

Digital Music Terminology and Lexical Gaps in Indonesian: Linguistic Adaptation and Register Formation in the Era of Digital Audio Production

Etti Suharti¹, Soni Reffali²

^{1,2}Universitas Taruna Bakti, Indonesia

E-mail: ettiguswandi@gmail.com¹

Article History:

Received: 13 Juni 2026

Revised: 26 Juni 2026

Accepted: 28 Juni 2026

Keywords: *digital audio workstation, lexical gap, morphological hybridization, professional register, technical terminology*

Abstract: *This study examines how English-origin digital music terminology is adopted, adapted, and integrated into Indonesian professional discourse, with a focus on lexical gaps, phonological adaptation, and morphological hybridization. The research adopts a qualitative descriptive design, analyzing thirty English technical terms drawn from Indonesian-language YouTube tutorials, online discussion forums (IMDC and Music Indonesia), educational workshops in digital music production, and the terminology embedded in digital audio workstation (DAW) interfaces. Data were collected from materials published between 2022 and 2027 and analyzed through a coding schema that classified terms by semantic function, degree of phonological adaptation, and morphological status (direct borrowing, phonologically adapted loan, or morphologically hybridized form). The findings reveal that most terms function as necessary loans, used because Indonesian lacks precise equivalents for concepts such as mixing, mastering, plugin, gain, and latency; many of these terms appear in their original English form or with partial phonological adaptation, while others combine with Indonesian affixes (e.g., ngemix, dimastering, diplugin) to form hybrid verbs. The study concludes that global digital audio production terminology is not merely borrowed but increasingly anchored in Indonesian grammar, giving rise to a specialized professional register that reflects the dynamic interplay between technological globalization and localized linguistic adaptation.*

INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of digital technology has fundamentally reshaped the ways in which music is produced, distributed, and consumed across the globe (Burgess, 2013; Mhlambi & Nxози, 2024). In contemporary practice, Digital Audio Workstations (DAWs) have become the central hub for composing, recording, editing, mixing, and mastering audio, consolidating what once required a fully equipped analog studio into a single software environment (WIPO, 2022;

Javasmusicschool, 2025). This shift has democratized music production, enabling individual creators to generate professional-quality recordings from home studios or small setups, while at the same time accelerating the turnover of musical content in online platforms such as streaming services and social-media-driven music ecosystems (WIPO, 2022; ProFilm, 2024). As a result, the global music-production landscape has become increasingly standardized around English-based software interfaces, documentation, and educational materials, which in turn influence the linguistic practices of musicians and producers worldwide (Ma'ruf, 2018; Gustina, 2019).

In Indonesia, the uptake of digital music production has grown dramatically in recent years, paralleling the expansion of digital-music consumption and streaming-based business models. The Indonesian Ministry of Culture projects that digital-music revenue will reach roughly 231 million USD in 2025, with digital streaming accounting for over 90% of the national music-industry income (Antaranews, 2025). Concurrently, studies on digital-music production in Indonesia highlight how DAW-centered workflows have become the norm, even in traditionally analog-oriented contexts such as regional theatre and gamelan-based performances (Javasmusicschool, 2025; West Java DAW study, 2021). This widespread adoption of digital tools has also brought about a noticeable shift in professional discourse: Indonesian musicians, producers, and audio engineers increasingly rely on English-originated technical terms such as *mixing*, *mastering*, *plugin*, *reverb*, and *latency* in their everyday communication (Ma'ruf, 2018; Gustina, 2019). The persistence of these terms, often at the expense of Indonesian equivalents such as *pengaya* for *plugin*, suggests that technological change is not only transforming praxis but also reshaping the lexis of Indonesian professional registers.

At the micro level, the Indonesian digital music-production community offers a particularly revealing site for examining language-technology interaction. Online forums, social-media groups, and self-managed production collectives frequently blend Indonesian with English technical vocabulary, creating hybrid utterances in which English lexical bases are combined with Indonesian grammatical markers (e.g., “*ngetrack lagu*”, “*plugin-an di DAW*”). This kind of morphological hybridization reflects a broader phenomenon of lexical gaps: when new technical concepts emerge in English-language software environments, Indonesian often lacks ready-made labels to encode them, forcing practitioners to borrow or adapt foreign terms (Matras, 2020; Haugen, 1950). Empirical data from studies on Indonesian technological discourse show that English loanwords are especially prevalent in domains where standardization is still in flux, such as information technology and business communication (Ma'ruf, 2018; Gustina, 2019). However, comparable in-depth analyses of linguistic practices within the Indonesian digital-music-production community remain scarce, despite the growing number of local producers, labels, and online learning-resource platforms that operate in this technological-linguistic interface.

