more	40	16.3
Two years	28	11.4
Three years	16	6.5
Total	127	51.8
Missing	118	48.2
Total	245	100.0

Table 19 shows that 17.6% of the respondents have been using the chatting and instant messaging programs for four years, while 16.3%

have been using chatting and instant messaging programs for three year.

About 11.4% of the respondents have been using chatting and instant

messaging for two years and only 6.5% have been using chatting and

instant messaging for three years.

Table (20)
Frequencies and percentages related to chatting and instant messaging program respondents use.

Chatting program	Frequency	Percentage
Yahoo Messenger	101	41.2
MSN Messenger	87	35.3
Window Messenger	51	20.8
ICQ	4	1.6
Other	35	14.3
Total	245	100.0

Table 20 shows that 41.2% use Yahoo messenger and 35.3% use

"MSN Messenger" The third mostly used chatting and instant messaging

was "Windows Messenger" with frequency of 51 and percentage of

20.8%. Results indicated that 1.6 % of the respondents use ICQ chatting

and instant messaging programs, and 14.3 % use other chatting and

instant messaging program.

Table (21)

Frequencies and percentages related to the period of time respondents spend in chatting and instant messaging weekly

Number of hours	Frequency	Percentage
Two hours or less	103	42
Three hours	39	15.9
Four hours	38	15.5
Five hours or more	26	10.6
Total	206	84.1
Missing	39	15.9
Total	245	100

Results in Table 21 show that 42% of the respondents spend two hours or less on chatting and instant messaging, while 15.9% spend three hours weekly. About 15.5% of the respondents spend four hours on chatting weekly and 10.6% spend five hours.

Table (22)
Frequencies and percentages related to respondents' check of grammar when they use chatting and instant messaging programs

Grammar check	Frequency	Percentage
Sometimes	87	35.5
Often	58	23.7
Always	41	16.7
Never	31	12.7
Rarely	28	11.4
Total	245	100

Table 22 shows that 35.5% of the respondents "sometimes" check the grammar when they use chatting and instant messaging programs, while 23.7% "often" do so. It is noticed that 16.7% of the respondents"always" check the grammar and 12.7 "never" do so. Only 11.4% "rarely" do so.

Table (23)
Frequencies and percentages related to checking spelling using chatting and instant messaging program

Spelling check	Frequency	Percentage
Sometimes	76	31.0
Always	63	25.7
Often	56	22.9
Rarely	29	11.8
Never	21	8.6
Total	245	100.0

Table 23 shows that 31.0% of the respondents "sometimes" check their spelling in chatting and instant messaging, whereas 25.7% "always" do so. About 22.9% "often" check spelling in chatting and instant messaging; 11.8% "rarely" do so and 8.6% "never" check spelling in chatting and instant messaging.

Table (24)
Frequencies and percentages related to putting salutation when using chatting and instant messaging

Use of salutation	Frequency	Percentage
Always	87	35.5
Sometimes	72	29.4
Often	40	16.3
Rarely	25	10.2
Never	21	8.6
Total	245	100.0

Table 24 shows that 35.5% of the respondents "always" put a salutation when they use chatting and instant messaging programs, while 29.4% "sometimes" do so. About 16.3% of the respondents "often" put salutation, while 10.2% "rarely" do so. Only 8.6% "never" do so.

Table (25)
Frequencies and percentages related to writing formal closing or ending when using chatting and instant messaging

Use of ending	Frequency	Percentage
Sometimes	81	33.1
Never	56	22.9
Rarely	44	18.0
Often	37	15.1
Always	27	11.0
Total	245	100.0

Table 25 shows that 33.1% of the respondents "sometimes" write formal closing and 22.9% "never" do so. Responses also show that 18.0% "rarely" write a formal closing and about 15.1% "often" write a formal closing. Only 11.0% of the respondents do so.

Table (26)
Frequencies and percentages related to the use of punctuation marks in chatting and instant messaging

Use of punctuation	Frequency	Percentage
Always	85	34.7
Sometimes	82	33.5
Often	44	18.0
Rarely	20	8.2
Never	14	5.7
Total	245	100.0

Table 26 shows that 34.7% of the respondents "always" use punctuation marks in chatting and instant messaging, while 33.5% "sometimes" do so. About 18.0% of the respondents "often" use punctuation marks in chatting and instant messaging and 8.2% "rarely" do so. Only 5.7% "never" use punctuation marks.

Table (27)
Frequencies and percentages related to the use of capitalization in chatting and instant messaging

Use of capitalization	Frequency	Percentage
Sometimes	86	35.1
Always	61	24.9
Rarely	38	15.5
Often	33	13.5
Never	27	11.0
Total	245	100.0

Table 27 shows that 35.1% of the respondents "sometimes" use capitalization and 24.9% of the respondents "always" do so. It is noticed that 15.5% "rarely" use capitalization; 13.5% "often" use capitalization and 11.0% "never" use capitalization in chatting and instant messaging.

