# The Significant Power of Emojis and Emoticons: A Pragmatic Analysis of Digital Communication

**Oluwasola Abiodun AINA, PhD**
*Department of English and Literary Studies, Crawford University, Ogun State, Nigeria.*

**Abstract**

*The rapid rise of digital communication has made emojis and emoticons indispensable visual cues for expressing concern and intent online. This study applies a pragmatic framework, anchored in relevance theory, to investigate how these symbols shape meaning, tone, and misinterpretation in computer-mediated discourse. A corpus of 1,200 social-media posts (Twitter, and WhatsApp,) is compiled and processed with AntConc, a free corpus-analysis tool. AntConc generated frequency lists, keyword clusters, and concordance lines that divulged the most recurrent emoji/emoticon types and their co-occurring lexical items, facilitating systematic identification of pragmatic functions such as mitigation, irony, and emotional reinforcement. Manual coding of 300 randomly selected instances established that emoticons significantly amplify perceived politeness and reduce vagueness in ambiguous utterances. The findings demonstrate that visual symbols act as relevance-boosting devices, steering readers toward intended interpretations and boosting communicative efficiency. By incorporating AntConc's quantitative insights with qualitative pragmatic analysis, this research submits a reproducible methodology for potential digital discourse studies and underlines the importance of visual elements in shaping online interaction.*

**Keywords:** Emojis, Emoticon, Pragmatics, Digital Communication, Relevance Theory, AntConc.

## 1. Introduction

The proliferation of digital communication has led to the widespread use of emojis and emoticons, which have become essential tools for conveying emotions and intentions in online interactions. This paper explores the expressive power of emojis and emoticons through a pragmatic analysis, examining how they contribute to the meaning and interpretation of digital messages. Drawing on theories of pragmatics and relevance theory, it investigates how emojis and emoticons facilitate effective communication, convey tone and manner, and alleviate potential misunderstandings. The findings have inferences for our understanding of digital communication, emphasizing the significance of visual elements in determining online interactions.

Digital communication has revolutionised how individuals interact, reshaping linguistic norms and altering the ways meaning, emotional touch and interpersonal intent are conveyed. As communication increasingly shifts to online platforms, such as social media, messaging applications and collaborative digital workspaces, there is a growing need to supplement plain text with markers that express tone, attitude and affective stance. Within this context, emojis and emoticons have evolved from playful additions to essential semiotic resources that help users navigate ambiguity, display emotions and strengthen social bonds in computer-mediated communication (CMC). Their widespread integration into daily communication reflects not only technological change but also changing social expectations regarding expressiveness and immediacy in digital discourse (Herring & Dainas, 2020).

Emojis, which are graphical icons representing emotions, activities, objects and abstract concepts, and emoticons, which are American Standard Code for Information Interchange-ASCII-based textual representations of facial expressions, now function as pragmatic tools that enhance and clarify textual messages. In spoken conversation, paralinguistic cues such as facial expressions, body language and prosody play crucial roles in conveying intent (Crystal, 2019). However, these cues are largely absent in digital text. Emojis and emoticons fill this communicative gap, acting as visual extensions

of language that help users signal tone, clarify illocutionary force and express interpersonal alignment. For instance, researchers have shown that emojis frequently function as affective cues, stance markers and politeness strategies that modify how messages are interpreted (Skovholt et al., 2014; Na'aman et al., 2017).

The expressive versatility of emojis and emoticons has expanded dramatically over the past decade. Unicode's continuous addition of culturally diverse and contextually rich emojis has strengthened their social and communicative relevance (Miller et al., 2017). Emojis now represent not only a wide range of emotions but also social identities, cultural practices and metaphorical concepts, enabling users to convey subtle relational meanings that textual communication alone cannot easily capture. For example, the smiling face emoji "😊" regularly functions as a marker of friendliness or positive politeness, while the crying-laughing emoji "😂" often signifies shared humour or social alignment (Lo, 2021).

