Mira Bekar

УДК 316.77:004.738.5
УДК 316.472.4:004
Original scientific paper / Изворен научен труд

CREATING PHATIC COMMUNION THROUGH EMOJI IN ONLINE CHATS

Key words: emoji, phatic communion, text-based chat, computer-mediated communication, conversation analysis

Introduction

In the past decade online communication dominates. It has outclassed face-to-face communication, becoming an increasingly common form of social interaction. The processes of establishing and maintaining social relationships for both personal and professional goals have been transferred to online venues. All social relationships are always something continuing through time. Establishing and developing a social relationship means that people prefer interacting with certain members of a community, but avoid, even reject to interact with other members. The relevance of this study is that close analysis of everyday social activities such as online chats can help us understand how we achieve satisfying our personal and professional development as human beings, i.e., how we use language as social action (Bekar, 2015).

Emoji are an integral part of any online social interaction. Their usage is taking on characteristics of verbal language (Herring, 2020; Na'aman et al., 2017). Research has shown that emoji are in fact evolving into a separate language which is specific for its graphic features (Ge & Herring, 2018; Monti et al., 2016). Other researchers claim that since it is pictographic, the language consisting of emoji is, or will be, universally used and understood (Ai et al. 2017).

Emoji usage is increasingly popular on social networking venues (e.g., Twitter, Facebook) which are offering alternative ways of gaining and responding to knowledge (Bekar, 2019). The produced content of these venues is open and dependent on audience engagement. For example, on Facebook, the content is scaffolded and co-constructed to such an extent that numerous readers and writers, i.e., users, participate in the discus-

sions that appear below a certain post. My main claim that will be supported in this paper is that phatic communion is not achieved only by "mere exchange of words," but that it also dwells in the extralinguistic elements and the sharing of individual mental, temporal, and existential contexts.

Text-based chat

Text-based chat is a computer-mediated communication mode. With the fast-emerging technology there has been terminological confusion of the words "CMC," "synchronous CMC," and "chat." Broadly speaking, CMC refers to human communication which is facilitated by computers, Ipads, smart phones. The definitions provided here are by three sources, two scholars and one online dictionary-encyclopedia, whose information is verified by experts. December (1997) defined CMC as "a process of human communication via computers involving people, situated in particular contexts, engaging in processes to shape media for a variety of purposes" (as cited in Thurlow, Lengel & Tomic, 2004, p. 14). Herring (1996) defined CMC as "communication that takes place between human beings via the instrumentality of computers" (p. 1). Finally, according to Webopedia.com,[1] "CMC is a human communication via computers and includes many different forms of synchronous, asynchronous or real-time interaction that humans have with each other using computers as tools to exchange text, images, audio and video" (Webopedia.com. 2004, CMC para. 1). CMC is a mode of communication different from face-to-face (FtF) communication and writing, and is defined by the medium used. In this study, CMC encompasses not only communication, but the whole process by which people exchange information and perform social action using computers or other tech-gadgets.

There are two types of CMC: asynchronous CMC (e.g., emails and blogs where the communication occurs without time constraints, i.e., participants can log in at their convenience) and synchronous CMC (when participants are online at the same time). Text-based chat is believed to be a mode of synchronous CMC. In synchronous communication, interaction occurs in almost real time, and it happens in so-called "chat rooms". Examples of chat rooms used in the past include Internet Relay Chats (IRCs), and web-based chat systems such as Yahoo chat (Yahoo! Messenger) or Google/Gmail talk. Recently, the online communication is mainly performed via Facebook, Viber, WhatsApp, and Twitter. Text-based chat is an interactive and synchronous mode of communication that may involve two or more participants who are online at the same time but can respond at any time that is convenient to them.

[1] Webopedia is a free online dictionary for words, phrases and abbreviations that are related to computer and Internet technology. Full-time experienced editors gather information from standards bodies, leading technology companies, universities, professional online technical publications, white papers and professionals working in the field. Every definition is verified among multiple sources; definitions are never based on just one source.