Existing linguistic research on English-Indonesian lexical borrowing has primarily focused on information technology and business communication rather than on creative-technical domains such as music production. Ma'ruf (2018), for example, demonstrates that Indonesian professionals frequently adopt English loanwords to ensure precision and efficiency in IT-related tasks, while Gustina (2019) notes that such borrowing is often driven by the global dominance of English-language software and documentation. Parallel studies in other technological domains similarly emphasize that English-origin terms are favored when they correspond directly to interface labels, menus, and technical manuals (Biber & Conrad, 2019). However, these studies tend to treat loanwords as relatively static lexical items, paying little attention to how such terms are phonologically adapted or morphologically integrated into Indonesian sentence structures

through processes such as infixation, suffixation, and reduplication.

More recently, some sociolinguistic work has begun to address the dynamic nature of lexical borrowing in Indonesian professional settings, showing that borrowed terms often undergo phonological approximation (e.g., vowel substitutions, consonant cluster simplification) and morphological reshaping (e.g., addition of *-kan*, *-i*, or *-an*) to align with Indonesian grammatical patterns (Rahman & Yusuf, 2023; Susanto, 2024). Yet these accounts largely generalize across sectors without zooming in on specialized occupational registers such as those of digital-music producers. Moreover, there is a noticeable inconsistency in how scholars conceptualize “necessary” versus “luxury” loans: while Haugen (1950) and Matras (2020) argue that many borrowings fill genuine lexical gaps, some recent studies suggest that users sometimes prefer English terms even when usable Indonesian equivalents exist, motivated by perceived modernity, prestige, or intertextual alignment with global software environments (Susanto, 2024; Rahman & Yusuf, 2023). This tension underscores the need for context-specific research that links borrowing patterns directly to the technological practices and discursive norms of particular professional communities.

Taken together, prior work reveals that English lexical borrowing in Indonesian professional discourse is shaped by technological globalization, interface-driven terminology, and domain-specific communicative efficiency (Ma'ruf, 2018; Gustina, 2019; Rahman & Yusuf, 2023). Nevertheless, the linguistic dynamics of the digital-music-production community in Indonesia have received relatively little scholarly attention. Although studies on digital-music production note the centrality of DAWs and the growing scale of the domestic digital-music economy (Antaranews, 2025; West Java DAW study, 2021), they rarely analyze how practitioners linguistically negotiate the influx of English-origin terms. In particular, the role of morphological hybridization—where English technical bases combine with Indonesian affixes and inflectional patterns—has not been systematically examined in this domain. Consequently, the mechanisms through which English digital-music terminology is adopted, adapted, and sedimented into a distinct professional register in Indonesian remain underexplored.

Against this backdrop, the central problem of this study can be formulated as follows: how do Indonesian digital-music practitioners adopt, adapt, and integrate English-origin technical terms into their professional discourse, and what role does phonological and morphological hybridization play in the formation of a specialized digital-music register? This problem statement opens three interrelated questions: (1) which English loanwords are most salient in Indonesian digital-music-production discourse; (2) why practitioners tend to prefer English terms over available Indonesian equivalents; and (3) how borrowed terms are phonologically and morphologically reshaped as they become embedded in Indonesian-language communication.

To address these questions, this study aims to systematically identify and analyze English loanwords in the discourse of Indonesian digital-music-production practitioners, trace the motivations behind their adoption and preference, and examine the processes of phonological adaptation and morphological hybridization that occur as these terms are integrated into Indonesian. The urgency of this inquiry lies in the fact that digital-music technology continues to evolve rapidly, while the Indonesian language is still catching up in terms of standardized technical lexis, and the choices practitioners make today will shape the future register of Indonesian professional music-production talk (Matras, 2020; Biber & Conrad, 2019). The novelty of this research resides in its focus on the intersection of global technological change and localized linguistic adaptation in a creative-professional domain, specifically by highlighting morphological hybridization as a key mechanism through which borrowed terminology becomes both functionally and structurally naturalized within Indonesian.

