การใช้ภาษาอังกฤษในสแลงไทยบนเฟซบุ๊ก: การวิเคราะห์เชิงวิทยาหน่วยคำและเชิงอรรถศาสตร์

The Use of English in Thai Slang on Facebook: A Morphological and Semantic Analysis

ปริชาติ สาลารัตน์

Parichart Salarat

อาจารย์ ภาควิชาวิทยาการภาษาและวัฒนธรรม คณะศิลปศาสตร์และวิทยาศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยเกษตรศาสตร์

Lecturer, Department of Language Sciences and Cultures, Faculty of Liberal Arts and Science, Kasetsart University

*Corresponding Author, E-mail: parichart.s@ku.th

Received : September 03, 2025 Revised : November 30, 2025 Accepted : December 26, 2025

บทคัดย่อ

บทความวิจัยนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อ 1) วิเคราะห์กระบวนการในสร้างคำหรือสำนวนสแลงไทยที่มีการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษ และ 2) วิเคราะห์การเปลี่ยนแปลงทางความหมายของคำเมื่อนำมาใช้เป็นสแลงในภาษาไทยในเฟซบุ๊ก ข้อมูลที่ใช้รวบรวมจากเพจเฟซบุ๊กยอดนิยมของไทย 10 เพจ พบคำสแลงที่มีการใช้ภาษาอังกฤษจำนวน 74 คำ จากนั้นวิเคราะห์โดยใช้วิธีวิจัยเชิงพรรณนาแบบคุณภาพ ใช้ประเภทกระบวนการในสร้างคำจาก Mattiello (2013) และการจัดหมวดหมู่ทางความหมายของ Ullmann (1962) ผลการศึกษาพบว่ากระบวนการสร้างคำที่ใช้มากที่สุดคือ การประสมคำ คิดเป็น 56.74% โดยมักเกิดจากการประสมคำไทยกับอังกฤษ เช่น “ทัวร์ลง”, “พ่อไมโครเวฟ” รองลงมาคือการเติมคำปัจจัย 13.51% เช่น ทีม-”, “-คีย์บอร์ด” นอกจากนี้มีการใช้คำย่อ เช่น “MVP” การตัดคำ เช่น “เว่อร์” และการซ้ำคำ เช่น “ฟิล ๆ” แต่พบในสัดส่วนน้อย ในขณะที่ไม่พบกระบวนการรวมคำในการสร้างคำสแลง แสดงให้เห็นถึงแนวโน้มการสร้างคำในระดับวากยสัมพันธ์มากกว่าระดับเสียง ในแง่ความหมาย พบว่ากระบวนการที่พบบ่อยที่สุดคือ การเปรียบเทียบเชิงอุปลักษณ์จำนวน 41.89% เช่น คำว่า “เต็มกราฟ”, “ชั้น G” ซึ่งสะท้อนการตีความเชิงสัญลักษณ์ในบริบทวัฒนธรรมไทย นอกจากนี้ยังพบ การจำกัดความหมาย 24.33% และการเปลี่ยนความหมายไปในทางลบ 12.16% เช่น “เช็คบิล” ไม่พบตัวอย่างของการเปลี่ยนแปลงความหมายในทางบวก จากการศึกษาข้อมูลดังกล่าวแสดงให้เห็นว่าผู้ใช้ภาษาไทยไม่เพียงแต่ยืมคำจากภาษาอังกฤษเท่านั้น แต่ยังแสดงให้เห็นถึงความคิดสร้างสรรค์ในการดัดแปลงความหมายให้สอดคล้องกับบริบทและวัฒนธรรมไทยอีกด้วย

