PESHUM : Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial dan Humaniora
Vol.5, No.6, Oktober 2026

Digital Socio-Onomastic Analysis of Username Naming Practices for Secondary Instagram Accounts

Amanda Titian Pamedia Azri[1], Rina Marnita[2], Reniwati [3]
[1,2,3]Universitas Andalas
Email: amandatpa.student.sasingunand@gmail.com[1], rinam.sasingunand@gmail.com[2], reniwati@hum.ac.id

Article History:
Received: 15 September 2026
Revised: 28 September 2026
Accepted: 07 Oktober 2026

Keywords: *Socio-Onomastics, Second Instagram Account, Username, Semantic Meaning, Digital Identity*

Abstract: *This study examines the social meaning of second Instagram account naming among Generation Z users, framed within socio-onomastics and social semiotics. Second accounts. often referred to as "finsta" or alternate accountshave become a common practice through which users construct identities separate from their main, more curated profiles. The study addresses three research questions: (1) what onomastic patterns and linguistic structures characterize second account usernames, (2) what semantic meanings these usernames convey, and (3) what social functions they perform for their owners. Using a qualitative descriptive method, data were collected through a survey, semistructured interviews, and a data of second account usernames, which were analyzed structurally, semantically, and functionally. Structurally, the usernames display a variety of morphological formations, including reduplication, compounding, affixation, and phrasal constructions, organized into a nine category taxonomy. Semantically, drawing on Van Langendonck's (2007) model of presuppositional name meaning, categorical meaning is present in all usernames (100%), followed by associative meaning (72%), emotive meaning (48%), and grammatical meaning (32%), indicating that usernames function primarily as referential markers layered with connotative and affective content. Functionally, self presentation and identity performance emerges as the most dominant social function, alongside community affiliation, emotional expression, creative identity construction, and privacy management. These findings suggest that second account usernames are not arbitrary labels but deliberate linguistic choices through which young users perform, manage, and index multiple facets of their digital identity. The study contributes to socio-onomastic scholarship by extending naming analysis into the context of contemporary digital youth culture.*

INTRODUCTION

Social media has become an increasingly important site for identity construction,

particularly among Generation Z users, who often maintain multiple accounts on a single platform to manage different facets of their online self presentation. Instagram, in particular, has given rise to a widespread practice of maintaining a "second account" alongside a primary, more public facing profile, a space reserved for a smaller, more trusted audience and, often, a more authentic or unfiltered version of the self. Central to this practice is the act of naming: unlike a primary account, whose username is frequently tied to a user's real name for recognizability, a second account's username is typically self-selected, expressive, and deliberately distinct from conventional naming norms. This naming choice is rarely arbitrary. As a form of digital self labeling, it encodes linguistic creativity, personal meaning, and social positioning, making it a productive object of onomastic inquiry.

Despite the ubiquity of this practice, onomastic research has traditionally centered on anthroponyms and toponyms assigned within institutional, familial, or cultural conventions, leaving digital, self-selected pseudonyms comparatively underexamined (Puzey & Kostanski, 2021). Where digital naming has received scholarly attention, studies have tended to focus on general online usernames or single platform identities, rather than on the specific and culturally distinctive practice of maintaining a second, restricted access account with a name deliberately built to differ from one's main account identity. Within the Indonesian context, where Instagram second account culture is especially prevalent among Gen Z users, this gap is more pronounced still: it remains unclear how these usernames are linguistically structured, what meanings they carry, and what social functions they are made to perform, three dimensions that, while related, are not reducible to one another, since a name's form and its socially recognized purpose need not align neatly with the private meaning its owner attaches to it.

These aims are grounded in the field of onomastics, broadly defined as the systematic study of proper names and their linguistic, cultural, and social functions (Algeo, 2006), and in Algeo's (1973) foundational typology of proper names, which continues to inform how such names are classified today. Socio-onomastics extends this inquiry by treating names as simultaneously linguistic, social, and cultural phenomena, attending to the contexts in which they are created and used, the interplay between individual naming choices and collective convention, and the ideologies embedded within them (Ainiala et al., 2021; Sjöblom & Aldrin, 2020). Digital contexts complicate this picture further: unlike traditional anthroponyms, digital pseudonyms are self-selected rather than assigned, semantically dense rather than semantically empty, and shaped by platform specific affordances such as character limits and searchability that have no equivalent in conventional naming systems (Puzey & Kostanski, 2021). Hassa's (2012) study of chatroom usernames similarly demonstrated that digital names function as social practices through which users project and reveal the self, while Androutsopoulos (2014) links this expressive naming behavior to the pressures of "context collapse", the need to manage selfpresentation for multiple, often incompatible audiences, a pressure that plausibly motivates the creation of second accounts under distinct names in the first place. Within Instagram specifically, this has given rise to a recognizable subcultural naming system, in which users share the competence to read certain username conventions. informal tone, emotional vocabulary, references to privacy or authenticity, and deliberate departures from mainaccount norms, as markers of the second account genre (Schellewald, 2021; Park, 2022).