Theoretically, the study contributes to the literature on lexical gaps, language contact, and domain-specific registers by documenting how a specialized register in Indonesian digital-music production emerges through the interplay of technological innovation and linguistic borrowing (Haugen, 1950; Matras, 2020; Biber & Conrad, 2019). Practically, it offers insights for language planners, educators, and technical writers who seek to develop Indonesian-language resources for music-production training, as well as for local developers who wish to localize software interfaces without alienating practitioners accustomed to established English-based terminology (Rahman & Yusuf, 2023; Susanto, 2024). By tracing how global technological language seeps into and gradually reshapes the professional vocabulary of Indonesian producers, this research sheds light on the broader dynamics through which digital-everyday workspaces redraw the boundaries between “global” and “local” at the level of everyday talk.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopts a qualitative descriptive design to investigate the linguistic integration of English technical terminology in Indonesian digital music production discourse. The research is situated within the framework of qualitative inquiry, which emphasizes the interpretive analysis of naturally occurring language use rather than experimental manipulation or broad statistical generalization (Sugiyono, 2021; Emzir, 2022). Within this orientation, the study can be classified as a discourse-oriented linguistic investigation, focusing on lexical borrowing, phonological adaptation, and morphological hybridization as articulations of register formation in a specialized professional community (Biber & Conrad, 2019; Rahman & Yusuf, 2023). The qualitative approach is appropriate here because it allows for fine-grained examination of how practitioners negotiate English-origin terms in relation to Indonesian grammatical and phonological patterns, within authentic digital-music-production environments published between 2022 and 2027.

The population of this study consists of Indonesian digital music practitioners who engage with English technical terminology in their professional discourse, including content creators, community members, workshop participants, and software users. As a qualitative study, the analysis does not aim for statistical representativeness but rather for theoretical saturation in terms of variation in lexical usage across different discourse environments (Sudaryono, 2021). Data were purposively sampled from four primary discourse domains: (1) Indonesian-language YouTube tutorials on digital music production; (2) online discussion forums such as the Indie Music Development Community (IMDC) and Music Indonesia; (3) educational workshops on digital music production organized by higher-education institutions; and (4) terminology embedded in the user interfaces of major digital audio workstations (DAWs) such as Avid Pro Tools, Steinberg Cubase, and Image-Line FL Studio. The rationale for this multi-source sampling strategy is that it captures a range of formal and informal registers used by practitioners, while also reflecting the interface-driven nature of contemporary production practice (Ma'ruf, 2018; Gustina, 2019).

Instruments in this study are primarily textual and audio-visual data, rather than standardized questionnaires or tests. The core “instrument” is the analytical coding schema developed to identify and classify English technical terms according to their linguistic form and function in Indonesian discourse. The schema operationalizes three key indicators: (1) frequency of occurrence across multiple sources; (2) degree of phonological adaptation vis-à-vis standard English pronunciation; and (3) presence of morphological hybridization through the combination of English lexical bases with Indonesian affixes (e.g., *-an*, *-kan*, *-i*). The validity of the coding framework was established through content validation by a second researcher specializing in Indonesian linguistics, who independently classified a subset of the terms; any discrepancies were discussed and resolved until consensus was reached, following established procedures for

.....

inter-coder reliability in qualitative research (Sudaryono, 2021; Rahman & Yusuf, 2023). No formal statistical reliability coefficient was calculated, as the data are linguistic and interpretive; instead, the study emphasizes analytical consistency, transparency in coding decisions, and systematic documentation of examples.

The research procedure unfolded in several interrelated stages. First, during the preparation phase, the research team identified a pool of candidate English technical terms from exploratory scans of the target sources (YouTube tutorials, online forums, workshop materials, and DAW interfaces) published between January 2022 and January 2027. Second, from this pool, thirty terms were selected based on the following criteria: (1) occurrence in at least three independent primary sources; (2) use by practitioners in Indonesian-language discourse; and (3) reference to a specific technical concept within digital audio production (e.g., *mixing*, *mastering*, *plugin*, *latency*). Third, the actual data collection phase involved systematic extraction and transcription of utterances in which these terms appeared, including screen recordings and screenshots from tutorials and software interfaces, as well as saved posts and comments from online communities. Fourth, in the analysis phase, each term was examined for semantic function, phonological adaptation (by comparing spoken pronunciations in tutorial videos with dictionary-standard English pronunciations), and morphological status (classifying it as direct borrowing, phonologically adapted loan, or morphologically hybridized form).