Previous research

Online text-based chat shares common features with instant messaging (IM) and text messaging (Isaacs, Walendowski, Whittaker, Schiano & Kamm, 2002; Palfreyman & Khalil, 2003). The linguistic items and the strategies of shortening standard language forms and substituting for the lack of prosody used in text-based chats are similar to those used in text messaging and instant messaging. Because I explore only several extralinguistic elements such as emoji, written out laughter and the like, the research-driven studies presented in this section provided information regarding how text-based communication has been analyzed so far and what else is still needed to be researched in this area. Text messages produced by American college students with respect to lexical shortenings, transmission way, emoticons, and punctuation were explored by Ling and Baron (2007).Texting in several languages was explored by Döring (2002) for German, Hård af Segerstad (2002) for Swedish, Ling (2005) for Norwegian, and Thurlow and Brown (2003) for British English (as cited in Ling & Baron, 2007). All these studies demonstrated how instant messaging and text messaging share common features in regard to abbreviations, acronyms, emoji, omission of vowels, omission of subject pronouns, misspellings, and multiple or specific punctuation. It is interesting from current perspectives to note that these researchers experienced difficulties to collect text messages, because text messaging was a new phenomenon relatively at the beginning of the 2000s. This proves how fast technology changes along with people's perceptions towards it, as well as CMC-related terminology.

During the same decade, Baron (2004), as well as Tagliamonte and Denis (2008), conducted two statistical IM studies, which along with the above-mentioned Thurlow and Brown's (2003) discourse analysis of texting reported that abbreviations, acronyms, and emoticons were less dominant in young people's computer-mediated communication than suggested by the popular published claims. Ling and Baron (2007) emphasized that more corpus-based analyses of such features as abbreviations and punctuation are necessary because by collecting data from similar populations the linguistics of texting and IM can be compared in a more insightful way. Researchers have also approached emoji as elements that exhibit the same linguistic patterns we see in sentences. Research on linguistic elements in online communication becomes more prominent when the use of emoji in non-English contexts is taken into consideration. Ge and Herring (2018) found out a tendency in Chinese emoji sequences for the emoji that expresses the position of the speaker to occur in sequence-final position, and also realized that some emoji which function like a grammatical object appear before the verb, suggesting an object-verb-subject order. This is due to the fact that the emoji order differs from the basic word order of Chinese, which is subject-verb-object, like English. Moreover, Stamatov (2017) discovered that the users of Google Hangouts from the United States and European and Asian countries create emoji sequences with verb-subject and object-verb orders, e.g., 'Boy rides horse' (lit. 'ride-horse boy')

and 'Look at mobile phone' (lit. 'mobile phone look-at'). These research studies show that emoji language is not universally used although the general assumptions are that it is a universal way of communication. It is less clear, however, to what extent these patterns are systematic, as opposed to random orders that convey no consistent linguistic meaning.

Research methods

This research included both quantitative (descriptive statistics) and qualitative methods. The qualitative approach included: (1) a survey used to collect some demographic data about the participants (first language, other languages they speak, age, gender, academic status, and occupation) and information about their experiences with text-based chat, as well as about their purposes for text-based chat; (2) analysis of the discourse features of fifty online text-based chats done by five participants, followed by (3) in-depth discourse-based interviews (Odell, Goswami, & Herrington, 1983) asking the participants to reflect on their chatting practices. For example, I asked questions such as "What did you want to achieve with this ☺ here?".

The focus of the research was on how participants engage into and maintain social interaction when communicating online by studying in detail the instances of computer-mediated interaction (TBC), analyzing participants' interpretations of what was going on and how their interaction influenced their phatic communion in two languages. The next step was categorization of the assumptions of the participants which guided them to act as they acted and to understand how the linguistic elements and the rhetorical choices they used contributed to their interpretive and expressive processes.

Five participants were included in this study and all of them sent me naturally occurring conversations (i.e., the chats were not collected in an experimental and controlled setting). The participants chatted online with Macedonian and English speakers. Participants provided 50 two-party chats done in Macedonian and in English. The only requirement given was that the TBCs should be minimum 15 minutes long (i.e., without counting the longer breaks between turns when one of the participants would leave the TBC for a short time).

The other instrument used for data collection was the survey distributed via Qualtrics. Apart from collecting background information about age, gender, first and other languages they speak, occupation and academic status, the survey consisted of 20 questions focusing on the reasons, frequency, and nature of the text-based chatting practices. The third step consisted of discourse-based interviews (Odell et al. 1983; Hyland, 2000) conducted in English with some instances of Macedonian in the answers. Participants reflected on their online chatting practices while focusing on significant points related to my text-analysis of their linguistic, rhetorical, and pragmatic choices (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995), i.e., they discussed why they communicated in the way they did.

