



Variations of comparative forms in online discourses: Acceptability and practicality

Michael John Tagadiad ⁽¹⁾*

⁽¹⁾ Bukidnon State University, Malaybalay City, Philippines

* michaeljohn_tagadiad@buku.edu.ph

Abstract

As non-native users of English, multilinguals sometimes produce discourses that seemingly deviate from the English norm. One dispute on Facebook, for instance, tagged someone being linguistically incompetent for using double comparatives (DCs), seeing that its use (e.g. more taller) violates the English grammar. Hence this study directs its attention to DC's emergence in online discourses to explore its acceptability and practicality. As a qualitative content inquiry informed by Chomsky's (1961) generative grammar and theory of linguistic structure, this study found 9 DC structures, which at a glance, deviate the English norms, suggesting a variation in the application of comparative forms in English. Surprisingly, at a closer look, DCs are linguistic innovations characterizing users' creativity and practical intent and their way to maximize the flexibility of English to serve a practical purpose. Understanding the purpose of Facebook discourses (e.g. to influence decisions) is crucial in this study to explain the use of DCs. As a result, promotional is the main purpose that justifies the use of DCs as it contains transactional and practical details to influence decisions (e.g. customers to grab discounted services). Significantly, this study introduces three types of DCs used in online discourses not yet explored in linguistics, namely: 1) intralingual (coreference) which coreferences with other lexical items composing units of linguistic references that denote meaning of an entire discourse in semantic level, 2) interlingual (intensifier) which intensifies the presentation of meaning according to how they are intended by users, and 3) extra-lingual (meaning marker) which adds related ideas not explicitly conveyed in a discourse. Although DCs appear to be acceptable in practical uses, particularly in online discourses, applying them in formal writing (where grammar accuracy is crucial) needs consensus among language experts because its usage may not be acceptable to convey technical information.

Keywords

English online discourses, comparative forms in English, double comparatives, generative grammar, linguistic innovation

Introduction

The emergence of social networking sites (e.g., Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter) paves way to efficient and revolutionized human interactions, allowing participation of the general public in global discourses online to exchange and express emotions, opinions, and thoughts using English (Al-Sharqi & Abbasi, 2020), where a simple use of hashtags convey them minimally and symbolically (Kaur et al., 2019). These global interactions put English at the mainstream which influences language innovation, development, and change in its cultural and virtual aspects (Dor, 2004, 2020; Klymenko, 2020).

As non-native users of English, multilinguals sometimes produce discourses that seemingly deviate from the English norm. In applying degree of comparison, for instance, double comparative (DC) is observed in online discourses. DC redundantly uses two comparative markers (e.g. more easier) and is perceived as deviation at a glance. A particular dispute that the researcher came across on Facebook, for instance, tagged someone as linguistically incompetent for using DC (e.g. more taller), seeing that the structure misuses the English grammar.

Double comparatives (e.g. more easier and more stronger) are observed in the essays and presentations of students of different backgrounds (Imran & Wahid, 2020; Morton, 2018). In consideration with the existing norms in writing, Morton decided initially that these emerging forms are improper, ungrammatical, and redundant, believing that the structure deviates from what is believed to be the standard formation of comparative forms. Imran and Wahid support this observation by investigating the variations of adjective phrases in Pakistani English and the influence of Urdu language to this English variety. They have observed that double comparatives and double superlatives are used in the adjective phrases of Pakistani English and perceived this application as a deviation from standard British English (BrE).

Comments against the use of double comparatives began in 1594 where Greaves and Butler (1636) viewed it as outdated and recommended users to refrain its use, preventing its form to emerge in standard English grammars, and decreasing the chance of its acceptability for uniformity of coding and economy and for purification of the English language (Włodarczyk, 2007). Though present in Latin, DCs are taken as vulgar forms, considering Latin as a pure language, and, therefore, rejected this emerging form in Latin grammar (González-Díaz, 2008). This decision is also seen to have influenced rejection of this structure in the English grammar (Morton). Contrary to the standardization effort and prescriptivist forces against double comparatives, the form is still found in 17th and 18th century speech and is even present in other languages like Dutch.

Since the 1300s, double comparatives have started gaining popularity. They serve as general markers of high style speech in Middle English (ME) notably present in William Shakespeare's works (Morton). Włodarczyk sees that the conflict between the rejection of double comparatives from standard English and its popularity and persistent presence in colloquial and online discourses cannot be ignored because its emergence shows variations of the English. With its inevitable emergence, González-Díaz hypothesizes that

when users of the language feel that inflectional forms do not clearly express the idea of degree, they, therefore, look for a new way of doing so, feeling the need to ensure successful transmission or the need to emphasize the message, that synthetic forms and norms appear to be the only comparative strategy available in the language (Morton).