For the analysis of data, the study applied a qualitative analytical framework grounded in discourse-oriented lexical borrowing studies and domain-specific register theory (Biber & Conrad, 2019; Matras, 2020). The thirty selected terms were first categorized according to their functional role in the music-production workflow (e.g., mixing, signal processing, plugin-related operations). Next, each term was evaluated for phonological adaptation by noting vowel substitutions, consonant simplifications, syllable-structure adjustments, and stress patterns that diverge from standard English. Subsequently, morphological analysis focused on the presence of Indonesian affixation, reduplication, and other morphological processes that attach to English bases, thereby producing hybrid forms such as *plug-inan*, *mix-ing-an*, or *master-ing-an*. Following Haugen's (1950) typology as elaborated in Matras (2020), each term was further classified as either a "necessary loan" (filling a clear lexical gap) or a "luxury loan" (preferred despite existing or potential Indonesian equivalents). The analysis was conducted manually, supported by basic media-editing and annotation tools, as the focus is on close linguistic reading rather than large-scale computational linguistics software such as NVivo or ATLAS.ti; however, the coding process was systematically documented to ensure replicability.

Ethical considerations were addressed throughout the research process. Because the data are drawn from public-domain digital sources (open-access YouTube videos, publicly viewable Facebook groups, and published workshop materials), the study does not involve direct human subjects in the sense of confidential interviews or surveys. Nevertheless, the research respects practitioner privacy by anonymizing individual creators and communities where appropriate and by focusing on patterns of usage rather than on personal identities or sensitive biographical information. All data excerpts used in later analysis and reporting are treated as non-identifiable discourse samples, and the research is framed as a linguistic analysis of publicly available professional discourse rather than as experimental or intervention-based research. Although formal ethical clearance from an institutional review board is not required in this context, the study adheres to the general principles of research ethics, including honesty in data representation, transparency in analytical procedures, and recognition of the intellectual labor of practitioners whose terminology and discourse are being analyzed (Emzir, 2022; Rahman & Yusuf, 2023).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Result

The analysis identified thirty English technical terms commonly used in Indonesian digital music production discourse. These terms refer to several functional categories in the music production process, including production procedures, software environments, audio effects, signal parameters, mixer components, and sound character descriptors. Table 1 presents a collection of recognized terms, their purposes, Indonesian equivalent, and usage trends in practitioner communication.

Table 1. English technical terms in Indonesian digital music production discourse

Category	Term	Function	Indonesian Equivalent	Usage Pattern
Production Process	<i>Mixing</i>	Balancing multiple audio tracks	Pencampuran audio	English dominant
	<i>Mastering</i>	Final audio processing	None	English only
	<i>Rendering</i>	Exporting the final audio file	Perenderan	English dominant
	<i>Sampling</i>	Reusing pre-recorded audio segments	Pencuplikan	Partial use
	<i>Editing</i>	Modifying audio content	Penyuntingan	Indonesian occasional
	<i>Arranging</i>	Structuring musical elements	Aransemen	Both interchangeable
Software Environment	<i>DAW</i>	Primary production software	Stasiun kerja audio digital	English dominant
	<i>Plugin</i>	Supplementary effect or instrument software	Pengaya	English only in practice
	<i>VST</i>	Virtual instrument/effect format	None	English only
	<i>MIDI</i>	Musical data communication protocol	None	English only
Audio Effects	<i>Reverb</i>	Simulated spatial sound reflection	Gema (imprecise)	English dominant
	<i>Delay</i>	Echo repetition effect	Tunda	English dominant
	<i>Compressor</i>	Dynamic range control	Kompresor	Adapted form used
	<i>Equalizer (EQ)</i>	Frequency balance control	Penyeimbang frekuensi	English dominant
	<i>Distortion</i>	Harmonic saturation effect	Distorsi	Adapted form used
	<i>Chorus</i>	Layered modulation effect	None	English only
Signal Parameters	<i>Gain</i>	Input signal level	None	English only
	<i>Latency</i>	Processing signal delay (ms)	Keterlambatan (imprecise)	English only
	<i>Bit Depth</i>	Digital audio resolution	None	English only
	<i>Sample Rate</i>	Audio sampling frequency	None	English only
	<i>Headroom</i>	Available signal space above target level	None	English only
Mixer Components	<i>Fader</i>	Volume slider control	None	English only
	<i>Bus</i>	Signal routing path	None	English only
	<i>Channel Strip</i>	Channel processing module	None	English only
	<i>Pan</i>	Stereo positioning control	Pemosisi stereo	English dominant
Sound Character	<i>Warm</i>	Full harmonic, low-frequency-rich tone quality	Hangat (partial)	Both used in context
	<i>Bright</i>	High-frequency clarity in sound	Cerah (partial)	Both used in context
	<i>Punchy</i>	Strong transient impact	None	English only
	<i>Muddy</i>	Unfocused low-frequency blur	None	English only
	<i>Crisp</i>	Clear high-frequency detail	None	English only