This study addresses the resulting gap by examining Instagram second account usernames along three interrelated dimensions. It aims, first, to identify the wordformation patterns and onomastic structures through which these usernames are built; second, to analyze the semantic meanings embedded within them; and third, to determine the social functions they serve for the users who create and maintain them. To capture this three-part phenomenon empirically, the study

adopts a qualitative descriptive design (Sandelowski, 2000), analyzing the structural, semantic, and functional dimensions of second account usernames through a combined framework: wordformation categories following O'Grady, Dobrovolsky, and Katamba (1997) for username structure, Van Langendonck's (2007) four-part meaning model for semantic analysis, and Kisel et al.'s (2018) five social function categories for the functional dimension. In doing so, the study offers an integrated account of how Instagram second account usernames are built, what they mean, and what they are made to do treating naming not merely as an act of labeling, but as a deliberate and socially meaningful practice of digital identity construction among Gen Z users.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study adopts an integrated theoretical framework that brings together socio-onomastics and virtual onomastics to examine second Instagram account usernames as simultaneously linguistic objects, semantic vehicles, pragmatic tools, and motivated products of self naming. The socio-onomastic perspective draws on three primary frameworks Van Langendonck (2007) to analyze naming patterns, name functions, and the social dimensions of naming practice. The virtual onomastic perspective, following Kisel, Mikhailov, Savinova, and Bosik (2018), analyzes how usernames function as selfgiven nickonyms shaped by psychological, adaptive communicative, and formal motivations, distinct from the community bestowed nicknames of offline naming practice. Together, these frameworks enable multidimensional analysis of second Instagram account names at structural, semantic, pragmatic, and motivational levels.

METHOD

Social media has become an increasingly important site for identity construction, particularly among Generation Z users, who often maintain multiple accounts on a single platform to manage different facets of their online self presentation. Instagram, in particular, has given rise to a widespread practice of maintaining a "second account" alongside a primary, more public facing profile. A space reserved for a smaller, more trusted audience and, often, a more authentic or unfiltered version of the self. Central to this practice is the act of naming: unlike a primary account, whose username is frequently tied to a user's real name for recognizability, a second account's username is typically self-selected, expressive, and deliberately distinct from conventional naming norms. This naming choice is rarely arbitrary. As a form of digital self labeling, it encodes linguistic creativity, personal meaning, and social positioning, making it a productive object of onomastic inquiry.

Despite the ubiquity of this practice, onomastic research has traditionally centered on anthroponyms and toponyms assigned within institutional, familial, or cultural conventions, leaving digital, self-selected pseudonyms comparatively underexamined (Puzey & Kostanski, 2021). Where digital naming has received scholarly attention, studies have tended to focus on general online usernames or single platform identities, rather than on the specific and culturally distinctive practice of maintaining a second, restricted access account with a name deliberately built to differ from one's main account identity. Within the Indonesian context, where Instagram second account culture is especially prevalent among Gen Z users, this gap is more pronounced still: it remains unclear how these usernames are linguistically structured, what meanings they carry, and what social functions they are made to performthree dimensions that, while related, are not reducible to one another, since a name's form and its socially recognized purpose need not align neatly with the private meaning its owner attaches to it.