Comparative Forms in English

Degree of Comparison

Degree of comparison is used to compare two or more entities (Bungsu et al., 2021; Kurniawan & Oktalia, 2017) and is widely used both in speaking and writing, as well as in online discourses. Having various grammatical rules, the concept sometimes lead non-native users of English to commit errors (e.g. misformation). In Indonesia, students demonstrate at least a fair mastery in applying the degree of comparison (Kurniawan & Oktalia) as they commit these errors because of some sources (e.g. intralingual transfer). In response, it is recommended that students need to explore more learning resources like grammar books, English courses, and other reliable sources to expand their knowledge and to develop their writing ability using the English grammar.

Errors in Comparative Forms

Bungsu et al. (2021) classified four errors (i.e., misformation, omission, addition, and misordering) committed by English learners in applying comparative forms in English. Misformation is an error characterized by the use of the wrong form of the morpheme or structure (e.g. "badder" instead of its comparative form "worse"). Omission is an error characterized by the absence of an item that must appear in a well-formed utterance and the content of morphemes which should be in the correctly expression and is committed when the students omitted a necessary element of word (e.g. "heaver" instead of "heavier"). Addition is an error that occurred when the students put unnecessary element to their sentences (e.g. "cheapper" instead of "cheaper"). And misordering is an error that occurred when the students put an utterance in a wrong order (e.g. "expensive more" instead of "more expensive").

Sources of Errors

Bungsu et al. (2021) also classified four sources of errors (i.e., intralingual transfer, communication strategy, interlingual transfer, and context of learning) in applying comparative forms. Intralingual transfer explains students' inaccurate application of the rules in the target language (e.g. "heavyer" instead of "heavier"). Communication strategy explains students' attempt to cross their message, believing that a certain rule is applicable to all linguistic formations (e.g. "badder" instead of "worse"). Interlingual transfer explains the influence of students' first language thinking that a sentence is already applying a comparative form (e.g. The pencil case is cheap [cheaper] than the purse). And context of learning explains students' misinterpretation of teacher's input, generalizing linguistic placement of comparative markers (e.g. more or most) applicable as comparative suffixes like "-er" (e.g. "expensive more" instead of "more expensive" as derived from the context of regular comparative suffixes "-er" in "heavier").

Double Comparative Forms

Double comparatives (DCs), as a singular paradigm, is initially an error in applying comparative forms in English. It is described as “the co-occurrence of free comparative morphemes and bound comparative morphemes” (Corver, 2005). As applied in this study, free comparative morpheme is an adjective (e.g. small) translated into a comparative form (e.g. smaller, from the adjective “small” where a comparative bound morpheme “-er” is now attached to it) having an independent value or meaning. Bound comparative morpheme, on the one hand, is a dependent suffix like “-er” which attains value or meaning when used together with a free morpheme.

As the linguistic norm sets adjectives to have three comparative degrees – absolute, comparative, and superlative, the comparative degree is expressed through inflection using suffixes like “-er” or pre-modifier like “more”. However, Wahid & Imran (2020) pointed out that the type of suffix and the kind of pre-modifier mentioned cannot be used together in standard English (e.g. the pre-modifier “more” + the free morpheme “small” + the bound comparative morpheme or suffix “-er”) to form comparative structures (e.g. more smaller). When this happens, double comparative is formed which, at a glance, misuses the English grammar, showing a variation in the application of comparative forms.

Context of Use or Purpose

Tafesse and Wien (2017) introduces eight purposes (i.e., experiential, seasonal, personal, professional, relational, communal, intentional, and promotional) that can explain the use of double comparatives in online discourses.

Experiential highlights the sensory and embodied qualities of an experience through sensory and physical stimulation. Seasonal captures active talking points about cultural events, holidays, anniversaries, and weather or season. Personal centers around personal relationships, preferences or experiences while invoking personal meaningful themes (i.e., family, friendship, personal anecdotes or future plans) to initiate deep personal conversations. Professional presents employees’ perspective on a range of issues, such as employees’ technical expertise, their managerial philosophies, or their personal interests, hobbies and worldviews.

Communal purpose fosters a sense of community identification and engagement with the community by recruiting new community members, as well as encouraging participation from existing members. Relational solicits information and feedback about one’s needs, expectations, and experiences in a way that deepen the impact of relationships between and among users. Intentional highlights socially responsive programs to promote worthy social causes and initiatives and encourage support from the users. And promotional entices users to take actions towards buying decisions as they contain transactional details such as availability of points, price discounts, coupons, and competitions.