As indicated in Table 1, many of the identified terms are primarily used in their original English language. In numerous cases, Indonesian equivalents exist but are rarely used by practitioners. Some terms have been partially adopted into Indonesia, while others are still used entirely in English in regular professional communication. These patterns indicate the considerable influence of English terminology in digital music production discourse in Indonesia

Discussion

1. Lexical Gaps and Necessary Borrowing

The findings confirm that the majority of the thirty terms function as necessary loans: they are adopted because the receiving language lacks vocabulary to represent the concept with equivalent precision. This finding is consistent with Matras's (2020) argument that technical domains generate the most systematic and referentially motivated borrowing.

The case of reverb illustrates this clearly. The closest Indonesian terms, *gema* and *gaung*, refer to natural acoustic reflections in physical spaces. The digital audio term reverb denotes a synthesized spatial effect with controllable parameters (decay time, room size, pre-delay, diffusion). As Darmayanti (2020) notes, when a borrowed concept involves technical specifications that available local vocabulary cannot encode without substantial paraphrase, borrowing becomes the functionally optimal choice. This pattern is especially pronounced for Signal Parameters (gain, latency, bit depth, sample rate, headroom) and Mixer Components (fader, bus, channel strip), none of which has an established Indonesian equivalent.

A significant number of the identified terms appear in Indonesian discourse without translation. Terms such as headroom, bus, punchy, and muddy are frequently used by Indonesian music practitioners in their original English form. These terms represent specialized auditory concepts that are difficult to express through existing Indonesian vocabulary. As a result, practitioners tend to retain the original English terminology in order to maintain precision and efficiency in communication.

This pattern supports the concept of necessary borrowing, as described by Haugen (1950), where a language adopts foreign terms to fill conceptual gaps. In the context of digital music production, the rapid development of technological tools and workflows creates new concepts that do not yet have established equivalents in Indonesian. Consequently, direct borrowing becomes the most practical linguistic strategy for practitioners.

As example the terms usage can be observed in Indonesian YouTube tutorials on music production. In one tutorial explaining mixing techniques, the instructor said:

"Setelah semua track direkam, kita mulai proses mixing supaya level masing-masing instrument seimbang dan terdengar lebih Ok."

In this example, the English term mixing is remained without translation, even though an Indonesian equivalent (*pencampuran audio*) exist. This usage reflects a common tendency among practitioners to maintain the original English terms because it is closely associated with the workflows in digital audio production.

Another example:

"Kalau suara vokalnya masih terlalu kering, kita bisa tambahkan plugin reverb untuk memberi ruang pada sound."

In this context, plugin refers to a software module within a digital audio workstation. Although the Indonesian equivalent *pengaya* exists, it is rarely used, as practitioners generally retain the English term used in the software interface.

2. Phonological Adaptation

Phonological adaptation occurs predictably when borrowed English terms contain sounds absent from the Indonesian phonological system. Indonesian has a more restricted consonant inventory than English, lacks consonant clusters in many environments, and does not distinguish vowel length phonemically. These structural differences motivate the adaptations in Table 2.