These aims are grounded in onomastics, broadly defined as the systematic study of proper names and their linguistic, cultural, and social functions (Algeo, 2006), and in Algeo's (1973)

foundational typology of proper names, which still informs how such names are classified today. Socio-onomastics extends this inquiry by treating names as simultaneously linguistic, social, and cultural phenomena, attending to the contexts in which they are created and used, the interplay between individual naming choices and collective convention, and the ideologies embedded within them (Ainiala et al., 2021; Sjöblom & Aldrin, 2020). Digital contexts complicate this picture further: unlike traditional anthroponyms, digital pseudonyms are self-selected rather than assigned, semantically dense rather than semantically empty, and shaped by platformspecific affordances such as character limits and searchability that have no equivalent in conventional naming systems (Puzey & Kostanski, 2021). Hassa's (2012) study of chatroom usernames similarly demonstrated that digital names function as social practices through which users project and reveal the self, while Androutsopoulos (2014) links this expressive naming behavior to the pressures of "context collapse" the need to manage self-presentation for multiple, often incompatible audiences a pressure that plausibly motivates the creation of second accounts under distinct names in the first place. Within Instagram specifically, this has given rise to a recognizable subcultural naming system, in which users share the competence to read certain username conventions informal tone, emotional vocabulary, references to privacy or authenticity, and deliberate departures from mainaccount norms as markers of the second account genre (Schellewald, 2021; Park, 2022).

This study addresses the resulting gap by examining Instagram second account usernames along three interrelated dimensions. It aims, first, to identify the wordformation patterns and onomastic structures through which these usernames are built; second, to analyze the semantic meanings embedded within them; and third, to determine the social functions they serve for the users who create and maintain them. To capture this three-part phenomenon empirically, the study adopts a qualitative descriptive design (Sandelowski, 2000), analyzing the structural, semantic, and functional dimensions of second account usernames through a combined framework: word formation categories following O'Grady, Dobrovolsky, and Katamba (1997) for username structure, Van Langendonck's (2007) fourpart meaning model for semantic analysis, and Kisel et al.'s (2018) five social function categories for the functional dimension. In doing so, the study offers an integrated account of how Instagram second account usernames are built, what they mean, and what they are made to do, treating naming not merely as an act of labelling, but as a deliberate and socially meaningful practice of digital identity construction among Gen Z users.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The data show that second Instagram account names among Gen Z users are structurally varied and carefully formed. The names include transparent common noun phrases, nickname-based recombinations, adopted existing proper names, hybrid constructions, and kinship-based relational forms. In the wider dataset, additional patterns such as reduplication, compounding, affixation, alphanumeric elements, and playful orthographic variation also occur.

These patterns indicate that second account naming is not random or merely aesthetic. Instead, it reflects deliberate linguistic and social decisions. Van Langendonck’s (2007) theory is useful here because many of these forms illustrate onymization, namely the process by which ordinary lexical material acquires proper name function through use. Kisel et al. (2018) likewise help explain these forms as examples of digital self naming, where users freely combine linguistic and graphic resources to construct identities suited to specific social purposes.

A useful point to emphasize is that the structural form of a username often already hints at the social work it is meant to do. A transparent phrase such as *Empty Space* invites interpretation through ordinary lexical meaning, while a recombined nickname such as *enoennss_* suggests familiarity, intimacy, and selective readability. A borrowed proper name such as *malee.pa* depends less on overt semantic transparency and more on identity continuity through adoption. In this sense,

the structure of the username is not merely surface form; it is one of the primary places where identity strategy becomes visible.

This section displays the results of the analysis: (4.2.1) Onomastic Patterns and Linguistic Structures, (4.2.2) Semantic Meanings and Conceptual Domains, and (4.2.3) Social Functions of Second Instagram Account Names

Onomastic Patterns and Linguistic Structures: Second account names are rarely improvised. How many words a name uses, which part of speech is carrying the meaning, whether the words stay recognizable or get stripped down into something opaque: none of that is accidental, even when the account holder never describes it as a decision. This section works through that structural layer, setting each informant's second account name against their own first account name, since the contrast within a person tends to say more than any name looked at on its own.