คำสำคัญ: *1. คำหรือสำนวนสแลง 2. การปนภาษา 3. สื่อสังคม 4. เฟซบุ๊ก*

Abstract

The objectives of this study are 1) to analyze the word formation processes of Thai slang that uses English elements, and 2) to examine the semantic changes of these words when used as Thai slang on Facebook. The data were collected from ten popular Thai Facebook pages. 74 English-originated slang words were qualitatively examined using a qualitative descriptive method, utilizing morphological categories by Mattiello (2013) and semantic typologies by Ullmann (1962). The results reveal the most productive morphological process was compounding (56.74%), often with Thai-English compounds (e.g., ทัวร์ลง, พ่อไมโครเวฟ), followed by affixation (13.51%) such as ทีม-, or -คีย์บอร์ด, as morphological models for expressive meaning. There were also clipping (เว'อร์), alphabetism (MVP, ROV), and reduplication (ฟีล ๆ), but less so. Surprisingly, real blending was not observed, which would suggest a preference for syntactic over phonemic innovation. The most prevalent process semantically was metaphorization (41.89%), as in words like เต็มกราฟ and ชั้น G, involving symbolic reinterpretation in terms of Thai culture. Narrowing (24.33%) and pejoration (12.16%) were likewise prevalent, with words like เช็คบิล conveying a negative meaning. No examples of amelioration were found. These findings are evidence that not only do Thai speakers borrow English words, they also actively resemantify them through culture-inseminated linguistic creativity.

Keywords: *1. Slang expression, 2. code-mixing, 3. social media, 4. Facebook*

Introduction

The increase of digital communication platforms has transformed the landscape of daily interaction that surrounds us, creating a popular linguistic environment – a constant invention and permissiveness. Along with the expansion of social media usage, traditional media consumption, that usually communicates in formal language, has increasingly shifted to user-generated content as a source favored over more casual and expressive means of communication (Jiamthapthaksin, Setthawong, & Ratanasawetwat, 2016). This digital discourse is defined by unique lexical features where language is not merely a tool for information exchange but a medium for advertising, entertainment, and identity construction (Liu et al., 2019; Nazir, Mehmood, & Mehmood, 2024). Within this context,

the rigid grammatical rules of standard language are often relaxed to accommodate the speed and conciseness of online interaction, leading to the emergence of Internet slang as a dominant linguistic feature (Sabri et al., 2020). This new form of language is marked by novel characteristics, humor, and a high degree of creativity, effectively capturing the attention of digital audiences in ways standard language cannot (Liu et al., 2019)

During the past decades, the Thai language has been more and more affected by globalization and online communication, especially on social media like Facebook. The one clear trend is the incorporation of English words in Thai slang, commonly used for humor, identity presentation, and emotional meaning (Benchamas, & Wilaporn, 2023; Sabri et al., 2020). This is not specific to borrowing; rather, English terms are phonologically, morphologically, and semantically adapted in order to fit Thai language and cultural norms (Unthanon, Chanthao, & Dandee, 2024; Sangsarai, 2021).

Social media accelerates such slang's diffusion. Thai speakers use innovative English words, especially to respond to popular culture and daily affairs (Pewpalaplow et al., 2023; Jiamthapthaksin, Setthawong, & Ratanasawetwat, 2016). Morphological processes such as clipping, affixation, and compounding are common (Mattiello, 2013; Kulkarni & Wang, 2018), so too are semantically motivated developments such as metaphorization, and pejoration (Yusuf, Fata, & Artini, 2022; Rahman, Supeni, & Mahmud, 2022).

While many studies have explored the influence of English on the Thai language, the majority have focused on loanwords within the areas of general linguistics and translation studies, fewer studies have examined these loans as slang, particularly in the context of social media communication. This study aims to investigate how morphological and semantic adjustment of English words in Thai slang occurs on Facebook.

Research Objectives

The purpose of this study is to examine the morphological integration processes of English words into Thai slang, and the English-derived slang expressions' English slang semantic changes.

Literature Review

One of the most innovative and socially rooted features of a language is slang, for it combines personal inventions and collective systems. Slang has a fast growth rate, is resistant to regulation, and is heavily influenced by technology and sociocultural factors. As Mattiello (2013) explains, slang tends to make use of extra-grammatical morphological techniques like blending, clipping, compounding, and reduplication to form new, expressive vocabulary. Through these means, speakers express condensed meaning, irony, or subcultural conformity. Regarding English, slang tends to break the so-called "morphological rules" as online and digital communication becomes prevalent and takes over. In this regard, Kulkarni, & Wang (2018) developed a computational model to examine slang form and structure further. Slang, as they pointed out, is a morphological structure of a language that diverges from dictionary norms.