Unlike some other genres, people are not taught how to compose text-based chat. For example, there are principles for writing reports, articles, letters and emails; however, there are no

rules what structure and content a text-based chat should have or what rhetorical moves one should use. Thus, this exploration of text-based chats was aimed to explore if there are some common social "norms" that participants respect while structuring and maintaining their TBCs. When I asked the interview questions, I assumed that there is some context-specific knowledge the chatters share and may be unknown to me. Participants were asked questions such as: "Do you often use emoji?" or "Do you feel you dominate in the conversation?"

My research is based on a case study approach (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Duff, 2008; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). The participants were chosen because of their willingness to participate and share their TBCs with me and they shared similar educational, linguistic, as well as professional background (EFL teachers at a certain period in life). It is important to mention that their chatting practices are tied to their local context, Macedonia, and other countries such as England and the US, where some of them got educated and lived for some time. All participants graduated from the same Department of English language and literature at the same university. All of them were between 24-33 years, four females and one male, and they used English for more than 20 years when the research occurred.

Phatic communion

This section defines *phatic communion* and explains how this phenomenon is co-constructed through using extralinguistic elements such as emoji. Malinowski recognized phatic talk to be a form of action with the aim "to establish bonds of personal union between people brought together by the mere need of companionship" (p. 151). *Phatic communion* as defined by Malinowski (1923) is a type of speech "in which ties of union are created by a mere exchange of words" (p. 315). Even though phatic talk "may not serve any purpose of communicating ideas, phatic communion is functional in defusing the threat of taciturnity" (p. 150). Lyons (1968, p. 417) modified the term "phatic communion," adding "it serves to establish and maintain a feeling of social solidarity and well-being." Moreover, phatic communion depends on the ability to manage interpersonal relations while simultaneously adjusting to the discussed topics, as well as on the awareness of the particular usage of emoji.

I am aware that it is difficult to separate individual from social phenomena. For example, Matusov's (1998, p. 326) major criticism of the internalization model is that it is "ethnocentric - it privileges mastery of a solo activity as the crux of human development" and in its place he suggested a "participation model," in which the focus is on the individual mastery of joint activity. Joint and solo activities mutually constitute each other and are "inseparable aspects of a sociocultural activity" (p. 327). By studying TBC it is possible to discover whether the basic social function of a complex interactional behavior which includes phatic communion is realized through a detailed organization of interpersonal relationships in which participants share their beliefs, attitudes, identities, and roles. The process of phatic communion provides people engaged in a conversation with the chance to

inquire into the unknown details of the evolving roles they will be playing and adjusting in an interaction, which basically include the social identity and the momentary interests, moods, motivations, and purposes of the other participants, or as Goffman (1959) believed, participants in communication try to achieve the "working consensus" of the interaction through phatic communion. The focus in such interactions is establishing a mood of sociability rather than communicating information.

Phatic communion through emoji and other extralinguistic elements

Apart from other rhetorical and discursive strategies, emoji, eccentric spelling, eccentric punctuation, and written-out laughter may also function as tools for creating phatic communion. In an online interactional environment that is mainly verbal and nonphysical, such as text-based chat, emoji, which are graphic representations of feelings (☺, ☹, ) may contribute substantially to the social meaning of a message. Emoji seem to be ritualized expressions that fulfill a social function. They are used by participants in an online communication to replace words, emotions but also to mitigate the strength of negative reactions, to make sure that nobody gets offended and to avoid specific answers to various questions that one may not want to answer. Imagine someone asking for someone's availability via TBC, saying "Are you busy?" and getting a negative response such as "Yes. Actually, I can't talk to you right now." That negative response might have an inordinate effect especially in a typed medium where contextualization conventions are absent. But putting a smiley at the end of the same response, or an emoticon showing how busy you are—for example, the emoticon for a nerd with glasses () referring to busyness—will foster the phatic function of an utterance.

The concrete functions emoji played in the TBCs analyzed in this study were alignment, relief, support, and solving problematic issues (e.g., complaints to romantic and business partners). Table 6.5 summarizes the frequency and types of emoticons participants used. Smileys, as the most frequent types of emoticons used in online text-based chatting, were counted separately from other emoticons such as nerdy face  , sad face  , party emoticon  , and so on.