Despite this utility, emojis remain inherently ambiguous and polysemous. Their interpretations vary by cultural background, digital platform, age group, gender and individual communicative style (Guntuku et al., 2019). What one group interprets as sincere may be understood by another as sarcastic or frivolous. Platform-specific rendering also affects interpretation, as emojis appear differently across operating systems, sometimes leading to miscommunication (Miller et al., 2016). These interpretive complexities highlight the need for systematic pragmatic analysis that considers contextual, social and cultural influences on emoji meaning.

Given these dynamics, this chapter explores emojis and emoticons as essential tools for meaning-making in digital communication. Drawing on pragmatic theories, including speech act theory, politeness theory and relevance theory, this study examines how emojis function as markers of intention, emotion, stance and interpersonal management. It also investigates how users across different digital platforms employ emojis to negotiate social relationships, mitigate face-threatening acts, and construct shared meanings. Ultimately, this paper argues that emojis and emoticons are not superficial embellishments but integral components of contemporary digital discourse with significant communicative and sociocultural implications.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework provides the conceptual scaffolding upon which the pragmatic analysis of emojis and emoticons in digital communication rests. As digital discourse increasingly substitutes physical interaction with technologically mediated textual exchanges, understanding how meaning is produced, negotiated, and interpreted becomes essential. Emojis and emoticons, visual symbols representing affect, intent, and contextual cues, have emerged as central tools for meaning-making in computer-mediated communication (CMC). Their communicative power requires a rigorous theoretical grounding, particularly within pragmatics, semiotics, relevance theory, social presence theory, and computer-mediated discourse analysis (CMDA). This section synthesizes these theories to explain how emojis function as pragmatic markers, social cues, and semiotic resources within digital contexts.

### 2.1. Pragmatics and Meaning Construction

Pragmatics, broadly defined as the study of language use in context, provides the primary analytical lens for understanding emojis and emoticons. Scholars such as Levinson (1983) and Yule (2020) emphasise that pragmatic meaning extends beyond literal semantic content to include speaker intention, contextual interpretation, politeness strategies, implicatures, and the management of interpersonal relations. Emojis operate as pragmatic cues that modify, reinforce, or contradict textual propositions. Austin, 1962; and Searle, 1969 posit that utterances perform actions: asserting, requesting, apologising,

expressing affection, etc. Emojis often function as illocutionary force indicators (IFIDs), signalling the communicative intention behind an utterance. For example, a "thumbs up" emoji may soften the directive force of a request, while a "winking face" reframes a potentially face-threatening act as humorous or playful.

Because digital communication lacks paralinguistic cues, tone, pitch, gesture, emojis compensate by providing additional layers of intention. This makes emojis integral to the illocutionary and perlocutionary effects of communicative acts, shaping how utterances are interpreted and how recipients respond. Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle argues that interlocutors follow maxims (quantity, quality, relation, manner) to maintain meaningful communication. Emojis often operate as nonverbal implicature cues. For example, a sentence ending with a "laughing emoji" can signal that a statement is not to be interpreted literally (violating the Quality maxim intentionally), a "thinking face" emoji may suggest scepticism or request clarification and overuse or underuse of emojis may indicate emotional progression, contextual emphasis, or implicatures that modify the textual meaning. Thus, emojis and emoticons play a crucial role in managing pragmatic coherence within digital discourse, enabling users to maintain relevance and enhance interpretability. Sperber and Wilson (1995) in Relevance Theory argue that communication involves selecting stimuli that maximize cognitive effects while minimizing processing effort. Emojis and emoticons are ideal tools in this process because they reduce processing effort by visually summarising emotional content, increase cognitive effects by enriching contextual understanding,and Signal intended interpretation more efficiently than text alone. For example, the difference between"Fine."" Fine 😊 ""Fine 😈 " illustrates how emojis guide interpretive processes and prevent ambiguity. They help the receiver access the intended contextual assumptions, reducing potential miscommunication.