The emergence of English as an international lingua franca has also had a great impact on the development of slang in many bilingual and multilingual communities, including Thailand. English words are borrowed and modified to fit local phonological, orthographic, and cultural conventions. In Thailand, the impact can readily be seen in the cyber community. As Unthanon, Chanthao, & Dandee (2024) noted, Thai individuals borrow English words via various morphological processes such as affixation, clipping, and hybridization, which exhibit linguistic creativity. English borrowings by Thai individuals demonstrate linguistic creativity and, at the same time, an expression of social identity and modernization. Further, what Wedananta et al. (2023) observe in a Balinese context holds here too: the incorporation of English items into youth discourse is commonly motivated by the desire to be seen as trendy and proficient in contemporary digital culture.

The evolution of Thai-English slang on social media such as Facebook and Twitter is not an accident but reflects more deep-seated sociolinguistic forces. As noted by Jiamthapthaksin, Setthawong, & Ratanasawetwat (2016), the speed and depth of the diffusion of slang have significantly been driven by the affordances of social media. Slang words now move in real-time, evolving in response with cultural, political, and entertainment storylines. Because of this rapid transformation, the vast majority of slang terms are outside the realm of traditional dictionaries and official language planning, inviting novel methodological approaches—like computer-based ones—for tracking their

usage. Thai slang, with its huge lexical borrowing from English, is in particular a challenge and an opportunity for linguistic study.

In semantic change, most researchers have explained how borrowed or recycled slang items undergo semantic change. Ullmann (1962) classifies common types of semantic change, such as broadening, narrowing, amelioration, pejoration, and metaphorization. These typologies are especially handy when examining the localized meanings of Thai English-origin slang words. For instance, Rahman, Supeni, & Mahmud (2022) demonstrate that online users have a tendency to adapt the meanings of English words based on specific online subcultures or communicative intents. This is in accordance with the work of Sangsarai (2021), who reported the application of English loanwords and transliterations as features of Thai political Twitter discourse. The applications indicate the versatility of English-origin slang beyond entertainment but into serious or expressive applications. Kanchanabundhu, & Trakulkasemsuk (2022) found that Thai LGBT speakers mainly used shift of meaning—giving new meanings to existing words—as their primary word-formation strategy. This was often combined with other techniques like rhyming or compounding to enhance expressiveness and entertainment.

Sociolinguistically, group identity construction is enabled by slang. Benchamas, & Wilaiporn (2023) investigated the prevalence of slang in LGBTQ+ Facebook groups and found that code-mixing English served not only as a stylistic element but also as a place of in-group membership signaling, irony, and culturally sensitive knowledge. This aligns with earlier studies by Yiamkhamnuan (2011) and Maghfira, & Pratiwi (2022) where it is mentioned that English had also been used to express humor, facilitate social relations, relax conversation seriousness, or encourage deep intimacy. Furthermore, Wedananta et al. (2023) mention that the use of English-inflected slang has symbolic capital aspects, representing social belonging within global youth culture.

From a morphological aspect, the morphological adaptation of English words into Thai could include alterations such as tone modification, syllable replication, or the application of Thai particles to ensure flow and local acceptability. In an exploration of beauty pageant fan pages, Sita, Moungsawad, & Sitthatheerawat (2023) find that English-derived slang tends to be further modified to be more approximate to Thai phonological and syntactic norms. These structural shifts are not only linguistic compromises but also

semiotically rewarding, conveying attitudes such as playfulness, sarcasm, or modern urbanity. This is in line with Malaysian social media communication research in which Sabri et al. (2020) indicated that English slang was adapted to meet local communication needs without losing its international status.

Together, these texts emphasize the importance of studying Thai-English slang as a linguistic and cultural phenomenon—ones that are driven by online communication, youth culture, and global reach. By analyzing the morphology and semantics of Thai English-origin slang, researchers can learn about how languages react to social change and the process through which speakers recycle linguistic resources in multilingual environments in creative ways. This study, therefore, not only contributes to the explanation of slang but also to more general language contact, localization, and identity discourses in the digital age.