Table 1 - Frequency of Emoji Used in English and Macedonian by the Participants

Participant	Emoticons in English TBC	Emoticons in Macedonian TBC	Total number of emoticons used by participant	Total Emoticons participant used to number of typed lines
P1	35 smileys; 5 other emoticons	15 smileys; 2 other emoticons	57	57/495 (11.5%)
P2	47 smileys; 10 other	32 smileys; 4 other	93	93/418 (22.2%)
P3	16 smileys; 7 other	13 smileys; 2 other	38	38/306 (12.4%)
P4	15 smileys; 2 other	25 smileys; 2 other	44	44/703 (6.2 %)
P5	9 smileys; 1 other	6 smileys; 1 other	17	17/503 (3.4 %)

P2 used emoji most frequently among all participants. Four participants used emoji more frequently in the English TBCs than in the Macedonian ones, only P4 used more emoji while chatting with their Macedonian friends.

Apart from emoji usage, phatic communion in the analyzed online text-based chats was built through the use of extralinguistic elements such as eccentric spelling, eccentric punctuation, and written-out laughter. In English, the participants substituted for body language and intonation with the use of 1) eccentric spelling (e.g., "*byeeeeeee*"); 2) written-out laughter (e.g., variants of "*haha-ha*," "*hehehhe*", "*chuckle*"); 3) words in parentheses for demonstrating lower voice, inner thoughts, or for avoiding interruption while the other chatter was typing; 4) eccentric punctuation (e.g., multiple punctuation marks "*!!!*" used for surprise, or "…" used for leaving a line/thought unfinished; 5) graphic representations of surprise and cheering (e.g., "*ju-huuu,*" "*wo-hoo*"); 6) emotional and mental states (e.g., "*argh*" for anger; "*yuk*" for disgust; "*pfff*" for nonsense; "*zzz*" for feeling sleepy; "*nope*" and "*nooo*" for negation; "*yup*," "*yeah*," and "*yay*" for agreement).

In Macedonian, the instances of eccentric spelling, eccentric punctuation, and written-out laughter that occurred in my data were the following: 1) eccentric spelling (e.g., "*naskoroooo*" meaning "soooon"; "*nateeeee*" - a prolonged final vowel of a personal name for drawing attention; "*SHO ZBORISH,*" meaning "WHAT ARE YOU SAYING," used for surprise - an instance of using capital letters for emphasis); 2) representations of emotional and mental states (e.g., "ay" for surprise and shock, "*uf*" for complaint, „xaxa" for laughter, "aaaa" for understanding), and 3) direct borrowings of English words with Macedonian spelling

(e.g., "*baj baj*" instead of "bye bye," "*frendli*" instead of "friendly," "lajt" instead of light, "*lajk*" for "like"). Data showed that one participant (the only male participant) used more instances of eccentric spelling in the Macedonian online text-based chats than the others, while all the others used eccentric spelling more frequently in their English TBCs. As for the written-out laughter, most of the participants used similar number of phrases to replace laughter in both languages. Overall, all instances of eccentric spelling, eccentric punctuation, and written-out laughter, which share similar functions with emoji were more frequently used in the English TBCs than in Macedonian TBCs. The male participant showed some specific features since he did not use a single instance of written-out laughter either in English or in Macedonian. In order to find out more about the possible reasons for these online chatting behaviors, I looked for evidence in the exact TBCs and then discussed these findings in the interviews with each participant.

Participants' Views on the Use of Emoji: Data from Interviews

This section presents three examples of discourse and conversation analysis of text-based and of excerpts of my interviews with the participants on their views about the possible reasons for the use of emoji, eccentric spelling, and eccentric punctuation, as well as other items to substitute for the non-existence of physical contact. All these items appear to be unavoidable elements for building phatic communion and help us understand how social action is performed with language. These three were chosen as good representatives of the larger corpus to show how the analysis was done for all 50 chats and how the interviews were structured.

Participant 2

The participant 2 used emoji, especially smileys, for the following reasons: (1) conversation movers (expressing willingness to chat with a certain person and keep the conversation going); (2) alignment (or tendency to return a smiley if the co-chatter uses an emoticon); (3) out of a habit, at the end of an utterance as a period. Regarding written-out laughter, she used 32 instances of "*haha"* (with its variations "*hah,"" hihi,"and "hihi"*). In the interview we discussed with the participant 2 her usage of smileys.