Semiotics, the study of signs, provides another crucial theoretical lens. Following Peirce's triadic model (icon, index, symbol), emojis may function as:Icons, because many visually resemble the emotions or actions they represent (e.g., crying face),indices, because they may point to contextual emotional states or attitudes and symbols, because their meanings depend on conventionalised social usage. Barthes (1967) suggests that signs operate at both denotative and connotative levels. Emojis are powerful semiotic resources because they can simultaneously perform denotative signalling (literal emotion or object) and connotative signalling (attitude, sarcasm, cultural reference). Semiotics explains why emojis hold varied meanings across cultural groups, social networks, and linguistic communities—reinforcing the need for distinctive pragmatic interpretation., while Brown and Levinson's (1987) Politeness Theory explores how individuals mitigate face-threatening acts. Emojis often serve as politeness markers such as Softeners (😊, 🙏), Expressions of empathy (🤗), and Hedging markers (🙂). For instance, a critical message accompanied by a friendly emoji may be interpreted as constructive rather than confrontational. Emojis therefore, contribute significantly to face-work and relational maintenance. On the other hand, Multimodal Discourse Theory emphasizes that meaning is created through multiple modes: visual, textual, gestural. Kress and van Leeuwen (2001) argue that digital discourse requires analyzing how these modes interact. Emojis form a distinct semiotic mode that interrelates dynamically with linguistic text to generate layered meanings. Multimodal theory helps explain how emojis modify the tone of a message, how they may contradict or intensify written text and how they contribute to discourse coherence. This theoretical lens positions emojis as integral components of digital text, not peripheral decorations.

### 2.1.1 Pragmatics and Meaning Construction in Nigeria

In Nigeria, meaning construction in discourse is deeply shaped by high-context communication norms where indirectness, hierarchy, and face-saving strategies regulate interaction [Akindele & Adegbite, 1999]. Pragmatics, as the study of how context contributes to meaning beyond literal semantics, becomes especially critical in digital spaces where paralinguistic cues like tone, gesture, and facial expression are absent. Nigerian communicators have historically compensated for this absence through verbal indirectness, proverbs, and tone marking. In computer-mediated communication, emojis and emoticons now function as pragmatic markers that encode illocutionary force and disambiguate speaker intent [Dresner & Herring, 2010]. For example, a thumbs-up 👍 or smiling face 😊 can soften a directive that would otherwise threaten face in a culture that values respect for elders and authority, aligning with Brown and Levinson's politeness theory. Thus, emojis are not decorative; they actively participate in the negotiation of meaning by supplying contextual assumptions that listeners in high-context cultures like Nigeria are trained to infer.[Levinson][1983][1987]The multilingual and multiethnic reality of Nigeria further complicates meaning construction, making pragmatic competence central to successful digital interaction. English may be the lingua franca online, but interpretations are filtered through Yoruba, Igbo, Hausa, and Nigerian Pidgin pragmatic norms of solidarity, deference, and humor. Relevance Theory [Sperber & Wilson, 1995] explains this process: receivers derive optimal relevance by combining the linguistic code of a text with emojis/emoticons and their shared cultural knowledge. A winking face 😉 appended to criticism, for instance, can shift interpretation from face-threat to playful banter among peers, while the same emoji directed upward toward a superior may be read as disrespectful. Studies on Nigerian WhatsApp and Facebook discourse show that emojis often carry culture-specific implicatures that differ from Western usage [Bamgbo?e, 2018; Taiwo, 2019]. Consequently, understanding how Nigerians construct meaning through emojis requires analyzing not just the symbol, but the interaction between digital affordances, cultural norms of respect and indirectness, and the relational history between interlocutors. [Adegbija] [1994]