NO	Structural Category	Frequency	Percent (%)
	Reduplication / Expressive Lengthening	21	21.2%
	Compounding (Adj+N / N+N)	17	17.2%
	Phrasal/Clausal Construction	17	17.2%
	Blending / Coined Wordplay (hybrid concatenation)	16	16.2%
	Affixation (Base + Suffix/Initial)	12	12.1%
	Alphanumeric (Numeralinclusive)	9	9.1%
	Simplex/Unmodified Borrowing (loanword or archaic spelling)	6	6.1%
	Onomatopoeia	1	1.0%
	total	99	100%

Table 4.2 Structural Categories of Second Account Name

Table 4.2 shows the distribution of morphological categories across all 99 Instagram second account usernames analyzed for RQ1. Blending/Coined Wordplay emerged as the most productive strategy (21.2%), in which users fuse lexical fragments, onomatopoeic elements, or borrowed proper names into novel, nonstandard forms (e.g., @rawrgvrl, @meetutt, @luffyluv_). Reduplication/Expressive Lengthening and Compounding followed closely, each accounting for 17.2% of the dataset, the former marked by repeated or elongated letters used for expressive emphasis (e.g., @ayinndaaa, @corndogiii), and the latter by the combination of two lexical items into a single naming unit (e.g., @klan.bulan, @hawkinsstudent_). Phrasal/Clausal Construction, in which users adopt full phrases or short clauses as usernames (e.g., @bemineepls_, @kucingbaubalsem), accounted for 16.2% of the data. The remaining categories are Affixation (12.1%), Alphanumeric formation (9.1%), Simplex/Unmodified Borrowing (6.1%), and Onomatopoeia (1.0%). were comparatively less frequent, though not negligible, indicating that Instagram second account users draw on a broad and heterogeneous repertoire of word formation strategies rather than converging on a single dominant pattern.

Blending and Compounding together make up over half the data, suggesting informants generally prefer names that are short, unique, and semantically layered. Reduplication and Simplex Borrowing occur at an equal, moderate rate, reflecting two common but different ways of adding expressive color to a name. Phrasal/Clausal Construction is less frequent, likely because Instagram's character limit discourages longer constructions. Affixation and Alphanumeric forms are rare, as both tend to produce less distinctive names. Onomatopoeia does not appear at all, since sound imitating words carry little identity related meaning.

Semantic Meaning

There are four categories of semantic meaning found in this study: 1) Categorical Meaning; 2) Associative Meaning; 3) Emotive Meaning; 4) Grammatical Meaning. They are presented on table 4.3 Semantic Meaning

No.	Semantic Meaning	Frequency	Percent (%)
	Categorical meaning	25	100%
	Associative meaning	18	72%
	Emotive meaning	12	48%
	Grammatical meaning	8	32%
	Total	25	100%

Table 4.3 Semantic Meaning

Table 4.3 shows the frequency of semantic meanings identified in the usernames of second Instagram accounts, based on Van Langendonck's (2007) fourfold model of presuppositional name meaning: categorical, associative, emotive, and grammatical. Since these four types operate on different levels and are not mutually exclusive, a single username can carry more than one type of meaning at once which is why the cumulative percentage exceeds 100%.

Based on the analysis of 25 second account usernames, categorical meaning is present across all 25 data points (100%). In Van Langendonck's framework, a proper name presupposes a categorical meaning that is inherent to its very use as a name. For instance, the meaning "male human" carried by the name Peter. This indicates that every username in the data presupposes a basiclevel category (such as a persona, an entity type, or a conceptual domain) without which it could not function referentially as a name.

Associative meaning is the second most frequent, occurring in 18 usernames or 72%. This type of meaning refers to the connotations a name can evoke either through its referent or through its phonological or formal shape. This shows that most usernames carry an additional layer of connotation beyond their categorical content, with associations linked either to what the name refers to or to how it sounds or is spelt. Emotive meaning follows, found in 12 usernames or 48%. Within the same framework, emotive meaning is likewise treated as a presuppositional connotation, distinct from categorical or associative meaning in that it reflects the feeling or emotional stance the account owner projects through the username.

Grammatical meaning is the least frequent, appearing in 8 usernames or 32%. Van

Langendonck's model describes grammatical meaning through features such as definiteness or number; in the context of usernames, this surfaces in structural markers such as plural forms, numerals, or morphological modification that carry grammatical rather than purely lexical information.

Overall, these findings suggest that categorical meaning forms the most fundamental and universal layer of meaning in second account usernames. Consistent with Van Langendonck's claim that it is a precondition for any name to function as such, while associative and emotive meanings represent additional, more variable layers shaped by personal and social connotation. Grammatical meaning plays the smallest role, appearing only in usernames marked by clear morphological or numerical structure.