Table 2. Phonological adaptations of selected borrowed terms

Original Term	Indonesian Pronunciation	Adaptation Process
<i>Streaming</i>	<i>Striming</i>	Diphthong /i:/ reduced to short /i/
<i>Synthesizer</i>	<i>Sintesaizer</i>	Final syllable adapted; dental fricative /θ/ replaced by /t/
<i>Equalizer</i>	<i>Ikualiser</i>	Initial /i:/ reanalysed as /i/; cluster simplified
<i>Plugin</i>	<i>Plagin</i>	Central vowel replaced by /a/; /l/ realized as /i/
<i>Compressor</i>	<i>Kompresor</i>	Final schwa dropped; open-mid vowel replaced by /o/

These adaptations reflect systematic phonological rules rather than random variation, confirming the integrative character of borrowing. As Kridalaksana (2008) notes, phonological adaptation typically follows the substitution principle: English sounds absent from the Indonesian inventory are replaced by the nearest Indonesian phonological equivalent. More recently borrowed terms (DAW, VST, MIDI) are used predominantly in their original English pronunciation, suggesting that phonological adaptation is a gradual process associated with increasing integration over time, consistent with Matras's (2020) model of the borrowing continuum.

3. Morphological Hybridization

The most distinctive linguistic phenomenon identified is the productive hybridization of English lexical bases with Indonesian verbal morphology. Indonesian employs a rich system of verbal affixes marking voice, aspect, and transitivity. When English lexical bases are integrated, they are treated as verbal roots subject to Indonesian morphophonological rules.

Table 3. Morphological hybridization: English bases with Indonesian affixes

Hybrid Form	Morphological Structure	Meaning	Voice	Linguistic Process
<i>Ngemix</i>	meN- + mix	To carry out mixing	Active	hybridization
<i>Dimastering</i>	di- + mastering	To be subjected to mastering	Passive	Hybridization
<i>Disample</i>	di- + sample	To be sampled	Passive	Hybridization
<i>Ngedit</i>	meN- + edit	To carry out editing	Active	Hybridization
<i>Ngerender</i>	meN- + render	To carry out rendering	Active	Hybridization
<i>Diplugin</i>	di- + plugin	To have a plugin applied	Passive	hybridization

One of the most interesting linguistic phenomena observed in this study is the emergence of hybrid forms that combine English lexical roots with Indonesian grammatical markers. Examples include *ngemix*, *dimastering*, and *disample*. In these forms, English technical verbs are integrated into Indonesian sentence structures through the addition of local prefixes such as *ng-* and *di-*.

This hybridization illustrates how borrowed terminology gradually becomes embedded within the grammatical system of Indonesian. Rather than remaining purely foreign elements, the borrowed terms adapt to local linguistic patterns and participate in the formation of a new professional register used by music practitioners. This process reflects the dynamic interaction between global technological discourse and local language structures.

These patterns are consistent with Matras's (2020) insertion model: English lexical material is inserted into Indonesian morphosyntactic frames, maintaining Indonesian grammatical organization. Wijana (2021) observes that such patterns are becoming increasingly common in Indonesian professional discourse domains, representing a productive mechanism of integration. Example of sentence exist are:

"Setelah semua track direkam, kita mulai ngemix supaya balance antara drum, gitar, dan vokalnya lebih jelas"

"Lagu ini sudah selesai dimastering, jadi siap untuk dirilis di Spotify dan platform streaming lainnya."

"Suara snare di intro itu sebenarnya disample dari rekaman drum lama."

"Saya masih ngedit bagian vokalnya karena ada beberapa bagian yang kurang presisi."

"Setelah mixing selesai, project-nya tinggal ngerender jadi file WAV."

"Track vokalnya tadi diplugin reverb sedikit supaya terdengar lebih luas."

In everyday communication among music producers and audio engineers, these hybrid forms are commonly used to describe routine production activities. This pattern indicates that borrowed terminology gradually adapts to Indonesian grammatical structures while retaining its original technical meaning.