Generative Grammar

The theory of generative grammar defines formally a collection of statements, rules or axioms which describe, define or generate all well-formed utterances in a language and only those, consisting of a set of abstract conditions which determine the form of the statements admitted in such grammars and which govern the choice among alternative descriptions of a given body of data (Halle, 1962). It also offers a system of explicit rules that assign to each sequence of phones, whether of the observed corpus or not, a structural description that contains all information about how this sequence of phones is represented on each of the several linguistic levels-in particular, information as to whether this sequence of phones is a properly formed or grammatical sentence and if not, deviates from well-formedness (Chomsky, 1961).

Chomsky promotes the application of this theory to distinguish classes of fully grammatical sentences. When given a grammatically deviant utterance (e.g. the use of double comparatives), a linguist may attempt to impose an interpretation on it (hence the purpose of this study), contributing possible interpretations in constructed contexts, concluding that the examples do not illustrate departure from grammatical regularities, and exploiting whatever features of grammatical structure it preserves and whatever analogies can be constructed with perfectly well-formed sentences. In this way, an interpretation on a perfectly grammatical utterance is not imposed seeing that a well-chosen deviant utterance may be richer and more effective to convey meaning and purpose.

Theory of Linguistic Structure

The theory of linguistic structure hypothesizes about linguistic universals (Chomsky, 1961) asserting that the grammars of all human languages are constructed on such-and-such a specified plan. Such a theory should explicitly characterize the form of grammar (the schema for grammatical description) and should provide a method for selecting alternative grammars (e.g. double comparatives as emerging features of an English variety), each compatible with the available data from some language (and each making a specific set of factual claims concerning this language). A theory of this sort can be verified in an indirect (hence this study) but satisfactory way. A linguist who is exclusively concerned with linguistic data and not with the facts of language, in this broader sense, has severely limited the scope of his research. Rather than looking for patterns with high frequency and regularity as traditional linguistic variation and change, a researcher should also accept emerging structures or variations in English to celebrate creative and practical acts of conveying messages (Wei, 2020).

Linguistic Situations: Innovation and Deviation

Linguistic innovation involves restructuring between language structure and meaning that is scarcely random or coincidental (e.g. in online discourses) (Croft, 2000, cited in Femila, 2020). The Internet, as a global phenomenon with an emerging number of online discourses, is transforming the relationship between standard and non-standard language structures (Klymenko, 2020). As English is widely used in online platforms, the

language activates innovative processes and influences variation, development, and changes where the interactions among users affect the development and evolution of language in its cultural and virtual aspects. The global emergence of new concepts of linguistic usage, standardization, maintenance, and variability is already witnessed on the Internet like in the formation of global online discourses (Dor, 2004, cited in Klymenko).

An inquiry was made whether non-native speakers of English can innovate in English (Wei, 2020) which bothers sociolinguists and sociolinguistic studies, having the feeling of uncertainty whether the innovation of the English language should be treated as linguistic innovation or deviation. In response, the question was tackled from a translanguaging perspective where the approach facilitates the overcoming of monolingual and lingua biases, focusing on instantaneity, spontaneity, and the transient nature of human communication. This approach aims to capture, for instance, the spontaneous Facebook postings and the circulation of innovations through social media, rather than looking for patterns with high frequency and regularity as traditional linguistic variation and change, highlighting criticality through creative acts while disrupting the standard English. As linguistic innovation and creativity do not only depend on a platform, social situations of the users should also be considered, that they are part of a society with influential cultural norms and languages that are used within a context (Nghipondoka, 2020).

Research Gap

Previous investigations on the use of double comparatives in writing (e.g., Imran & Wahid, 2020; Morton, 2018; Włodarczyk, 2007) initially inspire this study to further their inquiry outside the classroom by directing its attention to DCs present in Facebook discourses because it is one of the most celebrated platforms today that connects individuals online (Caers et al., 2013). This study specially recognizes Nghipondoka's (2020) remarkable attempt to investigate linguistic innovation strategies (i.e., use of emojis and emoticons, code-switching or mixing, colloquialisms and slang, vulgar and acronyms) in social media like Facebook, WhatsApp, and Twitter.

Consequently, previous studies limited their investigations in the classroom, without considering online discourses using double comparatives (i.e., more easier, more stronger, more nicer, more better, and more smaller) (see Imran & Wahid, 2020; Morton, 2018; Włodarczyk, 2007). Hence, the emergence of this structure sparks interest and inspires this study to look into DCs, specifically in Facebook discourses, to explore its acceptability and practicality as it initially go against the norms of verbal and written communications at a glance. Seeing that this structure may affect meaning, this investigation intends to find linguistic situations to explain this phenomenon online.