4. 2 Findings Related to the Second Question.

What are the systematic and orthographic aspects of Internet English that are used in e-mailing, chatting and instant messaging?

The use of systematic and orthographic aspects of Internet English included personal e-mailing, chatting and instant messaging. The answer to this question is divided into two parts; the first one discussed e-mailing and consisted of four questions, and the second section discussed chatting and instant messaging and, it consisted of two questions.

4.2.1 Systematic and orthographic aspects of personal e-mails.

Table (28)

Frequencies and percentages related to the use of bullets and numbering facilities as a distinctive feature in personal e-mails

Use of bullets	Frequency	Percentage
Sometimes	88	35.9
Often	54	22.0
Rarely	46	18.8
Never	33	13.5
Always	24	9.8
Total	245	100.0

Table 28 shows that 35.9% of the respondents "sometimes" use bullets and numbering facilities and about 22% "often" do so. It was also

found that 18.8% "rarely" use numbering facilities in personal e-mail. Finally, 13.5% "never" use numbering facilities and only 9.8% "always" do so.

Table (29)
Frequencies and percentages related to the use of acronyms in personal e-mails

Use of acronyms	Frequency	Percentage
Sometimes	64	26.1
Never	60	24.5
Rarely	48	19.6
Always	45	18.4
Often	28	11.4
Total	245	100.0

Table 29 shows that 26.1% of the respondents "sometimes" use acronyms in their personal e-mails, while 24.5% "never" do so. About 19.6% "rarely" use acronyms. The table also shows that 18.4% of the respondents "always" use acronyms and only 11.4% "often" do so.

Table (30)
Frequencies and percentages related to the use of abbreviations in personal e-mails

Use of abbreviations	Frequency	Percentage
Always	85	34.7
Sometimes	56	22.9
Often	52	21.2
Never	29	11.8
Rarely	23	9.4
Total	245	100.0

Results in table 30 show that 34.7% of the respondents"always" use abbreviations in personal e-mails, while about 22.9% "sometimes" do so. Results also show that 21.1% "often" use abbreviations in personal e-mails and 11.8% do so. Only 9.4% of the respondents "rarely" use abbreviations in personal e-mails.

Table (31)

Frequencies and percentages related to the use of emoticons such as "(:" to express happiness, "):" to express sadness in personal e-mails

Use of emoticons	Frequency	Percentage
Always	97	39.6
Often	52	21.2
Sometimes	51	20.8
Never	23	9.4
Rarely	22	9.0
Total	245	100.0

Results in Table 31 show that 39.6% of the respondents "always" use emoticons in personal e-mails and about 21.2% "often" do so. Results in the table also show that 20.8% "sometimes" use emoticons and 9.4% "never" do so. Only 9.0% of the respondents "rarely" use emoticons in personal e-mails.

4.2.2 Systematic and orthographic aspects of chatting and instant messaging.

Table (32)

Frequencies and percentages related to the use of acronyms in chatting and instant messaging

Use of acronyms	Frequency	Percentage
Sometimes	68	27.8
Always	63	25.7
Never	43	17.6
Rarely	40	16.3
Often	31	12.7
Total	245	100.0

Results in Table 32 show that 27.8% of the respondents "sometimes" use acronyms in chatting and instant messaging and 25.7% "always" do so. It is noticed that 17.6% "never" use acronyms, whereas 16.3% "rarely" do so. When it comes to the lowest percentage, it is noticed that only 12.7% "often" use acronyms in chatting and instant messaging.

Table (33)
Frequencies and percentages related to the use of emoticons in chatting and instant messaging

Use of emoticons	Frequency	Percentage
Always	128	52.2
Sometimes	62	25.3
Often	36	14.7
Never	14	5.7
Rarely	5	2.0
Total	245	100.0

Table 33 shows that 52.2% of the respondents " always" use emoticons in chatting and instant messaging and about 25.3% "sometimes" do so, whereas 14.7% "often" use emoticons .Responses indicated that 5.7% "never" use emoticons in chatting and instant messaging and only 2.0% of the respondents "rarely" do so.

4. 3 Findings Related to the Third Question

What is the attitude of English major students towards Internet English, as it differs from Standard English?

This section included nineteen questions which are related to students' attitudes towards Internet English and how it differs from Standard English. In addition, it contained questions which addressed the use of some systematic aspects of Internet English.

Table (34) Percentages and Means for the respondents' attitudes toward Internet English.