Social Function of second Instagram account usernames

As mentioned in Kisel et al. (2018), there are five social functions: Selfpresentation and Identity performance; Privacy Management and Selective Visibility; Community Affiliation and Social Positioning; Emotional Expression and Relational Bonding; and Creative Identity Construction and Digital Branding. In this analysis, those five functions are found in second Instagram usernames. Those analyses of each function are presented below:

No.	Social Function	Frequency	Percent (%)
	SelfPresentation and Identity Performance	7	28%
	Privacy Management and Selective Visibility	3	12%
	Community affiliation and Social Positioning	6	24%
	Emotional expression and Relational Bonding	6	24%
	Creative Identity Construction and Digital Branding	4	16%
	Total	25	100%

Table 4.4 Social Functions Identified in the Data

Table 4.4 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of social functions identified across the second account usernames. SelfPresentation and Identity Performance emerge as the most dominant function, accounting for 7 usernames or 28%. This suggests that the primary motivation behind naming second accounts is to construct and perform a particular selfimage, whether idealized, playful, or exploratory, distinct from the user's main account. Community Affiliation, Social Positioning, Emotional Expression, and Relational Bonding follow with equal frequency, each represented in 6 usernames (24%). This indicates that, alongside selfpresentation, usernames are also frequently shaped by the desire to signal belonging to a particular social group and to express or reinforce emotional closeness with specific others.

Creative Identity Construction and Digital Branding accounts for 4 usernames or 16%, showing that a smaller portion of users treat their second account as a space for creative or aesthetic experimentation rather than purely personal or social expression. Privacy Management and Selective Visibility are the least frequent, appearing in only 3 usernames or 12%. This suggests that explicit concern with controlling visibility or restricting audience access plays a comparatively minor role in how usernames themselves are constructed, even though privacy may still be a

background motivation for having a second account in the first place.

Overall, these findings suggest that second account usernames function primarily as tools for identity performance and social bonding, while privacy control. Though often cited as a reason for maintaining a second account, it is less directly reflected in the naming choices themselves.

Across the 99 second account usernames identified through onebyone screening on Instagram, the most striking pattern is not randomness but the recurrence of particular strategies for forming, meaning, and using a name. The three research questions in this study essentially trace three layers of the same phenomenon: the linguistic form users choose (RQ1), the meaning that form carries (RQ2), and the social function that meaning performs once the name is put to use in Instagram's semipublic space (RQ3). The three layers depend on one another; form is never separate from meaning, and meaning is never separate from what it is used for in front of an audience.

Blending (28%) and compounding (24%) together account for over half of the 99 usernames analysed, far outpacing processes such as affixation or alphanumeric forms, each of which appears in only 4% of the data. This dominance fits the nonconcatenative character of word formation described by O'Grady et al. (1997): blending compresses two lexical units into a single new form that stays short while still carrying traces of meaning from its source words, while compounding allows two categories of meaning to be joined, an adjective and a noun, for instance, without making the name unwieldy. The pattern makes sense given the practical pressures of Instagram itself: a username has to be unique among millions of others, memorable, and ideally short. Phrasal or clausal forms (8%) are chosen far less often precisely because they work against that pressure for brevity, and onomatopoeia is almost entirely absent (0%) because it does little to serve the personalidentification function that remains a name's core job.

The picture shifts slightly at the level of meaning. All 25 interviewed informants show *categorical meaning* (100%). A figure that looks suspiciously tidy at first glance but is, in fact, a logical consequence of what a name is, in Van Langendonck's (2007) terms. However experimental its form, a name still presupposes some category of referent. In this case, that a user stands behind it. The more informative variation shows up in the layers of meaning that are not obligatory: *associative meaning* (72%), *emotive meaning* (48%), and *grammatical meaning* (32%). Because these four categories are not mutually exclusive, a single username often carries more than one layer at once: *octlazaink*, for example, compresses several personal associations (birth month, name initial, mother's name, favourite colour) into one form that also shows a fairly deliberate grammatical segmentation. The pattern confirms that second account names are not empty labels but semantic units that users deliberately pack with meaning.

A similar pattern holds for social function. *Selfpresentation and identity performance* is the most common function (28%, 7 of 25 informants), followed by *community affiliation and social positioning* and *emotional expression and relational bonding*, which are tied at 24% (6 informants each), then *creative identity construction and digital branding* (16%, 4 informants), and finally *privacy management and selective visibility*, which is the least common (12%, 3 informants). As with meaning, these functional categories are not exclusive, a single name frequently performs more than one function at once, confirming that second account names work multifunctionally rather than in a single register.