Research Method

A qualitative descriptive method is applied in the study to examine how English-derived words are used and reformed as Thai slang, with a focus on morphological and semantic changes. The research seeks to expose how English words are integrated into Thai social media language phonetically, orthographically, and semantically, as well as how the changes reflect local linguistic creativity.

Data Collection

According to Bank Sitthinunt (2024: online), Facebook is the most frequently used social media platform in Thailand and the primary source for news consumption. The data, therefore, comprise a set of slang words used in Thai Facebook pages. Ten pages were randomly selected from a list of the top twenty most engaging Thai Facebook pages based on measures of interaction like shares, and comments. The examples of pages include TV Pool, Khaosod, Drama-addict, อีจัน (Ejan), and Thairath. To facilitate content and context diversity, the data from each of the selected pages were not collected on the same date. Instead, each page yielded a single block of 24-hour posts and comments, giving a broad cross-section of user speech from various time periods and topical focuses.

All the posts along with their corresponding comments within the selected 24-hour period were collected for each page. This sampling technique yields a good

representation of relaxed, spontaneous online conversation in which slang is being used actively. The data reflects how Thai netizens lightheartedly borrow and mold English words in real-time online communication.

Data Analysis

1. Morphological Analysis

Using the adaptation of Mattiello (2013); Kulkarni, & Wang (2018), and Unthanon, Chanthao, & Dandee (2024) models, the colloquial words collected were grouped according to morphological processes as follows: clipping, shortening a longer word by cutting a part of it such as เกม [game] from game over, and เว่อร์ [ver] from over; blending, fusing parts of words together, which is rare in Thai morphology and usually just phonetic assimilation such as บ่องตง [honestly]; reduplication, repeating a word or syllable such as ฟีล ๆ [based on emotions or feelings]; affixation, adding a bound morpheme to a root word, such as นัก- [-er] as in นักช็อป [shopper], and ทีม- [-supporter or -er] as in ทีมอ่านคอมเมนต์ [comment reader]; compounding, combining two or more words to create a new word with a specific meaning such as เต็มกราฟ [extremely]; alphabetism, using the individual letters of abbreviation such as MVP [top-notch]; phonological and orthographical adaptation, changing pronunciation or spellings such as such as ฮ่องกง [jail].

2. Semantic Analysis

The study also investigated semantic shift, using a framework adopted from Ullmann (1962), Rahman, Supeni, & Mahmud (2022), and Yusuf, Fata, & Aini (2022). Each slang term was processed to identify: metaphorization, shifting from a literal meaning to a figurative meaning such as เช็กบิล [to revenge]: narrowing or broadening of meaning, becoming restricted to a specific type or context or expanding to wider meaning such as เสิร์ฟ [to supply]; pejoration or amelioration, changing from a neutral or positive meaning to a negative connotation or shifting from a neutral or negative meaning to a positive one such as ติสต์ [a moody or unpredictable person].

Contextual application within comments and posts was the main approach to employ in the interpretation of these semantic changes. The meanings were inferred from the manner in which speakers used the words in free conversation and completed with example sentences or threads of comments.

Validation and Coding

All data gathered were read and hand-coded by the researcher. Repeated terms were cross-checked for reliability purposes, and ambiguous examples were excluded if the contextual sense was not apparent. A coding system was constructed to categorize each of the slang words within one or more morphological and semantic categories.

Results

This study explores the use of English-origin slang in Thai in terms of semantic change and morphological processes supported by evidence from highly active Thai Facebook pages. The data sample consists of 74 slang expressions.