Item	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Means	Std. Deviation
	*%**	*%*	*%*	*%*	*%*		
1 Internet English is richer and more dynamic than regular speech and writing in Standard English.	24.9	37.1	22.0	11.4	4.5	3.66	1.106
2. Neglecting Standard English rules appeals to young people in Internet communication.	19.6	35.5	29.4	11.8	3.7	3.55	1.049
3. Internet English will ultimately result in the creation of new language that	22.0	35.5	28.6	9.8	4.1	3.61	1.059

allows for greater creativity and expression.						
4. Young people should be thanked, not criticized for creating Internet English	23.3	29.8	29.8	12.2	4.9	3.54	1.121
5 People who use Internet English pride themselves on knowing a special language	29.0	33.9	22.0	10.2	4.9	3.71	1.133
6. Young people use Internet only for informal setting such as chatting and writing for friends and relatives.	19.6	28.6	24.5	16.3	11.0	3.29	1.262
7. The use of new language forms on the Internet is indicative of today's youth intelligence and ingenuity	13.5	39.2	27.3	16.3	3.7	3.42	1.031
8. Internet English is the same as Standard English but with slight changes.	10.2	30.2	26.5	24.1	9.0	3.08	1.143
9. In future, we need to learn or teach the aspects of the language used in internet such as syntax, lexis in universities	21.6	30.6	23.7	12.7	11.4	3.38	1.270
10. Those who use Internet English do so to show they are modernized and not traditional.	23.7	26.9	29.8	13.1	6.5	3.48	1.175
11. The Internet users need much time to learn the abbreviations and the acronyms used in the internet.	13.1	28.6	31.8	19.2	7.3	3.20	1.120
12. The Internet users use abbreviation like LOL, FAQ, BRB and emoticons like ;), (: to save both time and effort	37.1	32.2	18.8	7.8	4.1	3.90	1.110
13. The Internet users use general abbreviations and acronyms that are well known by everyone.	23.3	33.5	30.6	9.8	2.9	3.64	1.032
14. Using emoticons such as ☺,): and [: in chartrooms and emails helps express	41.6	30.2	18.8	6.9	2.4	4.01	1.051

user's emotions.						
15. Emoticons like **:D, :-D** are used to compensate for the inability to convey facial expressions and bodily gestures in internet communication.	30.2	31.8	29.0	6.5	2.4	3.80	1.020
16. Typing speed unintentionally leads to grammatical and spelling errors in Internet communication.	24.9	30.6	32.2	10.2	2.0	3.66	1.026
17. Young people misspell words because the English spelling system is full of exceptions and irregularities.	15.1	32.2	34.7	13.5	4.5	3.40	1.041
18. The users of the Internet ignore the grammar of English language such as sentence structure, verb form and subject verb agreement.	24.9	38.0	23.7	9.8	3.7	3.70	1.061
19. The users of the Internet ignore the use of capitalization and punctuation rules.	29.4	31.4	24.1	7.3	7.8	3.67	1.194
Total						3.568	04404

Responses to the first statement indicated that 62% of the respondents agree that Internet English is richer and more dynamic than Standard English. About 16% of the respondents disagree and 22% were neutral. Regarding the second statement, responses show that 55% of the respondents agree that neglecting Standard English rules appeals to

young people, while 15.5% of the respondents disagree and about 29.4% of the respondents were neutral.

It is noticed from Table 34 that 57.5% of the respondents agree that Internet English will result in the creation of new language, whereas 14% disagree. About 28.6% of the respondents were neutral. Regarding the fourth, responses show that 53.1% of the respondents agree that young people should be thanked for creating Internet English, while 17.1% disagree and 29.8% were neutral.

About 63% of the respondents agree that people who use Internet English pride themselves on knowing such a language, whereas 15.1 disagree and 22.0% were neutral. Regarding the statement number six, responses show that 48.2% agree that young people use the Internet for informal setting, while 27.3% disagree and 25% were neutral.

Regarding the seventh statement, about 52.7% of the respondents agree that the use of new language forms on the Internet indicates youth intelligence, whereas 20% of the respondents disagree and about 27.3% were neutral. Responses to the eighth statement show that 40.4% of the respondents agree that Internet English is the same as Standard English but with slight changes and about 33.1% disagree, whereas 26.5% were neutral. Responses to the ninth statement show that 52.2% of the

respondents agree that aspects of Internet English should be taught in universities, whereas 24.1% disagree and about 23.7% were neutral. About 50.67% of the respondents agree that those who use the Internet do so to show that they are modernized, while 19.6% disagree and 29.8% were neutral.