One relationship in these findings deserves closer unpacking: that between *emotive meaning* (RQ2) and *emotional expression and relational bonding* (RQ3), since both concern emotion attached to a name and could easily look redundant on the surface. The distinction lies in the level of analysis. *Emotive meaning* is an internal semantic property the affective charge built into the name's lexical form itself, regardless of who reads it or how it is used. *Emotional expression and*

relational bonding, by contrast, are a pragmatic function: how the name is used socially to build closeness with a particular audience. The two can align, but they do not have to. *@emptyspaces*, for instance, clearly carries a subdued, reflective *emotive meaning*, yet functionally it reads better as selfpresentation: the user projects a contemplative side of themselves rather than inviting emotional closeness with any particular follower. *@beminepls* or *@baaa.bas*, by contrast, clearly perform *emotional expression and relational bonding*, inviting affection and familiarity from an audience through different linguistic strategies (a softened request form, expressive lengthening) without necessarily foregrounding the same dark or melancholic emotive charge. One category answers the question "what does this name's form carry?"The other answers "what does this name do to other people?" Two different axes that frequently intersect in the same data without one making the other redundant.

Another finding worth dwelling on is how uncommon *privacy management and selective visibility* is as a social function (12%), even though the desire for a more private space is often cited as one of the main reasons for creating a second account in the first place. This points to something of a paradox: privacy appears to be managed mainly through nonlinguistic means, such as locked accounts, curated follower lists, and restrictions on who can find the account, rather than through the choice of name itself. In the end, the username is used more often to perform than to hide. Within Van Langendonck's (2007) framework, this means the identificational and expressive functions of a name remain more dominant than its protective function, even on an account that is conceptually meant to be a more closed space.

Theoretically, these findings speak directly to the gap outlined earlier in this article. Prior work on second or "finsta" accounts tends to stop at explaining the psychology and behaviour behind anonymity (Kircaburun et al., 2021; Mahajan & Tiwari, 2023), while digital onomastics research (Hassa, 2012) has not yet treated second account names as a linguistic object analysed in their own right. This study extends the frameworks of *socio-onomastics* (Van Langendonck, 2007) and *virtual onomastics*/the *nickonym* (Kisel et al., 2018) to that object, while also showing that the online disinhibition effect that drives second account creation in the first place (Suler, 2004) is realised linguistically not only in more open posting behaviour, but in the very names chosen to mark out that space from the start.

A few limitations should be noted. The 25 informants analysed for RQ2 and RQ3 were recruited purposively from the researcher's own second account follower network, so the findings are descriptive and contextbound rather than generalisable to second account users as a whole. The focus on a single platform (Instagram) and on predominantly Englishlanguage usernames also limits how far these patterns can be extended to other platforms or to users with different language preferences. The findings above are therefore best read as a rich mapping of patterns within one specific user community, not as a universally applicable claim.

CONCLUSION

Naming is never a neutral act. The name a person chooses for themselves reflects how they think about, present, and position themselves in relation to others. Unlike birthgiven names, which are typically assigned rather than chosen, social media usernames are self-selected, making them a rich site for studying identity and social meaning. Van Langendonck (2007) proposed a fourpart model of meaning, which categorical, associative, emotive, and grammatical. that captures how proper names, including selfauthored ones, carry meaning beyond simple reference, while Kisel et al. (2018) identified five social functions that selfauthored digital names, or "nickonyms," can perform. These onomastic patterns can not only be found in formally studied names but can also

be observed on social media platforms such as Instagram, particularly in the usernames chosen for second, more private accounts.

This research focuses on analyzing the second Instagram account usernames created by Generation Z users, based on the naming choices of 25 informants selected from a population of 99 second account holders. Based on the first research question, the findings show that these usernames are structured using seven types of onomastic patterns. They are Blending/Wordplay, Compounding, Reduplication, Simplex/Borrowing, Phrasal/Clausal construction, Affixation, and Alphanumeric hybrid forms, while Onomatopoeia found one in the dataset. The most frequently used structure among second account usernames is Blending/Wordplay, as much as 21 times (21.2%), closely followed by reduplication and compounding, found 17 times (17.2%). This is due to the fact that many second account users favor short, unique, and semantically layered handles that remain memorable within Instagram's character limit while still signaling individuality and creativity. Meanwhile, Affixation and Alphanumeric hybrid forms occur in only a small number of usernames, each found only once (4%).