Research Objective

This study aimed to take a closer look into the use of double comparatives in online discourses, to explore their acceptability and practicality. To guide this inquiry, the answers to the following research questions were sought:

1. What structures and types of double comparatives are present in online discourses?
2. What contexts of use and linguistic situations justify the emergence of double comparatives?

Method

Research Design

Though frequencies and percentage are used to present relative data, this study is mainly qualitative in nature which aims to explain a linguistic phenomenon (e.g. variation in comparative forms) emerging in online discourses (e.g. use of double comparatives). As a qualitative content inquiry, which is one of the numerous research methods used for subjective interpretation, the content of texts data, which in this study refer to Facebook discourses using double comparatives (i.e., more easier, more stronger, more nicer, more better, and more smaller) (Imran & Wahid, 2020; Morton, 2018; Włodarczyk, 2007), are systematically classified and identified using a coding instrument, focusing on the characteristics of double comparatives used in Facebook discourses as variations of comparative forms (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005), with attention to contexts of use (e.g. promotional) and linguistic situations (e.g. innovation) to explain their use and purpose (e.g. Tafesse & Wien, 2017).

Corpus of Data and Data Collection Procedure

This study investigates the acceptability and practicality of double comparatives as used in Facebook discourses and reconciles whether the use of these emerging linguistic constructs characterizes linguistic innovation or deviation. These Facebook discourses, in the form of Facebook captions, are systematically chosen based on the following inclusion criteria: (i) Facebook captions with and without assigned hashtags contained double comparatives (i.e., more easier, more stronger, more nicer, more better, and more smaller) (Imran & Wahid, 2020; Morton, 2018; Włodarczyk, 2007), and (ii) Facebook captions and hashtags using the identified double comparatives posted in 2019-2023 with less or more than one hundred reactions, comments, and shares.

By observing the inclusion criteria, one hundred one (n=101) Facebook discourses using double comparatives were collected, analyzed, and assessed. The collection requires the use of hashtag – a word or string of words preceded by the hash sign (#) which is adopted by social media users to categorize information and to add style in the communication process (Caleffi, 2015) and carries the responsibility to convey ideas and to understand writer's intention for meaningful communication (Tariq et al., 2020). The hash sign was used in data gathering preceded by contracted forms of double comparatives (e.g. moreeasier) to formulate appropriate search formats (e.g. #moreeasier) that directed the researcher to Facebook posts using double comparatives. The use of hashtags in this study is imperative because this feature functions as a keyword that helps users to quickly pull up Facebook posts using double comparatives (Sung et al., 2018, cited in Tariq et al., 2020).

Using the appropriate hashtags as search keywords, the process led the researcher to Facebook discourses posted by personal accounts and pages using double comparatives that are attached mostly to hash signs but are scarcely written within the texts or captions. When directed to Facebook posts with captions and hashtags using the applicable comparative forms, provided that the inclusion criteria are religiously observed, the entire Facebook captions were copied and pasted to a coding matrix prepared for analysis and assessment. This procedure found that most of the Facebook discourses using double comparatives are posted in 2021 with 31 out of 101 tokens, with less than 100 reactions, comments, and shares. This study, with the hope to draw additional factor contributing to the use of double comparatives, considered exploring the linguistic profile of the selected Facebook discourses, revealing that most of them are posted in English by non-native English users.

Data Analysis

Using a coding matrix, this study started its analysis and assessment by quantifying and qualifying Facebook discourses using double comparatives followed by understanding the contexts of use and the linguistic situations justifying the emergence of DCs (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). The counting and comparison of these structures followed the identification, quantification, and qualification to identify patterns (Morgan, 1993), allowing for interpretation of the contexts associated with the use of DCs and for discovering the range of meanings that they have in creative and practical uses. Also, recording the frequency and the interpretation of contexts of use is imperative in this study to observe reliable analysis and assessment on how the use of DCs is influenced by purposes (contexts of use) of Facebook discourses and how linguistic situations (e.g. innovation and deviation) justify emergence of this form.

With the limitation to getting the deeper meaning that explains the use of double comparatives in Facebook discourses, this study undertook careful deliberation to observe consistency and reliability between the use of double comparatives and their interpretations and assessments (Weber, 1990) using a coding matrix and a member checking instrument. A coding matrix, as well as a member checking instrument, is used to answer all the research questions. Imperatively, the result of the analysis prepared by the researcher was subjected to member checking procedures to confer with other language experts in a state university to employ a method that observes professional, consistent, and reliable interpretations and assessments on the use of double comparatives in online discourses.