Responses to statement number 11 show that 41.7% agree that the Internet users need time to learn the abbreviation used in the Internet, while 26.5% disagree 31.8% were neutral. Regarding statement number 12, responses show that 69.3% of the respondents agree that the Internet users use abbreviation and emoticons to save time and effort, only 12% disagree and 18.8% were neutral.

Responses in Table 34 show that about 57% of the respondents agree on statement that the Internet users use abbreviations that are known by everyone; about 12.7% of the respondents disagree, while 30.6% were neutral. About 72% of the respondents agree that emoticons are used to express user's emotions and about 9.3% disagree, whereas18.8% were neutral.

Regarding statement number 15, about 62% of the respondents agree that emoticons are used to compensate for the inability to convey

facial expression; 9% of the respondents disagree while 29 % were neutral.

Responses to statement number 16 show that 56% of the respondents agree that speed leads to grammatical mistakes, about 12.2% disagree and 32.2% were neutral. It is also noticed from responses to the statement number 17 that 47.3% agree that young people misspell word because English spelling system is full of irregularities, about 18% disagree and 34.7% were neutral.

Regarding statement 18, responses show that 63% agree that the users of the Internet ignore the grammar of English, about 13 % disagree and 23.7% were neutral. Responses to the last statement indicated that 61% agree that the users of the Internet ignore the use of capitalization and punctuation rules, about 15.1% disagree and 24.1% were neutral.

Summary of results to question three raised by the researcher shows that statement 14 ranks first in terms of its means (4.0163) and the direction of the respondents answers is very high. While statement 10 ranks last; as its means is (3.0857) and the direction of the respondents answers is between low and high. In general, it has been found out that students have positive attitudes toward Internet English because their means are above mean of the scale (3). The total grand mean of this

section of the questionnaire is (3.568), and this reflects the positive attitudes towards Internet English

4. 4 Findings Related to the Fourth Question.

The researcher discussed the difference between Internet English and Standard English under the umbrella of review of literature. This part addressed what other scholars mentioned about the difference between Internet English and Standard English

Sanderson and Gordon (1969) stated that

> **Good English is that form of speech which is appropriate to the purpose of the speaker, true to the language, as it is, and comfortable to speaker and listener. It is the product of the custom, neither cramped by rule nor freed from all restraint; it is never fixed, but changes with the organic life of the language. (P.99).**

Chafe and Danielewick (1987) argued that letter writers use more varied vocabulary, moderate number of colloquial words and contractions; they added that there are a great number of literary terms used in formal letter writing. The sentences which are used in formal letter writing are well formed, unlike Internet language which is found in personal e-mailing, chatting and instant messaging.

Crystal (1994) defined Standard English as "a variety of English – a distinctive combination of linguistic features with a particular role to play" (p. 1). He added that the linguistic features of Standard English are chiefly grammar, vocabulary and orthography (spelling and pronunciation).

Ferris (2002) argued that electronic writing is one of the products of computer age, and the electronic writing enabled by the computers has affected traditional writing. He claimed that electronic writing is characterized by the use of oral conventions over traditional conventions. The oral conventions are evident in the way people abandon the traditional conventions of grammar and punctuation in electronic writing.

Ferris also asserted that meaning is recognized by cues understood only by users of Computer - Mediated Communication, like for example the use of acronyms such as by the way (BTH) and   in my humble opinion (IMHP), in addition to the use of nonverbal icons or emoticons like a smiley face (: . All these cues differ from traditionally recognized textual cues. Fliss (2003) reported that correct spelling is a typical feature of most formal correspondence. Informal use of punctuation

brings text closer to speech by subverting traditional rules for letter writing where the use of punctuation is necessary to clarify the meaning.

Hayati (2003) conducted a study about the impact of electronic communication on writing. He pointed out that the language of e – mail, chats and Short Messaging Service (SMS) messages is marked by features of informal speech and formal writing, and this is illustrated by the use of text – based icons and acronyms in addition to changes in spelling norms. He added that the electronic medium provides a new context to the writing process. Also there is a tendency toward playfulness in e – communication

Crystal (2006) stressed that there is clear contrast between communication via the Internet and the world of paper – based communication. Letter writing is basically taught at schools; there are a number of conventions such as how to use opening and closing formula (Dear sir / madam), it is known where to put date and address, and how to break up the text into paragraphs. But with the Internet equivalent of letter writing – e-mails – there is no such tradition. People have been using the Internet for less than a decade and they do not know the factors which have to be respected if their messages are not to be misunderstood.

Internet English is different form Standard English. Standard English is characterized by restraint in vocabulary, avoidance of words which are informal and attention to grammatical agreement in sentences. In addition, it is important to consider word order, particularly with respect to the position of modifying words, phrases and clauses. On the contrary, Internet English is informal language which includes the use of emoticons, abbreviations, misspellings, grammatical errors, rich vocabulary. One of the clearest features of Internet language is the lexicon which is used to fit Internet situation. Internet English is a combination of spoken and written language because the Internet users tend to use emoticons, asterisks and symbols replacing words in order to compensate for the loss of paralinguistic features in real conversations such as facial expressions, voice inflections and body gestures.