Morphological processes

Table 1 Types of Morphological Processes

Types of Morphological Processes	Percentage	Example Terms
Clipping	6.76	ซิส, ลักชู, สตรอ
Blending	0	-
Compounding	56.74	ติดแกลม, ช็อตฟีล, ทัวร์ลง, พ่อไมโครเวฟ
Reduplication	1.35	ฟีล ๆ
Alphabetism	2.7	MVP, ROV
Affixation	13.51	ควีน-, ทีม-, ฟีล-, -คีย์บอร์ด, -ออนไลน์
Phonological and orthographical adaptation	2.7	บู้บี้, ฮ่องกง
Others	16.21	เสิร์ฟ, แครอท, ไทยแลนด์, มัลติเวิร์ส

Compounding was the dominant process, occupying over half of the data (56.74%). The majority of them are one Thai and one English, e.g., ติดแกลม (ติด+glam), ทัวร์ลง (tour+ลง), พ่อไมโครเวฟ (พ่อ+microwave) whereas others are one English and one English, e.g., ช็อตฟีล (short+feel), ก๊อปเกรดเอ (copy+grade A). These examples demonstrate innovative blending of English lexical stems with Thai functional or expressive stuff to yield idiomatic meaning peculiar to digital discourse.

It was also highly productive (13.51%) to attach affixes, particularly Thai ones, to English bases. Although Thai is an isolating language, certain words function as affixes in slang contexts. Examples include prefixes such as ควีน – (queen-) and ทีม- (team-). The suffix -คีย์บอร์ด (-keyboard), may resemble a compound, lacks its slang connotation

when used in isolation. It must be attached to a word such as โค้ช [coach] or นักเลง [obnoxious person] to create the slang meaning.

Clipping was observed in shortened forms of more prolonged words. 6.76% of the dataset consisted of clipping. The most frequently used terms are ซิส from sister, ลักชู from luxury, and สตรอ from strawberry.

English-borrowing initialisms were also present, though just 2.70% of the dataset. These were usually preserved in Roman letters, such as MVP and ROV.

Phonological and orthographical adaptation occupied a small part of the database (2.7%). บู้บี้, which originated from “bully”, has its standard transliteration as บูลลี่ and was changed to บู้บี้ maybe because of a similarity in sound with the existing Thai slang บุบบี้, which is similar to the way “bully” is used in English, though in a humorous or playful way.

Even though extremely rare (1.35%), reduplication was utilized – ฟีล ๆ from feel.

Since Thai words are dominantly monosyllabic, true blending is rare in Thai morphology. This study found no examples of true blending. What may appear to be blending is actually a clipping or phonetic assimilation.

The following are straightforward lexical loanings or English borrowings with minimal accommodation: เสิร์ฟ (serve), แครอท, วาร์ป (warp), มัลติเวิร์ส (multi-verse).

Semantic shift

Table 2 Types of Semantic Shift

Types of Semantic Shift	Percentage	Example Terms
Narrowing	24.33	ฟีล-, ติดคอนเทนต์
Broadening	9.46	MVP, ท็อปฟอร์ม, ซิส
Metaphorization	41.89	เต็มกราฟ, ลาสต์บอส, ชั้น G
Amelioration	0	-
Pejoration	12.16	ไทยแลนด์, พีค, ลักชู, มัลติเวิร์ส
Others	12.16	สตรอ, โซจิ้ง, ชี-, แท้ทรู

This table categorizes English-origin vocabulary and phrases borrowed into Thai slang based on the type of semantic shift that they subsequently undergo. The categorization follows conventional semantic shift categories such as narrowing,

broadening, metaphorization, amelioration, and pejoration, with an "others" category for more creative or problematic examples.

Metaphorization was the single most frequent semantic change type in the data under investigation (41.89%). It refers to the use of figurative or symbolic meaning on words that are other than their source meaning. This is particularly productive in Thai slang, as speakers creatively appeal to visual similarity, contextual relatedness, or structural analogy to redescribe the meaning of English or loan words in culturally relevant terms. For example: เต็มกราฟ is a mix of the Thai term เต็ม [full] and the English term graph. Symbolically, it represents doing one's best in a thing—emotionally, physically, or in performance. The picture is likely taken from video games, where a character's health or power bar is displayed in the form of a graph that is filled to its limit. Thus, saying someone is เต็มกราฟ implies they are giving their all or performing at their peak. ชั้น G [Ground Floor] is a metaphorical expression referring to socially inconsiderate or low behavior. It uses the literal meaning of the ground floor as the lowest floor of a building and metaphorically applies it to refer to a person with the worst level of manners, class, or behavior. The phrase is more often used as a sarcastic or ironic remark, and shows how architectural metaphors work well in Thai digital discourse.