Results and Discussion

As shown in Table 2, the results revealed three types of double comparatives (DCs) in Facebook discourses: interlingual (intensifier), extra-lingual (meaning marker), and intralingual (coreference) confirming the use of five double comparatives introduced in Imran and Wahid (2020), Morton (2018), and Włodarczyk (2007). Among these DCs, only four DCs are found being used in Facebook discourses with “more better” (55.23%) taking the majority used DC followed by “more easier” (26.67%), “more stronger” (15.24%), and “more nicer” (2.86%). This study, however, has no record on the use of the DC “more

smaller” (0.00%) within the period of this inquiry. If, however, the inclusion criteria were stretched to earliest years, usage of this particular DC may have been recorded.

Table 1. Types of Double Comparatives

DCs	Types			f	%
	Interlingual (<i>Intensifier</i>)	Extra-lingual (<i>Meaning Marker</i>)	Intralingual (<i>Coreference</i>)		
more easier	5	23	0	28	26.67
more stronger	0	16	0	16	15.24
more nicer	0	2	1	3	2.86
more better	24	31	2	58	55.23
more smaller	0	0	0	0	0.00
Other DCs					
more faster	0	9	0	9	50.00
more happier	0	2	0	2	11.11
more cheaper	0	5	0	5	27.77
more wiser	0	1	0	1	5.56
Other Form					
gooder	0	0	1	1	100.00

Other than the DCs found in this study (i.e., more easier, more stronger, more nicer, and more better), which are introduced in previous works, this study also found other emerging DCs (i.e., more faster, more happier, more cheaper, and more wiser) that are used in Facebook discourses revealing “more faster” (50.00%) as the majority used DC followed by “more cheaper” (27.77%), “more happier” (11.11%), and “more wiser” (5.56%). Interestingly, another emerging form is also found which assumes an entity being more desirable or useful than the other as described by the word “gooder” (5.56%) which Bungsu et al. (2021) initially referred to as misinformation. Misformation explains an error that is characterized by the use of the wrong form of the morpheme or structure instead of its comparative form (e.g. “better” not “gooder”). It is directly associated to a communication strategy where users try to cross their message, believing that a certain rule is applicable to all linguistic formations. In this case, the word “gooder” ignores the exclusivity of the rule that suffixes are only applicable to a number of adjectives ending in “-y” (e.g. heavy), but not to irregular adjectives (e.g. good).

Interlingual (Intensifier) Double Comparatives

Interlingual DCs are formed within Facebook discourses or captions (see Frame 1). They are not simply applied as normal lexical items that contribute presentation of semantic values (meaning) of an entire discourse but are specially formed using hash signs allowing users to form creative and practical hashtags. Likewise, these hashtags do not simply become part of the syntactic structure of a particular discourse but mainly intensifies the presentation of meanings according to how they are intended by users (Caleffi, 2015; Sung et al., 2018; Tariq et al., 2020). As observed, the use of interlingual DCs (i.e., #MoreEasier, #MoreCheaper, and #MoreBetter) displays not just the users’

linguistic innovation but also intensifies the message being conveyed with an attempt to convince their target audience.

- a. Long hair! Short hair! Change as you like High-end hair extension technology, **#MoreEasier**, #MoreQuick, **#MoreCheaper**, #MoreEasyMaintain and #MoreHair Completely customized for a natural look a perfect fit.
- b. You've worked hard this year and showed us what it's like to Live **#MoreBetter**. Now it's time to treat yourself to these delicious S'mores Brownie Muffins.
- c. Follow the recipe and try it yourself today 😊 So if you're looking to enjoy a **#MoreBetter** moment, make sure you sprinkle a bit of Selati Brown into your life.

Frame 1. Interlingual DCs in Online Discourses

For example, Facebook discourse "A" (see Frame 1) uses interlingual DCs (i.e. #MoreEasier and #MoreCheaper) to intensify the message about easier and cheaper high-end hair extension services. This style leads to the formation of a new linguistic hypothesis that interlingual DCs characterize Facebook users' creative style in the context of online discourses to put weight to their messages while trying to convince their target consumers to try promoted services being offered (e.g. easier and cheaper high-end hair extension services). This linguistic phenomenon occurring in online discourses is perceived as the users' style to intensify the meaning being conveyed, maximizing the creative potential of English grammar in online discourses constructed for a specified purpose (e.g. intensified promotions) using interlingual DCs within Facebook discourses as alternative and applicable feature or variation that is made compatible with the user's purpose (Chomsky, 1961).