Chapter Five

Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations.

5.0 Introduction

This chapter presents a summary and discussion of the findings of the four questions of the study. It also attempts to explain and interpret the results in light of the review of related literature. The chapter concludes with recommendations for further research.

5.1 Discussion and Analysis of the Findings of the First Question:

How does the use of the computer among English major students affect their English?

Results displayed in the previous chapter show that the majority of respondents have computers at their homes; they also have access to the Internet at home. Respondents who do not have access to the computer at home use the university computer centers. This asserts the importance of computers and the Internet in the lives of students. They sometimes use the Internet for personal or professional usage and they are fully aware

that the Internet, which has changed our lives enormously, has many advantages. This agrees with Gras (2004) who mentioned that the Internet among university students is essentially used to search for academic information and also for entertainment.

Results related to the period of time respondents have been using an e-mail account show that most of the respondents have been using an e-mail account for four years. The researcher believes that the e-mail is an essential communicative tool. It is time saving, more efficient and can be sent to more than one person at a time. This result matches to some extent with Gras (2004) who reported that 97% of the university students have more than one year's experience using the Internet. However, Gras (2004) stated that although students have been using the Internet for a long period of time, they display a passive use of the Internet. The reason behind this is that large multinationals aim to control the use of the Internet, indicate how the Internet should be used and with which contact.

Regarding results of respondents' check of grammar and spelling when they compose personal e-mails, results show that the majority of respondents sometimes check grammar when they compose personal e-mails and most of them always check spelling (See Tables no. 11 and

12). The researcher believes that they check grammar and spelling because they are English major students. They might make slight mistakes in spelling and grammar as a result of typing speed only. This result agrees with Randall (2002) who mentioned that over 50% of his survey respondents check their spelling in e-mail messages.

Findings related to putting a salutation in personal e-mails indicate that most of the respondents put a salutation in personal e-mails. The researcher thinks that respondents put a salutation as a stimulus of greeting. This result agrees with Randall (2002) who reported that over 75% of his respondents regularly include a salutation or other greeting.

With regard to attaching a formal closing in personal e-mails, findings show that number of respondents who attach a formal closing in personal e-mails dropped considerably. The researcher believes that this might be considered as a saving time strategy. In addition, the researcher thinks that simplicity and informality are overwhelming features of Internet language. Results Table 16 show that the majority of respondents prefer to put their names down without attaching any formal closing because of the nature of (CMC) communication, i.e. the informal Internet language which is used on personal e-mails. This result is in line with

Crystal (2006) who stated that the e-mail is used for brief and rapid communication.

With regard to respondents' use of punctuation marks and capitalization rules in personal e-mails, results show that most of the respondents apply the punctuation and capitalization rules in their personal e-mails. This result came contrary to expectations, but facts should be stated. The researcher thinks that respondents apply these rules because they are studying English, so their Standard English is not affected by the informality of the Internet language. These results contradict with Ferris (2002) and Fliss (2003) who argued that the traditional conventions of punctuation are totally ignored in electronic writing. Also this opposes what Khatib (2008) found out in his study that students tend to use less capitalization.

Results related to respondents' use of chatting and instant messaging show that the majority of respondents use chatting and instant messaging programs. This indicates that the chat engines have made the communication very easy and enabled chatters to talk with all the people around the world at the cheapest price possible. The highest percentage of respondents have been using chatting and instant messaging programs between one year and four years or more (refer to Table 19). In addition,

it seems that most of the respondents prefer the Yahoo Messenger (Y!) as a chatting program.

Results related to respondents' check of grammar and spelling when they use chatting and IM programs show that the highest percentage of the respondents sometimes check the grammar and spelling. The researcher believes that there is a difference between the communication through e-mail and chatting and IM programs. The difference lies on the fact that e-mails, even personal ones, are more formal than chatting which is considered to be less formal, full of abbreviations, acronyms and jargon. This explains why the number of students who check grammar and spelling in chatting and instant messaging dropped slightly compared with e-mails (see Tables 22 and 23). This result matches to some extent with Okin (2005) and Randall (2002).

Findings related to respondents' putting a salutation and attaching a formal closing in chatting and IM programs indicate that most of the respondents put a salutation in chatting and instant messaging but the number of respondents who attach a closing dropped considerably. The researcher thinks that respondents wish to initiate a conversation in chatting and instant messaging programs, so they start with greetings, but

they do not usually attach a formal closing because chatting and instant messaging is less formal than e-mailing. The researcher also thinks that this might be saving time and effort strategy.