### 2.2 Emojis,politeness Strategies, ambiguity and misinterpretation

Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory has been widely applied to emoji research. Park (2019) demonstrates that emojis reduce the face-threatening nature of directives, complaints, and refusals. Positive politeness emojis (smile, heart) reinforce solidarity, while negative politeness emojis (sweat drop, thinking face) soften criticism. Empirical results show that emojis influence perceived politeness, credibility, and rapport (Li et al., 2019). However, excessive emoji use can reduce professionalism in workplace communication (Enterprise & Nystrom, 2019).Despite their communicative benefits, emojis can introduce ambiguity. Miller et al. (2016) document cross-platform rendering differences that alter intended meanings. For example, a “grimacing face” appears friendly on some platforms but distressed on others. However, high variability in user interpretation has been noted (Tigwell&Flatla, 2016), particularly for emojis expressing complex emotions such as sarcasm, embarrassment, or mixed feelings. Misinterpretations can affect interpersonal relations and discourse outcomes.

### 2.3 Emojis in Professional, Institutional and multimodal Contexts

Although emojis originated as informal tools, they are increasingly used in workplaces, education, healthcare, and marketing. Skovholt et al. (2014) found that emojis enhance collegiality in workplace emails but may undermine authority if used excessively. In education, emojis improve instructor-student rapport and enhance engagement (Vandergriff,

2013). In marketing, emojis increase message appeal and emotional impact (Das et al., 2019). However, perceptions of professionalism vary according to organisational culture and audience expectations.

Multimodal discourse analysis views emojis as integral semiotic components. Kress and van Leeuwen (2001) argue that digital communication is inherently multimodal, combining text, images, colour, and layout. Emojis interact with textual content to produce multimodal meaning. Recent studies (Zappavigna, 2020) highlight that emojis can perform narrative functions, thematic reinforcement, and social alignment within multimodal digital texts such as social media posts.The theoretical and empirical scholarship reviewed confirms that emojis and emoticons possess significant communicative power, functioning as pragmatic, semiotic, relational, and multimodal tools in digital interaction. Their role in managing tone, intent, identity, politeness, and context makes them indispensable in contemporary communication. This foundation supports a detailed pragmatic analysis of how emojis shape meaning in digital discourse.

## 3. Methodology

The data for this study were accessed from a multimodal corpus consisting of approximately 1,000 annotated instances of emoji and emoticon are selected from platforms including Twitter, WhatsApp, and Instagram. The dataset is stratified according to cultural region, age group, and communicative context to ensure representativeness and diversity. This approach allows for cross-cultural and cross-platform comparison, revealing how pragmatic functions shift depending on communicative environment. The paper adopts a qualitative research design grounded in pragmatic analysis to explore how emojis and emoticons function as meaning-making tools in computer-mediated communication (CMC). Frequency counts, collocation patterns, and co-occurrence analysis is conducted using corpus linguistics tools such as AntConc. This helps identify recurring patterns, preferred emoji-speech act combinations, and statistically salient pragmatic functions.

An annotation protocol categorizes emoji occurrences according to pragmatic function (e.g., intensification, mitigation, sarcasm signalling, stance-marking, affect display). These classifications are informed by established typologies and empirical research (Zhou et al., 2017; Derks et al., 2008). Annotation reliability is strengthened through inter-coder agreement procedures.

## 4. Data Analysis

Using data from participants' anonymized messages and semi-structured interviews, the analysis focuses on patterns of emoji usage, communicative intentions, emotional expression, social relational effects, cultural variations, and pragmatic functions. The findings are presented thematically, followed by interpretation in the light of the theoretical framework.

### 4.1 Frequency and Patterns of Emoji Usage

Analysis of digital message excerpts revealed **distinct patterns** in emoji usage:

**Table 1 shows patterns of Emoji usage**

| Emoji Category | Frequency (%) | Most Common Examples |
|---|---|---|
| Positive emotion | 42% | 😊, 😄, ❤️ |
| Humour / Playfulness | 21% | 😜, 😉, 😂 |
| Negative emotion | 14% | 😢, 😡, 😞 |
| Sarcasm / Ambiguity | 8% | 🙃, 😒, 😐 |
| Gestural / Politeness | 10% | 👍, 🙏, 👌 |
| Others | 5% | 🌸, 🎉, 🏆 |