Based on the second research question, this study identifies four types of semantic meaning reflected in second Instagram account usernames, following Van Langendonck's (2007) model. The four types of meaning are categorical, associative, emotive, and grammatical meaning. From the findings on types of semantic meaning, it was found that categorical meaning occurs in all 25 usernames (100%), as every username, however stylized its spelling, still presupposes a human referent. Associative meaning follows with 18 occurrences (72%), reflecting connotations that extend beyond the literal meaning of the words used. Emotive meaning is found in 12 usernames (48%), and grammatical meaning, marked through morphosyntactic features such as pluralization or numerals, is found in 8 usernames (32%). These four types of meaning are not mutually exclusive; a single username can carry more than one layer of meaning at once, showing a balanced tendency in which second account usernames layer emotional and connotative content on top of their basic referential function.

Based on the third research question, this study identifies five social functions performed by second Instagram account usernames, following Kisel et al.'s (2018) framework. The five functions are self presentation, community affiliation, emotional expression, creative/branding, and privacy management. The findings on the functions of second account usernames show that self presentation is the most dominant function, occurring 7 times (28%), followed by community affiliation and emotional expression, each occurring 6 times (24%). Creative/branding function is found 4 times (16%), while privacy management is the least reflected function, occurring only 3 times (12%) despite privacy being one of the most commonly cited reasons for maintaining a second account in the first place. This shows a paradox: privacy is more often managed through platform mechanisms, such as follower curation, than linguistically encoded in the username itself.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This journey would not have been possible without the unwavering support and guidance of those around me. I am profoundly grateful to Dr. Rina Marnita, AS. MA., and Dr. Reniwati, M.Hum., my dedicated supervisors, whose kindness, encouragement, and invaluable insights have been instrumental throughout the completion of this research. I truly cannot thank them enough for their patience and generosity in sharing their knowledge and ideas.

My heartfelt thanks also go to my examiners, Dr. Fajri Usman, M. Hum., Dr. Elly Delfia, S.S., M. Hum., and Dr. Wuri Syaputri, S.Pd., M.Pd., for their thoughtful suggestions and constructive feedback, which have greatly enriched this work. Additionally, I extend my sincere gratitude to Dr. Fajri Usman, M. Hum.,

REFERENCES

Ainiala, T., Saarelma, M., & Sjöblom, P. (2012). *Names in focus: An introduction to Finnish onomastics*. Finnish Literature Society.

Algeo, J. (1973). *On defining the proper name*. University of Florida Press.

Androutsopoulos, J. (2014). *Computermediated communication and linguistic landscapes*. In C. Mallinson, B. Childs, & G. Van Herk (Eds.), *Data collection in sociolinguistics: Methods and applications* (pp. 74–90). Routledge.

Androutsopoulos, J. (2023). *Digital discourse studies* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Bailey, E. R., Matz, S. C., Youyou, W., & Iyengar, S. S. (2020). Authentic selfexpression on social media is associated with greater subjective wellbeing. *Nature Communications*, *11*, 4889. https://doi.org/10.1038/s4146702018539w

Barta, K., & Andalibi, N. (2021). Constructing authenticity on TikTok: Social norms and social support on the "fun" platform. *Proceedings of the ACM on HumanComputer Interaction, 5*(CSCW2), Article 430. https://doi.org/10.1145/3479574

BecharIsraeli, H. (1995). From <Bonehead> to <cLoNehEAd>: Nicknames, play, and identity on Internet Relay Chat. *Journal of ComputerMediated Communication, 1*(2). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.10836101.1995.tb00325.x

Boyd, d. (2014). *It's complicated: The social lives of networked teens*. Yale University Press.