Regarding the use of capitalization rules and punctuation marks in chatting and instant messaging, results indicate the highest percentage of respondents always use punctuation and sometimes use the capitalization. The researcher thinks that since the majority of the respondents are in their fourth year, they are supposed to have good English language proficiency. Therefore, Internet English does not have a negative impact on their Standard English. This result confirms what Harhsheh (2004) who concluded with that (CMC) does not have a negative impact on English grammar and on hand written English. However, it contradicts Ferris's (2002) and Fliss's (2003) findings.

5.3 Discussion and Analysis of the Findings of the Second Question.

What are the systematic and orthographic aspects of Internet English that are used in e-mailing, chatting and instant messaging?

Results related to the use of systematic and orthographic aspects of Internet English used in e-mailing indicate that the majority of the respondents sometimes use bullets and numbering facility in personal e-

mails. Numbering and bullets facilities are considered to be an essential stylistic feature of e-mails; however respondents do not seem to be interested in using this stylistic feature because they tend to be less formal and because they usually write personal e-mails. Most of the respondents write e-mails to their friends and colleagues as shown in Table 7, and this explains why they wish to be less formal.

Findings related to the use of acronyms in personal e-mails show that the highest percentage of respondents sometimes use acronyms in personal e-mails. About 24.5% of the respondents never use acronyms in personal e-mails. There is a tendency to use less acronyms in e-mails, whereas there is a strong tendency to use emoticons and abbreviations. This result agrees with Randall (2002) in his finding that only 11% of his survey respondents use acronyms regularly in e-mails.

Results related to the use of abbreviations show that respondents always use abbreviations in their personal e-mails. In addition, about 97% of them always use emoticons in their personal e-mails. The researcher believes that acronyms and abbreviations can be time-saving when used correctly. They are a useful tool in the fast-paced information age that we live in. Emoticons also are used to express feelings. Similar results were found regarding the use of emoticons and acronyms in

chatting and instant messaging. The researcher assumes that they are used in order to save time and effort. This result is in line with the findings of Baron (2002), Crystal (2006), Sa'de (2003), Johvana (2004), Randall (2002) and Stevenson (1999).

5.4 Discussion and Analysis of the Findings of the Third Question.

What is the attitude of English major students toward Internet English and how it differs from Standard English?

Findings related to the attitudes of English majors students toward Internet English show that Internet English has been positively viewed by the respondents, as it is shown in (Table 34 pp. 81-86). The positive attitudes are based on the high percentages of items (1, 5, 3, 4, 7, and 10 in Table 34) that illustrate the positive attitudes.

Items (1, 3) show that high percentage of the respondents think that Internet English is richer and more dynamic than Standard English; in addition respondents think that Internet English is an expressive and creative language. The researcher assumes that the respondents feel more free and less formal when they communicate by using aspects of Internet

English. These findings are similar to Crystal (2006) who mentioned that it is very easy to introduce innovation in Internet English.

Based on the high percentages of items (4, 5, 7, 10), respondents are aware of the advantages of creating Internet English; they think that Internet English should not be criticized because it facilitates the communication and it indicates youth intelligence.

Items (2, 16, 17, 18, and 19) in the Table 34 indicate that respondents sometimes neglect Standard English rules. The researcher thinks that this might be due to typing speed and the necessity to keep up with the conversation which leads to unintentional spelling and grammatical mistakes. These results match with the findings of Angel and Heslop (1994) who discussed the grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors in e-mails. It also confirms what Crystal (2006) mentioned about punctuation that it is sometimes absent because of typing speed.

Item (6) in Table 34 shows that 48.2% of the respondents use the Internet only for informal settings, such as chatting or sending e-mail to friends and colleagues. This finding agrees with Harahsheh (2004) who stated that Internet English is a new electronic dialect used by (CMC) to fit the situation on the Internet.

Based on the results of items (9, 11) in Table 34, it seems that respondents think that aspects of Internet English should be taught in universities; however few of them think that Internet users need much time to learn the abbreviations and acronyms used in the Internet. The researcher assumes that Internet aspects are easy to learn because the language of the Internet is expressive and creative, so any one can invent new abbreviations or acronyms in the future.

Items (12, 13, 14, 15) which are pointed out in Table 34 indicate that the majority of the respondents use abbreviations, emoticons and acronyms to save time and effort, to express emotions and to convey facial expressions. These results support Baron (2002), Fingean & Rickford (2004), Sa'de (2003), Stevenson (1999) and Randall (2002) in their conclusions.