Excerpt 1

Me: Tell me, when it comes to using emoji which emoji do you use most often and do you use them with anybody, no matter what the relationship is with that person?

P2: Actually, I use the smiley face. That's the most common. Sometimes if that person is very close, I would use the one with the kiss or the one taking their tongue out. (P2Int2)

The discourse analysis of her TBC demonstrated that P2 has used smileys as conversation movers, or as she explained it, a smiley at the end of a line in the opening sequences meant that the other chatter gets the turn and "can continue chatting." Using smileys also meant that the participant was willing to chat with somebody. If she knew that

the interaction would be short, she "would just *not* put the smiley face". The excerpt below is a representative instance of using an emoji for expressing willingness to interact, as a form of alignment or accommodation. The way P2 performs this social action is a good representation of other participants' accommodation of their online behaviors.

Excerpt 2: [An English TBC between P2 and Salome. Salome is preparing a presentation on Macedonia and asks P2 to help her with some Macedonian music. In this sequence they are discussing a traditional Macedonian song "Your Eyes, Lena."]

50 [14.05.2010 23:52:38]
Salomé: BTW... I love Lena's eyes!!!
51 [14.05.2010 23:52:51]
Salomé: I wish I knew what it said... but it's beautiful
52 [14.05.2010 23:52:58]
Salomé: I'm enjoying this sooo much!
53 [14.05.2010 23:52:59]
Salomé: =)
54 [14.05.2010 23:54:03]
P2: :) (P2Ch 1)

In line 50, Salome changes the topic with the abbreviation "BTW," often used as a topic shift initiator, and expresses her positive evaluation of a Macedonian song, adding that in spite of her lack of knowledge of the language, she enjoys the song. Salome ends her sequence, consisting of four turns, with a variation of a smiley, to which P2 responds with another smiley, aligning with the feelings Salome expressed. The analysis of all TBCs P2 sent to me demonstrated that she tended to react with a smiley when the other chatter would use a smiley. In trouble sequences, P2 usually reacted with written-out laughter ("hahaha") because for her, online text-based chatting "doesn't seem as serious as the face-to-face interaction."

Participant 3

Participant 3 (P3) was the only participant who conceptualized emojis, specifically smileys as a "problem-solver," as tools which "absorb the shock," and as face preservers. For example, she stated, "the other side will not take your refusal so seriously if you use a smiley." The discourse analysis of her text-based chats showed that P3 was very systematic in her use of smileys; for instance, for avoiding losing face. She reported she would always use a smiley when she felt like avoiding an answer she was expected to give and said she used planned repetition "in a manner to buy time or to think up with the other person". P3 appeared to keep a positive face with emoji and used smileys "as a screen," meaning she did not want people to see what she was actually thinking. We can see this usage in the excerpt below.

Excerpt 3: [An English TBC between P3 and Bob. After checking the well-being of P3, Bob starts a sequence in which he complains about his destroyed sleeping patterns.]:

18 [14.09.2010 09:44:49]
Bob: plus I'm training again so that is taking time to adjust too
19 [14.09.2010 09:45:11]
Bob: I don't know if it's the sleeping or the training but I'm mega horny all the time :D

20 [14.09.2010 09:48:34]
Bob: I did a back walkover this morning :)
21 [14.09.2010 09:48:42]
Bob: Getting over my fear of going backwards
→ 22 [14.09.2010 09:48:58]
P3: :D
23 [14.09.2010 10:00:31]
P3: off to work
24 [14.09.2010 10:00:36]
P3: hugs
25 [14.09.2010 10:02:10]
Bob: cau (P3Ch 2)

In this sequence, Bob complains about his sleeping habits being destroyed after two nights of partying and because of his training. After line 21, P3 appears that she wants to leave the chat. It seems that the word "horny" made P3 use a smiley "as a shield/screen" to avoid any further comments and keep positive face. Instead of commenting on Bob's new condition, she decides to use the big smiley (:D), in line 22, and initiates the ending of the TBC. What is notable is the time lag of 11 minutes between the smiley and the reason P3 provides for ending the TBC—that she has to go to work. This may show P3's hesitation whether to find a reason to leave the TBC or to stay committed to the interaction after the face-threatening moment Bob does when using the word "horny". Whatever her reason was, Bob respected her reaction and closed the chat.