These examples indicate not only the way Thai slang borrows words from English but also redefines their meaning by using cultural metaphor to allow speakers to express humor, sarcasm, criticism, or admiration in efficient and innovative forms. This creativity highlights the informal, roundabout, and satirical nature of online language.

Narrowing is the application of a word to a more limited or specific sense in Thai usage than its generic English meaning. 24.33% of the slang terms have narrowing senses. ฟีล- (feel-) is used as a prefix to signify specific moods or atmospheres, e.g., ฟีลแฟน [feel like a boyfriend]. These examples demonstrate social media culture and appearances affecting the specialization of words in English in Thai.

Pejoration is the term that shifted to create a mocking or pejorative tone in colloquial Thai. The research found that 12.16% of the dataset shifted into negative meaning. Examples: ไทยแลนด์ (Thailand), ironic usage to imply crazy or absurd conditions, often ridiculing national conduct. พีค (peak) literally "top point," but often implies a point

of absurdity or melodrama. This is representative of satirical tone widespread in internet culture, whereby language is adapted to mock or belittle.

12.16% of slang expressions are comprised of creative or playful substitutions which do not neatly fall into the traditional categories, e.g., phonetic puns, parody, or cultural reference. Examples: สตรอ (from strawberry) is similar to Thai snarl word meaning insincere or two-face. โซจิ้ง [so emotional] reduplication of English "so" with Thai จิ้ง [forcible], indicating strong feelings. ชี- (chi-) prefix placed before names to feminize or dramatize, e.g., ชีลิซ่า for Lisa of BLACKPINK. แท้ทรู [real true] is a humorous reduplication to stress the truth or sincerity in exaggerated way. These innovative creations show linguistic playfulness and humor of Thai users in recombining English for local purposes.

In broadening, the initial meaning of the English word is extended in Thai slang to cover wider or different contexts. 9.46% of slang words have extended their meanings. Examples: MVP (most valuable player) is widely used to praise anyone who is the best in any area—not limited to sport. ท็อปฟอร์ม (top form) can be applied to refer to a person as being excellent in looks, brains, or anything else than sporting performance. ฟีล ๆ (feel-feel) can become an overall mood or vibe descriptor, even applied in the lack of proper reference. This indicates generality and flexibility are favored in Thai online usage.

Interestingly, there were no cases of amelioration in the corpus. This suggests perhaps a tendency towards humor, irony, or satire rather than positive semantic change.

Discussion

This study investigated the process of how English-origin words are morphologically and semantically transformed into Thai slang on Facebook conversation. As derived from a corpus of 74 slang items collected from top Thai Facebook pages, the results of data analysis indicated that compounding (56.74%) and affixation (13.51%) were the most daunting morphological techniques, and metaphorization (41.89%) and narrowing (24.33%) were the most pervasive modes of semantic shift.

Compounding had a tendency to prefix Thai lexemes with English words (e.g., ติดแกลม, ทัวร์ลง), reflecting users' tendency to insert foreign materials in recognizable Thai structures. Affixes such as -คีย์บอร์ด and ทีม- had high productivity trends of affixation, serving as morphological templates for creativity and expressiveness.

On the semantic level, the study indicates that Thai users do not merely transfer English word with their original meanings but creatively reuse them to serve certain communicative needs within the Thai online environment. 41.89% of metaphorization supports the function of slang as a tool for expressive and emotional connotation (Mamasalieva, 2024). This supports the claims by Liu et al. (2019), which states that internet slang can be a part of creative processing, where people are more attracted to the novelty, and creativity of language use as a means of gaining attention. The use of ชั้น G, a metaphor from “Ground Floor” to “low class/unrefined,” for example, is a creative application that requires common cultural knowledge within Thai users to interpret.