5.5 Discussion of the Findings of the Fourth Question.

The discussion of the reviewed literature shows that there are many differences between Standard English and Internet English. Sentences in Standard English are well formed and attention is paid to grammar, spelling punctuation and capitalization. The researcher believes that formal language is used to express ideas and thoughts in Standard English, unlike the Internet language which is found in personal e-

mailing, chatting and instant messaging. These results match with the findings of Chafe and Danielewick (1987). Meaning in Internet English in understood by words which are known only by users of Internet language. The sentences are informal and (CMC) users use abbreviations, acronyms and smileys to express their thoughts and to compensate for the loss of paralinguistic features found in face to face communication. These findings agree with Ferris (2002).

5.5 Conclusion

The Internet is one of the most powerful tools throughout the world. It is a collection of various services and resources. Emails, chat rooms and instant messaging programs are examples of the Internet components and they are widely used by the young generation. The researcher in the current study has chosen young people between 18 and 27 years for conducting the questionnaire, because this age group spends more time on online chatting. In addition, this age group is known to be the most "internet literate" among other age groups. On the basis of the researcher findings, the most important conclusion is that the Internet English does not have a negative impact on Standard English. The Internet users sometimes ignore the Standard English rules, not because

they lack knowledge but to save time and effort. Data obtained show that Standard English is not threatened by using Internet English. Students have good knowledge of English and they use the Internet language only in informal settings because they are aware that the Internet English is used to facilitate the communication i.e. they do not use it in academic setting. Data also shows that students have positive attitudes towards Internet language because, as mentioned before, it is a linguistic medium students use to show how they are relaxed when they send informal e-mails and chat with their friends and colleagues.

5.6 Recommendations

On the basis of the results of this study, the researcher proposes a set of points to be taken into consideration by researchers:

- The study may be replicated to other universities in Jordan. The sample may include public and private universities for detecting the difference between them.

- The study may also include majors other than English in order to detect the difference between English majors and other majors

- Further study can investigate the Short Messaging Service (SMS) language which is used in mobile phones.

- More research can investigate the use of Latin letters to send Arabic messages via the Internet.

References

Angel, D. & Brent, H. (1994). *The elements of e-mail style.* New York: Addison – Wesley.

Baron, S. N. (2002). Language of the Internet. In Farghali. A. (ed.), *The Stanford handbook for languages engineers,* Stanford: CSLI Publications, pp. 59-127.

Bakardjieva, M. (2005). *Internet society.* London: SAGE Publication Ltd.

Crystal, D. (2006). *Language of the Internet.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (1994). *What is Standard English?* Retrieved 30th March, 2010, from www.davidcrystal.com/DC_articles.

Chafe, W. & Danielewicz (1987). Prosperities of spoken and written language. In Horowitz, R. & Samuels, F. J (Ed), *Comprehending oral and written language.* (pp. 26 -27). New -York. Retrieve April 27th, 2010 from http://www.nwp.org/cs/public/print/resource/591

Danet, B. (2002). *The language of e-mail.* Retrieved March 14, 2010, from www.atar.mscc.huji.ac.il.

Danet, B., Wright, L., Tamari Y. (1997). "Hmm.Where's that smoke coming from?" writing play and performance on Internet Relay Chat. *In Journal of Computer – mediated Communication.* 12 (4). Retrieved May 28, 2010 from http//jsmc.indiana.edu/vol12/isuue4/danethtml.

Durham, M. (2003). Language choice on a Swiss mailing list. *In Journal of Computer – mediated Communication.* 9 (1). Retrieved May 28, 2010 from http//jsmc.indiana.edu/vol9/isuue1.

Ferris, S. (1997). What is (CMC): an overview of scholarly definitions. *(CMC) Magazine.* Retrieved April 13, 2010 from http://www.december.com/(CMC)/mag/1997/jan/ferris.html

Ferris, S. (2002). The effects of computers on traditional writing. *The Journal of Electronic Publishing.* 8 (1). Retrieved April 23rd, 2010 from http://www.press.umich.edu/jep/08-01/ferris.html.

Fingean, E., & Rickford, J. (2004). *Language in the USA. Themes for the twenty – first century.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved March 27th, 2010 from www.books.google.com

Fliss, B. (2003). *The language of e-mail.* Retrieved April 28th, 2010 from www.chass.untoronto.ca.

Gates, K. (1998). Should colleges and universities require students to own their own computers? *The Cause Effect Journal.* 21 (3). Retrieved October 25th, 2009 from http://net.educause.edu

Gras, R. (2004). Internet usage and digital divide among Spanish university students. *Revista Media Jornalismo.* 8 (1). Retrieved September 15th, 2009 from www.cimj.org.