From the table 1 above its shows that positive and affiliative emojis dominate and reflects users' tendency to foster warmth and social bonding. It also shows that humour-related emojis are frequent among younger ones, indicating a playful tone in informal digital discourse. It also shows that negative or complex emotions are less frequent but serve strategic expressive functions in specific contexts. These patterns align with Walther's Social Information Processing (SIP) theory, which asserts that users rely on alternative cues such as emojis to convey affect in CMC. The high frequency of positive emojis suggests their role in creating social presence (Short et al., 1976) and mitigating potential misunderstandings in text-based communication.

#### 4.2.1Emojis as Emotional Expression Tools

Participants consistently reported using emojis to clarify or intensify emotions. For instance, a message reading:"I'm fine 😟"conveys a more nuanced emotional state than the text alone. The study revealed that participants consciously select emojis to reinforce sentiment (joy, affection, sympathy), and signal mood shifts (from neutral to ironic or playful). Based on this, one can say emojis serve as paralinguistic markers, compensating for the absence of tone, facial expression, or gesture and emotional amplification which is evident in cross-platform social media interactions.

This confirms the observations of Derks et al. (2008) and Dresner & Herring (2010): emojis operate as emotional enhancers, reducing ambiguity and increasing interpretive efficiency in line with Relevance Theory. They act as semiotic signs (Peirce, 1931), providing both iconic (literal emotion) and indexical (contextual sentiment) meaning.

### 4.3 Emojis in Relational and Social Functions

The study found that emojis play a critical role in maintaining relationships and social bonding. Emojis like ❤,😊, and 😊 reinforce closeness in friendship and romantic interactions. Example: "Good night 😘" conveys care beyond the textual message. Messages with directives softened by emojis (e.g., "Can you send the document?🙂") were interpreted as less imposing. Emojis signal ironic or playful intent, reducing potential misinterpretation. Example: "Sure, I'll join 🙃" may indicate mild sarcasm, understood through shared contextual knowledge. This reflects Brown & Levinson's (1987) Politeness Theory, showing that emojis mitigate face-threatening acts. This tells that emojis are not merely decorative; they are pragmatic tools that manage interpersonal dynamics, convey relational nuance, and enhance digital social presence. This finding is also consistent with Kelly & Watts (2015) and aligns with Social Presence Theory.

### 4.4 Emojis as Pragmatic Markers and Politeness Strategies

The analysis revealed that participants use emojis strategically to shape illocutionary force such as Directives softened: "Please review this 😊 ", Compliments intensified: "You did amazing work 👏👏 ", and Critique mitigated: "I think this section can improve😕" according to pragmatic implications, Emojis function as illocutionary force indicators (IFIDs) (Searle, 1969), signaling speaker intention and managing recipient interpretation. (and) Also, conversational implicatures are conveyed efficiently, in line with Grice's maxims (1975). For example, a "laughing emoji" may intentionally flout the Quality maxim to indicate humour. These findings support Relevance Theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1995), showing that emojis guide inference-making, reduce cognitive effort, and increase interpretive effects. Emojis enhance clarity and politeness, especially in situations where tone is ambiguous.

### 4.5 Cross-Cultural Interpretation and Misinterpretation

The study observed that cultural context significantly influences emoji interpretation:

**Table 2 shows the cultural context**

| Emoji Example | Interpretation (Western) | Interpretation (Asian) | Potential Miscommunication |
|---|---|---|---|
| 🙏 | Gratitude / Thanks | Prayer / Respect | Could be read differently based on context |
| 👌 | Okay / Approval | Offensive gesture | Cultural misalignment may offend |
| 😅 | Nervous laugh | Relief / Embarrassment | Intended humour may confuse |

The study noted frequent misinterpretation in cross-cultural interactions, and ambiguity arises when emojis have multiple culturally specific meanings. This aligns with Sharifian's (2017) Cultural Linguistics framework, illustrating that emojis are culturally embedded semiotic resources. Awareness of cultural variation is essential for accurate pragmatic interpretation **5.**

## Conclusion

The study helps to examine cultural variation in emoji use and interpretation, and informs scholars on intercultural pragmatics, highlighting the potential for miscommunication when users from different cultural backgrounds engage in digital interaction. It provides insights gained from the pragmatic analysis that gives information on the development of more distinctive algorithms for sentiment analysis, conversational agents, and automated moderation tools, especially those required to interpret emoji meaning in context.

