ABSTRACT

Purpose. This paper examines the communicative (also known as pragmatic) functions of the most common five emojis in the Jordanian context as perceived by Jordanian Facebook users.

Methods. The data were collected in four stages. First, the researcher shared a post on his Facebook account in which he asked his Jordanian-Arabic speaking virtual friends to report in a comment the most common emojis they use. The researcher compiled 174 comments / responses with 1716 emoji tokens. Second, the received tokens were used to identify the most common five emojis. Third, in order to identify the set of functions of each emoji, the researcher shared another post in which he...
asked the same previous group to report when each of them tends to press each emoji and for what purposes. Based on the received comments, a preliminary list of functions was prepared. Finally, the proposed functions were subjected to a validation process by two Jordanian-Arabic speaking linguists and three senior students from the Department of English at the University of Jordan. Most of their judgments were compatible with those of the researcher. To further validate the data, the acceptability of the identified functions were tested against the intuition of 261 Jordanian BA students at the University of Jordan.

**Results.** The findings show that the five most common emojis in the Jordanian context are (1) the Face With Tears of Joy, (2) the Red Heart, (3) the Slightly Smiling Face, (4) the Face Blowing a Kiss, and (5) the Winking Face. Furthermore, emojis are not only used to show emotions, but can also act as markers of illocutionary force, as face saving devices, and as boosters of rapport. The set of emojis examined in this study can be employed to perform 19 multiple illocutionary acts including but not limited to expressive acts (happiness, admiration, etc.), directive acts (e.g., directing the addressee to stop doing something) and declarative acts (e.g., threatening). Emojis are not solely used to convey the functions envisaged by their creators. Instead, with time, emojis start to drift extensively from their semantic import by acquiring a wide spectrum of new illocutions.

**Conclusions.** The study concludes that although emojis are evolving and developing at a rapid pace, becoming more diverse, pervasive and integral in our daily communications, sharing even some of the characteristics of human language such as arbitrariness, they remain a mode of communication within computer-mediated communication (CMC). At this stage, they can mainly play the role of non-verbal cues that help us understand the intended message and function as a parallel lingua franca limited in domains of CMC.
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**Introduction**

Over the past two decades, one of the biggest developments affecting human language and the course of life was the rise of computer-mediated communication (CMC), a revolutionary hybrid register that “relies on a blend of features from both traditional modes of communication [spoken and written] in addition to features of its own” (Hamdan, 2021). The introduction of the Internet together with the advent of social media networks and the penetration of thousands of applications made CMC gain momentum, zest and soul. Accordingly, due to its essential role in fostering communication across geographic
boundaries between netizens, scholars from all parts of the world grew interested in examining several linguistic phenomena that occur within it. While some examined the linguistic and textual features of CMC (Crystal, 2001; Segerstad, 2002; Al-Sa’di & Hamdan, 2005; Denis, 2008; Hamdan, 2012; Dressler & Dressler, 2016; Banikalef, 2019, Hamdan, 2021; Hamdan & Al-Salman, 2021, among others), others investigated the commonalities and differences between this new mode of communication and previous modes such as writing and speaking (Crystal, 2001; Palfreyman & Al-Khalil, 2003; Denis, 2008). However, one phenomenon in CMC that has not received thorough scholarly attention and is still awaiting further research is emojis, particularly in terms of their communicative (pragmatic) functions. Consequently, the study reported here aims to fill this gap by (1) identifying the five most commonly used emojis in the Jordanian context and (2) exploring their communicative functions with a view to identifying when Internet users select them and for what purposes.

Emoji (n.d.) is a word borrowed from Japanese – literally, “pictograph”, from e “picture, drawing” + moji “letter, character”. It stands for:

Any of various small images, symbols, or icons used in text fields in electronic communication (as in text messages, e-mail, and social media) to express the emotional attitude of the writer, convey information succinctly, communicate a message playfully without using words, etc. (Emoji, n.d.).

According to Pardes (2018), emojis were first developed in the 1990s by the Japanese developer Shigetaka Kurita who worked for a phone company called ‘NTT DoCoMo’. He came up with the idea of introducing emojis to make it easier and more appealing to the customers to communicate their emotions and convey complex meanings in texts. Kurita’s collection of emojis totaled 176 emojis. Later, witnessing the success of Kurita’s company, other Japanese mobile carriers followed suit and created their own sets of emojis. Eventually, the rise of emojis continued elsewhere in different parts of the world until they became recently so pervasive and integral in our daily communications to the extent that it is difficult to imagine how conversations in CMC could flow smoothly without them (ibid). Each emoji is supposed to substitute one word, emotion or concept. Thus, to express love, a ‘heart’
emoji ❤ could suffice. In fact, whole messages and stories could be expressed through only using sequences of what I would call orphan emoji-sets as they can stand alone without any other textual characters. To illustrate, in a response to a question like: ‘what are you going to do today?’ one can simply respond by using the following orphan set of emojis 🍔🏋️‍♂️сет️😴 to mean ‘I will be eating a burger, weightlifting, taking a shower and having some sleep. Not only can emojis substitute words, but they can also add more warmth and liveliness to messages. A message like ‘I am not mad’ sent after an online quarrel or a misunderstanding between two interlocutors is cold and passive, whilst a message with an emoji showing a face with its tongue stuck out 😛 and a wink is warm and friendly. The addition of an emoji here in such a context softens the verbal message. Emojis are attracting the attention of researchers because they are not just images or icons that convey emotions; they are markers of illocutionary force (Dresner & Herring, 2010); they are face saving (Maiz-Arevalo, 2015); and they are boosters of rapport (Golato & Taleghani-Nikazm, 2006).