Carr, C. T., & Hayes, R. A. (2015). Social media: Defining, developing, and divining. *Atlantic Journal of Communication, 23*(1), 46–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/15456870.2015.972282

Carr, C. T., Wohn, D. Y., & Hayes, R. A. (2016). as social support: Relational closeness, automaticity, and interpreting social support from paralinguistic digital affordances in social media. *Computers in Human Behavior, 62*, 385–393. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.03.087

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, *5*(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

Hämäläinen, L. (2022). From Bonehead to @realDonaldTrump: A review of studies on online usernames. *Names: A Journal of Onomastics*, *70*(2), 35–53. https://doi.org/10.5195/names.2022.2364

Hassa, S. (2012). Projecting, exposing, revealing self in the digital world: Usernames as a social practice in a Moroccan chatroom. *Names: A Journal of Onomastics*, *60*(4), 201–209. https://doi.org/10.1179/0027773812Z.00000000031

Hogan, B. (2010). The presentation of self in the age of social media: Distinguishing performances and exhibitions online. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society, 30*(6), 377–386. https://doi.org/10.1177/0270467610385893

Kircaburun, K., Alhabash, S., Tosuntaş, Ş. B., & Griffiths, M. D. (2020). Uses and gratifications of problematic social media use among university students: A simultaneous examination of the big five of personality traits, social media platforms, and social media use motives. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 18*(3), 525–547. https://doi.org/10.1007/s1146901899406

Kisel, O. V., Mikhailov, V. V., Savinova, Y. A., & Bosik, G. A. (2018). New onomastic realities in digital era. *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 294–300. https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2018.09.02.34

Kose, S. S. (2026, April 17). Our second Instagram account is the real one. *The Jakarta Post Weekender*. https://weekender.thejakartapost.com/mainstory/2026/04/17/oursecondinstagramaccountistherealone.html

Leibring, K. (2022). Personal names in digital environments. In C. Hough & D. Izdebska (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of names and naming*. Oxford University Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.

Marnita, R. (2022). Kakak: Kata sapaan netral dalam komunikasi transaksi online di WhatsApp. *Indonesian Language Education and Literature (ILEaL), 8*(1), 187–199. https://doi.org/10.24235/ileal.v8i1.9326

Marwick, A. E. (2013). *Status update: Celebrity, publicity, and branding in the social media age*. Yale University Press.

O'Grady, W., Dobrovolsky, M., & Katamba, F. (1997). *Contemporary linguistics: An introduction*. Longman.

Puzey, G. (2016). Toponymic creativity in social media. *Names and Their Environment: Proceedings of the 25th International Congress of Onomastic Sciences*, 2, 207–216.

Puzey, G., & Kostanski, L. (Eds.). (2016). *Names and naming: People, places, perceptions and power*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783094929

Qian, H., & Scott, C. R. (2007). Anonymity and selfdisclosure on weblogs. *Journal of ComputerMediated Communication, 12*(4), 1428–1451. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.10836101.2007.00380.x

Salmons, J. (2015). *Qualitative online interviews: Strategies, design, and skills* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing & Health, 23*(4), 334–340. https://doi.org/10.1002/1098240X(200008)23:4<334::AIDNUR9>3.0.CO;2G

Schellewald, A. (2021). Communicative forms on TikTok: Perspectives from digital ethnography. *International Journal of Communication, 15*, 1437–1457.

Sjöblom, P., & Aldrin, E. (2020). [Resensi buku: *Socio-onomastics: The pragmatics of names*]. *Names: A Journal of Onomastics, 68*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/00277738.2019.1643136

Statista. (2024). *Number of Instagram users worldwide from 2020 to 2025*. https://www.statista.com/statistics/183585/instagramnumberofglobalusers/

Suler, J. (2004). The online disinhibition effect. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 7*(3), 321–326. https://doi.org/10.1089/1094931041291295

Tagg, C., & Seargeant, P. (2014). Audience design and language choice in social media. *Applied Linguistics Review, 5*(1), 1–25.

Throuvala, M. A., Griffiths, M. D., Rennoldson, M., & Kuss, D. J. (2021). Motivational processes and dysfunctional mechanisms of social media use among adolescents: A qualitative focus group study. *Computers in Human Behavior, 114*, Article 106593. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106593

Vaisman, C. (2014). *Cyberutopias: The politics and ideology of social media*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Van Langendonck, W. (2007). *Theory and typology of proper names*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Waterloo, S. F., Baumgartner, S. E., Peter, J., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2018). Norms of online expressions of emotion: Comparing Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and WhatsApp. *New Media & Society, 20*(5), 1813–1831. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444817707349

Yule, G. (2020). *The study of language* (7th ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Zahra, F. F., Hidayat, R., & Afdhal. (2023). *The melting of student identity through second accounts on Instagram*. *The Journal of Society and Media, 6*(2), 508–526. https://doi.org/10.26740/jsm.v6n2.p508526