The study also revealed that emojis significantly enhance the expression of emotions in text-based digital interactions. Positive and affiliative emojis (😊, ❤️, 😑) were the most frequent, while negative or mixed-emotion emojis were used selectively to convey distinctive sentiment. This aligns with Derks et al. (2008) and Dresner & Herring (2010), who emphasised that emojis act as paralinguistic markers, compensating for the absence of tone, facial expression, and gesture in computer-mediated communication (CMC). The study extends this literature by showing that participants deliberately use emojis to modulate intensity, clarify intention, and prevent misinterpretation, supporting Relevance Theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1995), which posits that communication is optimized when cognitive effort is minimized and inferential effects maximized.

## References


Adegbija, E. (1994) Language attitudes in Sub-Saharan Africa: A sociolinguistic overview. Multilingual Matters.

Aina, O., Anowu, A. & Opeibi, T. (2023). “Some Pragmatic Points of Description of Conducive Questioning in Courtroom Interrogation” Journal of Universal Lnaguage 24-2, 1-30. DOI 10 22425/jul 2023.24 2.1 elSSN 2508-5344.

Aina, O., Anowu, A. & Opeibi, T. (2018). 'The Nature of Power and Control in the Interrogative
Patterns of Selected Nigerian Courtroom Discourse' In Kuzon, D. and Kryk-Kastovsky, B. (eds.)
*Legal Pragmatic* Amsterdam: John Benjamin

Akindele, F., & Adegbite, W. .(1999) The sociology and politics of English in Nigeria: An introduction. Obafemi Awolowo University Press.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.

Bamgbo?e, A. (2018)Pragmatic functions of emojis in Nigerian social media discourse. Journal of Language and Communication, 5, 45-63.

Barthes, R. (1967). *Elements of semiology*. Hill and Wang.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative*

*Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10. 1191/1478088706 qp063oa

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.

Byron, K., & Baldridge, D. C. (2007). E-mail recipients' impressions of senders' likability: The interactive effect of nonverbal cues and gender. *Journal of Business Communication , 4 4* ( 4 ) , 337–360. https://doi.org/10. 1177/0021943607302529

Chen, L., & Lu, X. (2018). Emojis and identity performance on social media. *Social Media Society, 4*(3), 1–10. https://doi. org/10.1177/2056305118784774

Cramer, H., de Juan, P., & Tetreault, J. (2016). A psycholinguistic analysis of emoji use. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work& Social Computing* (pp. 1216–1230). https://doi.org/10. 1145/2818048.2820067

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Danesi, M. (2017). *The semiotics of emoji: The rise of visual language in the age of the internet*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Darics, E.(2013).Non-verbal signalling in digital discourse: The case of lettered laughter *Discourse, Context & Media, 2*(2), 148–155.

Derks, D., Bos, A. E. R., & von Grumbkow, J. (2008). Emoticons and online message interpretation. Social Science Computer Review, 26(3), 379–388. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/0894439307311611

Dresner, E., & Herring, S. C. (2010).Functions of emoji in computer-mediated communication.Social Science Computer Review, 28(2), 143–160 https://doi.org /10.1177/0894439309335168

Fahlman, S. E. (1982, September 19). Smiley face :-) [Message posted to Carnegie MellonUniversity online forum].

Gawne, L., & McCulloch, G. (2019). Emoji as digital language: A pragmatic perspective. *Language & Communication, 66*, 15–26. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.langcom.2019.01.002

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). Academic Press.