Participant 4

Participant 4 (P4) was the most creative of all five participants in expressing affective states with extralinguistic items such as "*ah,*" "*oh,*" "*noooo,*" "*YUP,*" "*OMG,*" "*wo-hoo,*" "*Nah…,*" "*ARG,*" "*au,*" "*uf,*" multiple punctuation, surprise markers such as "*oooo,*" "*lele,*" and capital letters for surprise—a feature she used consistently. Regarding written-out laughter, P4 used seven instances in the English TBCs and seven in the Macedonian TBCs: four instances of "*HAHAHAHA*," one of "*hihihi,*" and two of "*hehe*"). She reported that usage of smileys depended on how serious her co-chatter was and considered smileys "infantile," and "kind of stupid but very convenient." P4 used emoji, especially smileys, for the following reasons: (1) teasing or a face-threatening act; (2) filling a conversation slot (the tendency to satisfy the need to be active in the interaction); (3) alignment (showing common interests and adapting the conversation style); (3) showing she misses the people she chats with; and (4) demonstrating playfulness. P4 explained that she "would never use a lot of abbreviations or that kind of Internet chat slang" with someone unless she felt very comfortable with that person.

To conclude, participants in online chats have various reasons to use emoji at the end of an utterance or on a separate line—for example, as an afterthought, for softening the force of an utterance. They may be used for (1) expressing emotional and facial expressions (e.g., worry, moral support, joy), (2) ritualized unemotional expressions similar to the use of punctuation marks (e.g., use of a smiley after every utterance), and (3) contextually dependent phatic communion which is shaped by the chatter's purpose for interaction.

Conclusion and discussion

The topic explored addressed the nature of online text-based chats with the aim to understand the chatting practices and communication strategies of a small group of Macedonian participants who use both English and Macedonian in their online interactions. Specifically, this study focused on how speakers strengthen phatic communion through emoji. The analysis of the participants' usage of specific linguistic and extralinguistic resources in English and Macedonian showed how these segments are integral parts of approaching language as social action. My research contributes to the perception of TBC being a new mode of communication -- a hybrid text mediated by an electronic device which is in-between spoken and written type of communication. Online chatting becomes a multi-competence interactive skill. It represents a mode of communication typical of the new generations and which provides rapidly increasing opportunities to add video and audio files that augment TBC text. Online text-based chat is a specific mode also in regard to the extralinguistic elements chatters use; chatters are creative in finding ways to substitute for the missing elements available in face-to-face interaction and for the psychological states such as "showing" different emotions through typing. Another feature of text-based CMC is that since it usually happens fast, spontaneity and interactivity, the two social features, are more emphasized. The fact that this use sometimes affects the clarity of the utterances should not be ignored since often when one chatter does not understand the use of emojis by the other chatter in a certain TBC, for example, the use of stand-alone smileys, they would not ask for clarification.

The findings showed that phatic communion was built through emoji meaning that all the participants but one used emoji for different purposes. They also showed that neither men nor women used TBC only to exchange information, and the way the exchange was performed revealed various ways of strengthening the phatic communion. We can understand the process of building phatic communion more clearly by acknowledging that people constantly adopt and defend their positions on community belonging, knowledge, ignorance, power, education, mentoring, and respect, and that they accept, confront, and negotiate the positions of others. The participants in online interactions were able to quickly accommodate to personal and collective cultures of their friends with a focus on maintaining social interaction at a distance.

The idea of floating between the ritualized, i.e., conventionalized interaction and the affective one is important for phatic communion and crucial to the social nature of interactions. For example, if an emoji softens the impact of a troublesome sequence, it is by one criterion phatic. All this shows that emoji and other extralinguistic items should *not* be only seen as substitutes for the absence of physical cues such as gestures, voice, and facial expressions, but also as tools for maintaining social relationships and co-constructing phatic communion.

References

Ai, W.; Lu, X.; Liu, X.; Wang, N.; Huang, G.; and Mei, Q. (2017). Untangling Emoji Popularity Through Semantic Embeddings. In Proceedings of the Eleventh International AAAI on Web Social Media, 2–11.

Baron, N. 2004. See you online: Gender issues in college student use of instant messaging. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 23, 397-423.

Bekar, M. 2015. *Language, writing, and social (inter)action: An analysis of text-based chats in Macedonian and English.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Bekar, M. 2019. How fake new affects academic literacy: A case of small country enhancing US elections. *Context*, 20, 73-83.