Herring, S. (1996). Computer –mediated communication: Linguistic, social and cross – cultural perspectives. In. Herring, S. (Ed), *Computer-mediated communication: linguistic, social and cross-cultural perspectives*. *Pragmatics and beyond* (pp. 1 – 10). Amsterdam: Benjamins. Retrieved 25th March from http://www.slis.indiana.edul.

Harahsheh, A. (2004). A study of linguistic techniques in the language of the Internet and mobile telephones. (Unpublished M.A thesis, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan).

Internet World Users by Language (2000). Top Ten Users. Retrieved May 22, 2010 from www.internetworldstats.com.

Jurkowitz, L. (2008) Interaction, meaning – making and accuracy in synchronous (CMC) discussion: The experiences of a university – level intermediate French class. (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, United States). Retrieved 26th March from www.scribd.com.

Johnova, M. (2004). The language of chat. *The Online Journal of Modern Philology.* (1214-5505). Retrieved 4th April from www.philologica.net.

Jurida, S. H. (2008). Some distinctive lexical features of Netspeak. *Portal of scientific journals of Croatia*. 8 (2). Retrieved March 3rd, 2010, from http://hrcak.srce.hr.

Kitao, K. (1990). *Internet resources: ELT, linguistics, and communication.* Tokyo: Eichosha, Co., Ltd.

Khatib, M. (2008). E-mail as a mode of communication among Jordanian university students: A sociolinguistic perspective. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture.* 25. Retrieved from May, 1 2010 from www.educ,.utas.edi.au.

Lee, C. (2002) Literacy practices in computer mediated communication in Hong Kong. *The Reading Matrix.* 2 (2). Retrieved November 1st, from www.**readingmatrix**.com.

Lingwood, R. and Hussein, R. Jordanian students' use of the computer and their attitudes towards Internet English. (Forthcoming) .

Okin, J. R. (2005). *The Internet revolution.* United States of America, Ironbound Press: Winter Harbor Maine.

Paolillo, J. (1999). The virtual speech community: Social network and language variation on IRC. *In Journal of Computer – mediated Communication* 4 (4). Retrieved 27, May 2010 from http: // jsms.indiana.edu/vlo4/issue4.

Poon, W. (2005). Two varieties of Hong Kong English: Language use in computer – mediated communication compared to other forms of written English among Hong Kong adolescents. Unpublished PhD

dissertation. (The University of   Edinburgh, UK). Retrieved 26th May from www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/bitstream.

Randall, N. (2002). *Lingo online: A report on the language of the keyboard generation.* Retrieved October 12, from arts.uwaterloo.ca/~nrandall/LingoOnline-finalreport.pd.

Tagliamonte, S. & Denis, D. (2008). Linguistic Ruin? lol instant messaging and teenage language. *American Speech.* 83 (1). Retrieved March 6th, 2010 from www.americanspeech.dukejournals.org.

Sa'di, R. (2003). An investigation of the linguistic and textual feature of "Internet relay chat" IRC and yahoo messenger (y!) English. (Unpublished M.A thesis, University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan).

Sanderson, J. & Gordon, W. (1969). *Exposition and the English Language.* New York: Division of Meredith Publishing Company.

Stevenson, J. (1999). *The language of Internet chat rooms.* Retrieved May 20, 2010 from http://www.demo.inty.net/Units/IRC.htm.

Stewart, F., Mann, C. (2000). *Internet Communicative and Qualitative Research.*   London: SAGE Publications.

Warschauer, M., Said, G. & Zohry, A. (2002). Language choice Online: Globalization and identity in Egypt. *In Journal of Computer - mediated Communication.* 7 (4). Retrieved May 29, 2010 from http://jc,c.indana.edu/vol7/issue4.

Wellman, B. & Haythornthwaite, C. (2002). *The Internet in everyday life.* Bodmin, Cornwall: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. (2010) Computer- mediated communication. Retrieved on May 25, 2010 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/computer.

Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. (2010) Telecommunications in Jordan Retrieved on May 29, 2010 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/computer.

Appendix 1
English Major Students Questionnaire

Appendix 2
Approval Letter from The Middle East University

Appendix 3
Panel of Juries and Validation Letter

Name	Academic Rank	Affiliation
Jihad Hamdan	Professor- Linguistics-Language Acquisition.	University of Jordan
Mahmoud Al.Khatib.	Professor- Sociolinguistics	University of Science and Technology.
Bader Dweik	Professor - Linguistics and Methods of Teaching.	Middle East University for Graduate Studies.
Ahmed Al.Ali	Associate Professor	Applied Science University.
As'ad Abu Libdeh	PhD	Applied Science University.
Amer Adwan	PhD	Applied Science University.
Rania Yacoup	PhD	Applied Science University.
Sali Al.Karmi	PhD	Applied Science University.