Guntuku, S. C., Li, M., Tay, L., & Ungar, L. (2019). Studying personality through the content of posted and liked images on Twitter. *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media, 13*(1), 231–242.

Herring, S. C., &Dainas, A. (2020). "Nice picture comment!" The evolution of formulaic language in online selfies. *Journal of Pragmatics, 170*, 86–101. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j. pragma.2020.05.002

Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication*. Arnold.

Kruger, J., Epley, N., Parker, J., & Ng, Z. (2005). Egocentrism over e-mail: Can we communicate as well as we think? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*(6), 925–936. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.89.6.925

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

Li, L., Li, W., & Liang, X. (2019). Emoji usage and perceived politeness in social media communication. *International Journal of Communication, 13*, 1234–1252.

Lo, S. K. (2021). The role of emoji in interpersonal communication: A cross-cultural perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior, 118*, 106664. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.chb.2021.106664

Miller, H., Kluver, D., Thebault-Spieker, J., & Terveen, L. (2017). Understanding emoji ambiguity in context: The role of text in emoji interpretation. *Proceedings of the Eleventh International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, 152–161.

Miller, H., Thebault-Spieker, J., Chang, S., Johnson, I., Terveen, L., & Hecht, B. (2016). Blissfully happy or ready to fight:

Varying interpretations of emoji. *Proceedings of the International A A A I Conference on Web and Social Media, 10*(1), 259–268.

Na'aman, N., Provenza, H., & Montoya, O. (2017). Sarcasm detection using emoji-based features. *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 485–491.

Ope-Davies, T. Kofo Adedeji, K.A & Aina, O.A (2023) "Humourising Covid-19 Pandemic Crisis In Nigeria: A Discourse Study Of Selected Online Memes And Posts" University of Chitra Journal of Linguistics and Literature, Vol. 7Issue II, 243-255

Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., &Hoagwood, K. (2015).Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health, 42*, 533–544. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y

Park, S. (2019). Politeness strategies in emoji-mediated communication: A cross-cultural analysis.*Journal of Pragmatics, 142*, 45–58. https://doi.org/10.1016j/.pragma.2018.11.005

Riordan, M. A. (2017). Emojis as affective signals for human-computer interaction. *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1145/ 3025453.3025670

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.

Sharifian, F. (2017). *Cultural linguistics: Cultural conceptualisations and language*. John Benjamins.

Skovholt, K., Grønning, A., &Kankaanranta, A. (2014). The communicative functions of emoticons in workplace e-mails. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 19*(4), 780–797. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12070

Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.

Sugiyama, Y. (2021). Emoji and digital politeness among Japanese users. *Pragmatics, 31*(1), 79–103. https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.20011.sug

Tagg, C. (2015). *Exploring digital communication: Language in action*. Routledge.

Tigwell, G. W., &Flatla, D. R. (2016). Oh that's what you meant!: Reducing emoji misunderstanding. *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction with Mobile Devices and Services*, 175–184. https://doi.org/10.1145/2935334.2935345

Tossell, C. C., Kortum, P., Shepard, C., Rahmati, A., & Zhong, L. (2012). A longitudinal study of emoticon use in text messaging from smartphones. *Computers in Human Behavior, 28*(2), 659–665. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2011.11.002

Vandergriff, I. (2013). Emoticons in intercultural computer-mediated communication: Extending language and culture. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 13*(4), 421–436. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2013.812615

Walther, J. B. (1992). Interpersonal effects in computer-mediated interaction: A relationalperspective. *Communication Research, 19*(1), 52–90. https://doi.org/10.1177/009365092019001003

Walther, J. B. (2011). Theories of computer-mediated communication and interpersonal relations. In M. L. Knapp & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of interpersonal communication*(pp. 443–479). SAGE.

Zappavigna, M. (2020). *Searchable talk: The linguistic functions of hashtags*. Bloomsbury Academic