The data support the working hypothesis that English-origin slang is not used haphazardly but is actively morphological and semantic localizing to meet Thai social, cultural, and communicative norms. Language hybridity observed is symptomatic of a broader-scale sociolinguistic tendency by which online Thai users deploy English as a resource of identity, a joke-telling resource, and a group-membership resource—especially where fast, evocative, and culturally nuanced communication is valued.

The pervasiveness of metaphorization and narrowing points to a salient context-sensitive language play, not so much borrowing but remaking meanings through creative and culture-embedded reinterpretation. This is not only a sign of a need for expressiveness but also of a performative character of digital communication—users signal sophistication, irony, or solidarity by reconfiguring global linguistic resources in terms locally meaningful.

These implications extend to wider studies of language contact, code-mixing, and online discourse. They suggest the necessity of approaching slang not as a linguistic corruption but as an adaptive linguistic strategy that can provide insights into how speakers manage to speak globalisation and localisation at the same time.

This study extends previous work of Benchamas, & Wilaiporn (2023), Sabri et al. (2020), and Unthanon, Chanthao, & Dandee (2024), all of which emphasized that English usage in Thai online discourse has identity and stylistic purposes. The morphological processes observed agree with Mattiello's (2013) categorization of slang-making processes, and the semantic changes validate Rahman, Supeni, & Mamud's (2022) study findings on digital language meaning adaptation.

Unlike studies on Thai slang among isolated groups such as the LGBTQ+ setting (e.g., Kanchanabundhu, & Trakulkasemsuk, 2022), this study was conducted with cyber public discourse. However, it confirms their observation that morphological creativity and shift of meaning are main concerns in the construction of Thai slang regardless of group.

One such significant difference is that there is no such phonemic blending involved in this corpus, though it is extensively quoted in English slang research (e.g., brunch = breakfast + lunch). This shows that even though Thai-English slang shows some processes of English slang, it has a preference for syntactic compounding and affixation over phonemic fusion, possibly due to phonological or orthographic limitations in Thai.

Despite its original contribution, this research is not free from some constraints. First, the data is limited to one social media site (Facebook) and is a 24-hour window by page, which, while useful for transient language data, may not capture trends in longer-term slang emergence. Second, selection bias may have been involved in choosing the pages, even when sampling for diversity. Third, semantic change interpretation is context-bound and researcher-judgment-dependent, which, while verified, is inherently subjective.

Furthermore, slang is highly dynamic and group-oriented. What is "in" with one internet-based community may not take off elsewhere. Therefore, care must be taken in making broad generalizations and follow-up studies should involve longitudinal data or contrast slang usage rates across platforms (e.g., Twitter, TikTok) or groups.

Conclusion

This study explored how English words are creatively borrowed and restructured into Thai slang on Facebook, morphologically and semantically. The findings show that Thai Facebook users don't merely borrow English words—they restructure it for expressive purposes, for humor, and for constructing identity. Morphological processes such as compounding, affixation, and clipping were especially productive, demonstrating the generativity of both languages in online settings. Semantic innovations—specifically metaphorization and narrowing—illustrated how Thai speakers assign English items new, culture-specific senses.

These innovations reflect broader-scale sociolinguistic processes resulting from globalization, youth culture, and computer-mediated communication. The study

demonstrates how language contact in the online space generates not only linguistic blending but also creativity and locally expressed identity. Overall, English-derived Thai slang is not evidence of language decay but of effective, resourceful language use due to modern communication contexts.

Further research on different platforms, periods, and groups will help us understand how the global and local linguistic resources get blended in the digital era. This work contributes to mounting arguments over language change, multilingual practice, and cultural adaptation in the age of social media.