Extra-lingual (Meaning Marker) Double Comparatives

Extra-lingual DCs are used outside and below Facebook discourses which are formed as sets of hashtags as they are attached to hash signs, making a particular Facebook post searchable and accessible as they are used as key string of words that will help users to quickly pull up Facebook posts that are associated with them (Sung et al., 2018, cited in Tariq et al., 2020), which also works for interlingual DCs. Unlike interlingual DCs, extra-lingual DCs are intentionally formed to serve as meaning markers to add related ideas that are not explicitly conveyed in a Facebook discourse. For example, Facebook discourse "A" (see Frame 2) uses extra-lingual DCs (e.g. #moreeasier) outside and below the discourse marking a comparative idea that the use of Jompay, E-Wallet, E-Boost, and Razer Pay offer easier payment methods.

- a. Now the customers can pay anywhere the premium!!! Via Jompay, E-Wallet, E-Boost and Razer pay.
#makeyourlife **#moreeasier**
#withtokiomarine
- b. I'm work in progress, and constantly working with the best intentions to be the best genuine version of myself. Not perfect but certainly more than happy! 🍷 ❤️
#healthymind #workoutmotivation #fitnessgirl **#morestronger**
- c. It's the tape mustache for us ... and of course give us ALL the pillows!!!
#hatersaremymotivators #morepillows **#morebetter** #men

Frame 2. Extra-lingual DCs in Online Discourses

Additionally, extra-lingual DCs (e.g., #moreeasier, #morestronger, and #morebetter) are used as extralinguistic references displaying the users' creative adoption of English grammar to provide an extra idea that is not explicitly conveyed in Facebook discourses A, B, and C (see Frame 2). In this manner, the audience is informed on the expanded meaning of an implicit or ambiguous discourse requiring a relevant context or marker to be understood. For instance, "#morebetter" serves as the extralinguistic reference to the discourse "It's the tape mustache for us ... and of course give us ALL the pillows!!!" that offers the audience an extra context or idea to get more meaning from what is given in the discourse. In this example, the discourse does not directly convey a comparative situation but is given using an extra-lingual DC (e.g. #morebetter) to inform the audience about a situation that is probably comparing that having "all" the pillows is better. In this sense, extra-lingual DCs are functional DCs acting as general markers of high style and practical speech (Morton, 2018) that expand the meaning of a Facebook discourse.

Intralingual (Coreference) Double Comparatives

Intralingual DCs are formed inside a discourse as coreferences. Unlike interlingual and extra-lingual DCs, interlingual DCs are formed without requiring the use of hash signs, bearing similar value with other lexical items (words) composing the linguistic reference within a textual structure useful for the production of meaning of an entire discourse. As observed in Frame 3, intralingual DCs (i.e., more easier, more faster, and more nicer) are used in Facebook discourses A, B, and C as coreferences to other lexical items, composing units of linguistic references that denote meaning of the entire discourses in semantic level. For instance, the intralingual DC "more nicer" in the Facebook discourse "More nicer than the OEM piece" contributes to the entire meaning of the entire discourse suggesting that an object is probably nicer than an OEM piece.

- a. Transfer Your Transaction **More Easier**
- b. It's ok!! Let's use auto withdrawal make withdraw **more faster** and easier
- c. **More nicer** than the OEM piece.

Frame 3. Intralingual DCs in Online Discourses

Needlessly, this study perceives intralingual DCs characterizing user's creativity when the application is intentional and practical. In case the usage is rather unconscious that does not serve specific intention or purpose (see Table 3), then the form is a misused of the English norm. Hypothetically, given the inevitability of this form, this phenomenon happens because non-native users of English feel that the available forms and standards do not clearly express the degree of idea. Therefore, they look for a new way of doing so by using DCs in a discourse as they feel the need to ensure successful transmission or the need to emphasize the message (González-Díaz, 2008), especially when the established norm seem to be the only comparative strategy available that does not effectively convey the users' real intention (Morton, 2018).

Contexts of Use and Linguistic Situations

Another way to reconcile the use of DCs requires investigation of the contexts or purposes and linguistic situations to look into patterns and factors contributing to their usage in Facebook discourses (Morgan, 1993), allowing for interpretation of the context associated with the use of DCs and for discovering the range of meanings that they can have in creative and practical uses. As presented, Table 3 shows promotional (57.43%) as the most perceived context or purpose of Facebook discourses that may reconcile acceptability of using double comparatives in online discourses, suggesting that such discourses entice users to take actions towards buying decisions as they contain transactional and practical details such as availability of points, price discounts, coupons, and competitions (Tafesse & Wien, 2017). Subsequent to promotional context are personal (18.81%), experiential (11.88%), relational (4.95%), seasonal and intentional (2.97%), and communal (0.99%). Professional, on the other hand, is not suggested in these discourses as the term suggests dignity and professionalism of the users who therefore value observation of available English norms or standards.