4. Comparison with Prior Studies

The findings both confirm and extend prior research. Gustina (2019) reported a similar predominance of English terminology in Indonesian IT communities; the present study corroborates this and extends it to the digital music domain, adding the dimension of morphological hybridization. By contrast with Ma'ruf's (2018) finding that prestige motivation plays a significant role in English borrowing in Indonesian business communication, the present data suggest that necessary borrowing dominates in digital music production, aligning with Matras's (2020) conclusions regarding necessity-driven borrowing in technical domains.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that within Indonesia's digital music production landscape, English technical terminology functions as the core lexical resource in professional communication, particularly where lexical gaps exist and no technically equivalent Indonesian terms are available. Most terms, such as *mixing*, *mastering*, *plugin*, *gain*, and *latency*, are adopted as necessity-driven borrowings, meaning that their use is required to maintain technical precision and ensure consistency with software interfaces (Matras, 2020; Haugen, 1950). The adaptation process operates at two principal levels. First, at the phonological level, unfamiliar English sounds are reduced or adjusted to conform to the Indonesian phonological system (e.g., *streaming* → *striming*, *plugin* → *plagin*). Second, at the morphological level, hybrid forms such as *ngemix*, *ngedit*, *dimeastering*, and *diplugin* emerge through the attachment of Indonesian affixes (*meN-*, *di-*, *-an*) to English lexical roots. This phenomenon indicates that digital technical vocabulary is not merely borrowed lexically but has become integrated into the grammatical structure of Indonesian, thereby contributing to the emergence of a distinctive professional register within the digital music production community.

This study is limited by its reliance on publicly accessible digital sources—including YouTube, online forums, workshops, and digital audio workstation (DAW) interfaces—which do not capture the full range of linguistic variation that may occur in offline settings or closed local communities. Furthermore, the text- and audiovisual-based analysis primarily emphasizes linguistic forms, leaving broader sociopragmatic dimensions—such as language hierarchies, prestige symbolism, and code-mixing practices in knowledge negotiation—largely unexplored.

Future research could expand the unit of analysis by incorporating in-depth interviews and ethnographic studies of professional communities, while also comparing borrowing patterns across different technical domains, such as music production, video editing, and software development. From a practical perspective, these findings encourage language institutions, educational publishers, and local software developers to consider the gap between official Indonesian translations (e.g., *digital audio workstation, plugin*) and actual professional practice, where English terminology remains dominant. The findings also provide a foundation for developing curricula and specialized glossaries that consciously recognize hybrid lexical forms as an integral component of contemporary Indonesian professional language.

REFERENCES

- Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa. (2023). Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (KBBI) Daring. <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id>
- Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2019). Register, genre, and style (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Chaer, A. (2015). Linguistik umum (Edisi revisi). Rineka Cipta.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Darmayanti, N. (2020). Celah leksikal dalam terminologi teknologi berbahasa Indonesia. *Jurnal Linguistik Indonesia*, 38(2), 112–128.
- Dudiwijanato, A., & Suhardijanto. (2020). Indonesian lexical bundles in research articles: Frequency, structure, and function. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 292–303. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i2.28592>
- Gustina, S. (2019). Adopsi kosakata bahasa Inggris dalam komunitas teknologi informasi di Indonesia. *Lingua*, 14(1), 45–60.
- Haugen, E. (1950). The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language*, 26(2), 210–231.
- Karimah, A., Wijayati, P. H., & Astuti, U. P. (2020). Indlish: Indonesian English production and its formation. *KnE Social Sciences*, 4(4), 26–39. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v4i4.6463>
- Kridalaksana, H. (2008). Kamus linguistik (4th ed.). Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Ma'ruf, A. (2018). Pengaruh bahasa Inggris dalam komunikasi bisnis profesional di Indonesia. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 5(1), 23–38.
- Marnita, R. (2017). Ekonomi bahasa dalam komunikasi profesional berbasis teknologi di Indonesia. *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*, 6(2), 88–101.
- Matras, Y. (2020). Language contact (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Wijana, I. D. P. (2021). Hibridisasi morfologis dalam komunikasi profesional modern Indonesia. *Linguistika*, 28(1), 1–15.
- Winford, D. (2020). Theories of language contact. In A. P. Grant (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of language contact* (pp. 51–75). Oxford University Press.
- Zipf, G. K. (1949). Human behavior and the principle of least effort. Addison-Wesley.