References

Bank Sitthinunt. (2567, สิงหาคม 16) *อินไซต์โลกดิจิทัลของประเทศไทยจาก Digital Insights Thailand Report 2024*. Contentshifu. https://contentshifu.com/blog/digital-insights-thailand/

Benchamas, A., & Wilaiporn, S. (2023). The creativity in Thai slang creation on social media. *Journal of Liberal Arts Ubon Ratchathani University, 13*(1), 39–53. https://so06.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/jounal-ubu/article/view/256764

Choomthong, D. (2017). Characteristics of slang terms in online discussion among Thai stock investors. *NIDA Journal of Language and Communication, 22*(30), 81–105. https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/NJLC/article/view/94730

Jiamthapthaksin, R., Setthawong, P., & Ratanasawetwat, N. (2016). A system for popular Thai slang extraction from social media content with n-gram based tokenization. In *2016 8th International Conference on Knowledge and Smart Technology (KST)* (pp. 130–135). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/KST.2016.7440478

Kanchanabundhu, K., & Trakulkasemsuk, W. (2022). Shift to impress: How Thai LGBTs create new terms in their daily chats. *rEFLections, 29*(3), 621–637. https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v29i3.262413

Kulkarni, V., & Wang, W. Y. (2018). Simple models for word formation in English slang. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)* (pp. 1424–1434). Association for Computational Linguistics. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N18-1129

Liu, S., Gui, D.-Y., Zuo, Y., & Dai, Y. (2019). Good or bad slang? Embedding internet slang in persuasive advertising. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10(1025). http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01251

Maghfira, N., & Pratiwi, S. D. (2022). Analysis of the use of English in slang on video content used by TikTok content creators. *Deskripsi Bahasa, 5*(1), 20–24. https://doi.org/10.22146/db.v5i1.4962

Mamasalieva, Z. (2024). Pragmatic Peculiarities of English Slang in Online Communication. *Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education, 2*(5), 435 – 439.

Mattiello, E. (2013). *Extra-grammatical morphology in English: Abbreviations, blends, reduplicatives, and related phenomena*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Nazir, M., Mehmood, A., & Mehmood, A. (2024). Humor and slang as linguistics tools: A study of audience engagement strategies among social media influencers. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL, 7*(4), 960 – 969.

Pewpalaplow, C., Pansila, A., Thamdecho, H., & Chanaroke, U. (2023). The use of slang in teenagers' Facebook pages. *Journal of English Language and Linguistics, 3*(1), 29–36. https://doi.org/10.62819/jel.2022.105

Rahman, A., Supeni, A., & Mahmud, S. (2022). Semantic shift of English internet slangs used in social media. *Journal of Language and Literature Education, 9*(1), 12–20.

Sabri, N. A., Hamdan, S. B., Nadarajan, N. M., & Shing, S. R. (2020). The usage of English internet slang among Malaysians in social media. *Selangor Humaniora Review, 4*(2), 15–22. https://doi.org/10.37134/shr.vol4.2.3.2020

Sabrina, A. N. (2021). Internet slang containing code-mixing of English and Indonesian used by millennials on Twitter. *Kandai, 17*(2), 153–165. https://doi.org/10.26499/jk.v17i2.3422

Sangsarai, P. (2021). *The use of English loan words of Thai people on Twitter application* [Master's independent study, Thammasat University]. Thammasat University Library. http://ethesisarchive.library.tu.ac.th/thesis/2021/TU_2021_6321040146_15930_19699.pdf

Sita, Y., Moungsawad, A., & Sitthatheerawat, T. (2023). The study of slang usage in beauty pageant Facebook fan pages among Thai fans. *Phranakhon Rajabhat Research Journal (Humanities and Social Sciences), 18*(1), 156–164.

Unthanon, K., Chanthao, R., & Dandee, W. (2024). Word formation of new vocabulary in Thai dictionary. *Journal of Language and Culture, 43*(1), 179–198.

Ullmann, S. (1962). *Semantics: An introduction to the science of meaning*. Basil Blackwell.

Wedananta, K. A., Padmadewi, N. N., Artini, L. P., & Budasi, I. G. (2023). Slang words used by Balinese Generation Z in Instagram communication. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 13*(8), 2097–2106. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1308.26

Yiamkhamnuan, J. (2011). The mixing of Thai and English: Communicative strategies in internet chat rooms. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences, 32*(3), 478–492. https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/kjss/article/view/246758

Yusuf, Y. Q., Fata, I. A., & Aini, R. (2022). “GOTCHUU!”: The use of slang in social media by Generation Z. *LiNGUA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra, 17*(2), 167–174. https://doi.org/10.18860/ling.v17i2.17756