Table 2. Contexts and situations

Contexts/Purposes	f	%
Experiential	12	11.88
Seasonal	3	2.97
Personal	19	18.81
Professional	0	0.00
Communal	1	0.99
Relational	5	4.95%
Intentional	3	2.97
Promotional	58	57.43
Linguistic Situation/Phenomenon		
Innovation	99	98.02
Deviation	2	1.98

Relatively, given the assessments and interpretations that other language experts put forward through the member checking procedure, this study suggests that the use of DCs in online discourses embodies the writers' way of celebrating the flexibility of English grammar in the internet in a manner that considers the extra role or function of the

language that puts weight or emphasis and adds extralinguistic references to production of the entire meaning of a particular discourse. As perceived, these emerging forms characterize linguistic innovations that therefore adopt the English language creatively in the internet to convey a specific purpose (e.g. promoting a product or service). This result is tantamount to having “more better” as the majority used DC among the DCs found in this study as it denotes promotional semantic values, conveying that a particular service or product is rather desirable, effective, or practical than other available services or products promoted online, with a practical intent to persuade target consumers.

Conclusion

This study perceives that the use of DCs embodies the writers’ way of exploring the flexibility of English online which considers its extra role or function that puts weight or emphasis, especially extralinguistic references, to the production of meaning of an entire discourse (Croft, 2000, cited in Femila, 2020; González-Díaz, 2008). Their emergence in online discourses, in general, is a result of linguistic innovations caused by non-native English users who adopt the language creatively to convey a purpose (e.g. meaning marker) (Klymenko, 2020; Wei, 2020), though seemingly deviant from the English norm at a glance. However, at a closer look, the use of DCs offers interpretations based on intended contexts, concluding that the usage does not illustrate departure from grammatical regularities, but a way to exploit the flexibility of English grammar and features, seeing that the usage may be richer and more effective to put emphasis and intensity to the meaning being conveyed (Chomsky, 1961).

This study relatively offers a new perspective to the ongoing discussion on varieties of English, particularly in English writing, by introducing the types of double comparatives (variations in the application of comparative forms in English by non-native users), namely: 1) intralingual (coreference) which coreferences with other lexical items composing units of linguistic references that denote meaning of an entire discourse in semantic level, 2) interlingual (intensifier) which intensifies the presentation of meaning according to how they are intended by users, and 3) extra-lingual (meaning marker) which adds related ideas not explicitly conveyed in a discourse. These types sum up promotional as the practical purpose explaining this emergence, particularly in online discourses, aiming to draw attention, make appeal, influence decisions, or interest the minds of the general public. If the use is impractical and unintentional, this study suggests that the use is a form of deviation from the English norm. Hence, English writing teachers should regulate its acceptability in English writing (e.g. technical writing) where grammar accuracy is crucial.

This study, however, has no record on the use of other DC structures (e.g. more smaller) introduced in previous studies as it only covers Facebook posts posted in 5 years (2019-2023). If, however, the inclusion criteria are stretched to earliest years, usage of other DC structures may have been recorded. Moreover, though the study employed an intensive analysis and a member checking procedure to confer with other language experts, 101 Facebook posts as tokens seem insufficient. By extending the inclusive years, as well as exploring other social media platforms (i.e., LinkedIn, TikTok, Twitter, and Instagram),

tokens may go beyond 101 data sets that may offer perspective different or more grounding than what is found in this study.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank the language experts whom he conferred with in assessing and interpreting the use of double comparatives through a member checking procedure. With their significant contributions, the study offers a multi- and professional perspective assessment on the acceptability and practicality of these emerging comparative forms in online discourses.

References

- Al-Sharqi, L., & Abbasi, I. S. (2020). The influence of technology on English language and literature. *English Language Teaching*, 13(7), 1-7.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n7p1>
- Bungsu, O., Daud, A., & Masyhur, M. (2021). An analysis on students' grammatical errors in writing degrees of comparison. *Indonesian Journal of Economics, Social, and Humanities*, 3(1), 55-63. <https://doi.org/10.31258/ijesh.3.1.55-63>
- Caleffi, P. M. (2015). The hashtag: A new word or a new rule? *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*, 12(2), 46-69. <http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL28/>
- Chomsky, N. (1961). Some methodological remarks on generative grammar. *WORD*, 17(2), 219-239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1961.11659755>
- Corver, N. (2005). Double comparatives and the comparative criterion. *Recherches linguistiques de Vincennes*, 34, 165-190. <https://doi.org/10.4000/rlv.1387>
- Croft, W. (2000). Explaining language change: An evolutionary approach. In P. Femila (Ed.) *Innovations in world Englishes: A multifaceted linguistic phenomenon*. *BODHI International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Science*, 4(1), 59-61.
- Dor, D. (2004). From Englishization to imposed multilingualism: Globalization, the internet, and the political economy of the linguistic code. In O. L. Klymenko (Ed.) *Linguistic innovations paving the way for language democratization*. A Collective Monograph on Modern Approaches to Philological Studies, pp. 1-21.
<https://doi.org/10.36059/978966-397-196-4/1-21>
- Downe-Wamboldt, D. (1992). Content analysis: Method, applications, and issues. *Health Care for Women International*, 13(3), 313-321.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07399339209516006>
- Femila, P. (2020). Innovations in world Englishes: A multifaceted linguistic phenomenon. *BODHI International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Science*, 4(1), 59-61.
- González-Díaz, V. (2008). English adjective comparison: A historical perspective. In M. Morton (Ed.) *The double comparative: A more better use of the English language*. *Schwa Language and Linguistics*, 18, 103-115. <https://schwa.byu.edu/>
- Graneheim, U. H., & Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: Concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today*, 24, 105-112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2003.10.001>
- Halle, M. (1962). Phonology in generative grammar. *WORD*, 18(1-3), 54-72.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1962.11659765>

- Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. (2005). Three Approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687>
- Imran, M., & Wahid, M. R. (2020). The syntactic variations in adjective phrase – double comparatives and double superlatives in Pakistani English (PakE): A corpus-based study. *American Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 1-11. <https://www.americanjournals.com/>
- Kleinheksel, A. J., Rockich-Winston, N., Tawfik, H., & Wyatt, T. R. (2020). Demystifying content analysis. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 84(1), 7113. <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7113>
- Klymenko, O. L. (2020). *Linguistic innovations paving the way for language democratization*. A Collective Monograph on Modern Approaches to Philological Studies, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.36059/978-966-397-196-4/1-21>
- Kurniawan, I., & Oktalia, M. (2017). An analysis of students' mastery in using degrees of comparison at the 1st semester of the 10th grade of SMK PGRI 4 Bandar Lampung in the academic year of 2016/2017. *Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*, 10(1), 88-103. <https://ejournal.radenintan.ac.id/index.php/ENGEDU>
- Morgan, D. L. (1993). Qualitative content analysis: A guide to paths not taken. *Qualitative Health Research*, 3, 112-121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104973239300300107>
- Morton, M. (2018). The double comparative: A more better use of the English language. *Schwa Language and Linguistics*, (18), 103-115. <https://schwa.byu.edu/>
- Nashaat, O. (2018). Double comparative forms in William Shakespeare plays: Sociolinguistic analysis. *Iraqi Academic Scientific Journal*, 11(44), 485-498. <https://iasj.net/iasj/article/156386>
- Nghipondoka, T. (2020). *Exploring linguistic "creativity" on social media: A case of selected posts by Namibians on Facebook, Twitter, and Whatsapp*. Master's Thesis, Scholarly Repository, University of Namibia. <https://repository.unam.edu.na/handle/11070/2863>
- Sung, W.M., Ng, Y.L., & Choi, L.K. (2018). Integrating corporate social media communication into the English language curricula. In U. Tariq, S. Sarfraz, & A. Abbas (Ed.) Digital media users and Facebook hashtags' misinterpretation. *Online Information Review*, 44(6), 1183-1198. <https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-08-2019-0262>
- Tafesse, W., & Wien, A. (2017). A framework for categorizing social media posts. *Cogent Business & Management*, 4(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2017.1284390>
- Tariq, U., Sarfraz, S., & Abbas, A. (2020). Digital media users and Facebook hashtags' misinterpretation. *Online Information Review*, 44(6), 1183-1198. <https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-08-2019-0262>
- Włodarczyk, M. (2007). More stronger and mightier: Some remarks on double comparison in middle English. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 43, 195-217. <http://hdl.handle.net/10593/19052>
- Weber, R. (1990). Basic content analysis. SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412983488>
- Wei, L. (2020). Multilingual English users' linguistic innovation. *World Englishes*, 39, 236248. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12457>

Author's Biography

Michael John Tagadiad is a university Assistant Professor who earned both his bachelor's and master's degrees specializing in English Language at Bukidnon State University, Philippines. He is currently pursuing his Ph.D. degree in English Language Studies at University of Santo Tomas, Manila, Philippines. Since 2023, through collaborative research works, he has started publishing articles in international refereed journals related. His research interests focus on sociolinguistics, language policy and planning, transformational and generative grammar, and comparative linguistics.

He is also interested in culture preservation, language documentation, and instructional material development and indigenization.

Michael John Tagadiad

Language and Letters Department

Bukidnon State University

Malaybalay City, Philippines

E-mail: michaeljohn_tagadiad@buku.edu.ph