December, John. 1997. Notes on defining of computer-mediated communication. *Computer-Mediated Communication Magazine*, (3):1. http://www.december.com/cmc/mag/1997/jan/december.html.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). 1994. *Handbook of qualitative research.* London: Sage.

Duff, P. A. 2008. *Case study research in applied linguistics*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ge, J.; and Herring, S. C. 2018. Communicative Functions of Emoji Sequences on Sina Weibo. *First Monday 23*(11). https://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/9413/761

Goffman, E. 1959. *The presentation of self in everyday life.* New York, NY: Anchor Books.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. New York: Routledge.

Herring, S. C. 1996. (ed.) C*omputer-mediated communication: Linguistic, social and cross-cultural perspectives.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Herring, S. C. 2020. Grammar and Electronic Language. In The Concise Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics, edited by C. Chapelle. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Isaacs, E., Walendowski, A., Whittaker, S., Schiano, D. J., & Kamm C. 2002. The character, functions, and styles of instant messaging in the workplace. Proceedings CSCW 2002, CHI Letters 4(3), 11-20.

Ling, R., & Baron, N. S. 2007. Text messaging and IM: A linguistic comparison of American college data. *Journal of language and social psychology*, 26, 291-298.

Lyons, J. 1968. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Matusov, E. 1998. When solo activity is not privileged: Participation and internalization models of development. *Human Development*, 41, 326-349.

Monti, J.; Sangati, F.; Chiusaroli, F.; Benjamin, M.; and Mansour 2016. Emojitalianobot and EmojiWorldBot. New Online Tools and Digital Environments for Translation into Emoji. Paper presented at the Third Italian Conference on Computational Linguistics, Naples, Italy, December 5-6.

Malinowski, B., 1923. The problem of meaning in primive languages. In C.K. Ogden & I.A. Richards. (Eds.) *The Meaning of Meaning.* Supplement I. 296-336. Kegan Paul.

Na'aman et al. 2017 Na'aman, N.; Provenza, H.; and Montoya, O. 2017. Varying Linguistic Purposes of Emoji in (Twitter) Context. In Proceedings of ACL 2017, Student Research Workshop, pp. 136-141

Palfreyman D., & Khalil, M. 2006. A funky language for teenzz to use: representing Gulf Arabic in instant messaging. *Journal of Computer-mediated Communication 9*(1). doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2003.tb00355.x.

Stamatov, E. G. 2017. Do Emoji Use a Grammar? Emergent Structure in Non-Verbal Digital Communication. Master's thesis, Tilburg University.

Tagliamonte, S., & Denis, D. 2008. Linguistic ruin? LOL! Instant messaging and teen language. *American Speech*, 83, 3-34.

Thurlow, C., & Brown, A. 2003. Generation Txt? The sociolinguistics of young people's text-messaging.

Discourse Analysis Online. http://extra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/v1/n1/a3/thurlow2002003-paper.html.

Thurlow, C., Lengel, L., & Tomic, A. 2004. *Computer-mediated communication: Social interaction and the internet.* London: Sage publications.

Мира Беќар

Создавање на фатичко заедништво преку емоџи во онлајн разговор
(Резиме)

Во прикажаниот труд ја истражувам врската помеѓу фатичкото заедништво и употребата на емоџи во комуникацијата која се одвива онлајн. Целта на истражувањето е подобро да ги проучи практиките за онлајн комуникација (четување) кај мала група родени говорители на македонскиот јазик, кои комуницираат и на македонски и на англиски јазик како странски. Податоците беа обезбедени преку анкета, текстуални онлајн разговори и интервјуа и беа анализирани со употреба на квалитативни и квантитативни методи, како и дискурзивна и конверзациска анализа. Поконкретно, со проучување на екстралингвистичките феномени (пр. емоџи, типографски форми како LOL, испишана смеа, емоции претставени со зборови) присутни во четовите на моите учесници, како и со анализа на интервјуата во кои беа прашани и за нивните комуникациски практики, се дојде до заклучок за можните форми на фатичко заедништво и на кои начини се изведуваат различни друштвени активности во два јазика.

Клучни зборови: емоџи, фатичко заедништво, текстуален онлајн разговор, компјутерска комуникација, анализа на разговор