Emojis are so pervasive to the extent that makes one dare to say they are the lingua franca of the digital world of today’s media communication. This lingua franca is so diverse that it has emojis that refer to different places from all sorts of cultures like the Statue of Liberty ⛪ in New York, USA, and Kaaba in Mecca, Saudi Arabia, 🕌 and the Tokyo Tower 📡 in Tokyo, Japan, among others.

While developers of social network applications and websites do their best to introduce new emojis that match the growing needs of users, their usage among netizens is developing at a pace that is hard to follow. Apparently, emojis start to drift extensively from their semantic import by acquiring a wide spectrum of new illocutions. This drift is driven by Internet users’ need to better express themselves through making the best of emojis already available at their disposal. Eventually, Internet users start to associate an emoji with multiple communicative functions. Interestingly, some emojis might acquire new illocutions that may even be contradictory to what developers have already planned. For instance, while the Slightly Smiling Face emoji 😊 is supposed to mean a friendly smile, the researcher, based on his observation of
online conversations sent to him by his friends, prior to conducting this study, noticed that it is also used by Jordanian online users when they cannot stand the person they are talking to or when they simply want to put an end to an ongoing conversation that they deem to be boring and pointless.

Owing to the scarcity of studies that address emojis whether in the Arab / Jordanian context or elsewhere, the question of whether the communicative functions of emojis are culture specific or show a tendency towards universality is difficult to answer. In order to come up with a scientific logical answer, the need arises for emojis to be examined in different cultures to be compared and contrasted. Thus, this study sets out to contribute to closing the gap caused by the scarcity of linguistic studies on emojis through examining their communicative functions in the Jordanian context in order to pinpoint when they are used and for what purposes, a contribution that paves the way for future research to examine the universality of such functions.

The current study draws on Austin’s (1962) speech act theory in its attempt to delineate the different functions of emojis. Further, the study is contextualized within computer-mediated communication (CMC) and thus a whole section is devoted to offering an overview of this hybrid means of communication.

Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

(1) What are the five most commonly used emojis in the Jordanian context?

(2) What are the communicative functions of the five most commonly used emojis in this context and when do Jordanian online users include them in their CMC?

However, in order to set the scene for the exploration of the communicative functions of emojis, a review of the speech act theory is due. This review will be followed by a brief presentation of CMC. The section concludes with a review of literature on emoji.

**Speech Acts**

Austin (1962) theorized that we, as human beings, use language to convey a wide range of actions, called speech acts, and that each act consists of three subacts or aspects. Below is a brief account of these subacts (Austin, 1962: 108).
Locutionary act: “uttering a certain sentence with a certain sense and reference”.
(1). Illocutionary act: “utterances which have a certain conventional force [such as ordering, informing, undertaking, warning among others]”.
(2). Perlocutionary act: “What we bring about or achieve by saying something, such as convincing, persuading, deterring, and even, say, surprising or misleading”.
(3). Thus, when someone says ‘I apologize’, the locutionary act is the utterance itself. The illocutionary act is the social function of what is said which is a form of apology while the perlocutionary act is the effect of what has been said on the hearer. Thus, the hearer might either accept or reject the apology.

While a locution is expected to have a direct illocution, (e.g., ‘sorry’ as a locution said to express ‘apologies’ as an illocution), this may not always be the case in real everyday communications. For example, the locution ‘sorry’ could be uttered to convey ‘disagreement’ not ‘apology’ as in ‘sorry, but you are wrong’ (see Hamdan & Mahadin 2021).

A competent language user’s ability to successfully produce speech acts and figure out a given illocutionary force of an utterance whether direct or indirect can be ascribed to what Grice (1975) labelled the cooperative principle and the four maxims he suggested. According to this principle, interlocutors in a conversation expect that each will make a “conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange” (Grice, 1975: 26). The principle has four maxims, viz., quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. In the maxim of quantity, interlocutors should “make their contribution as informative as required [not more than one should and not less]” (ibid.: 27). The maxim of quality is about saying what an interlocutor believes is right, saying the truth. As for the maxim of relevance, interlocutors should say what is relevant to the interaction. Finally, in the maxim of manner, one needs to avoid ambiguity, “be orderly, brief and avoid obscure expressions” (ibid.: 27). Taking these maxims into account, “if communication is successful, the illocution and the perlocution [should be] alike or nearly alike” (Kreidler, 1998: 181).
Although Austin’s (1962) theorizing focuses on the verbal side of communication, the non-verbal side of communication, especially in our case ‘emojis in CMC’ should not be neglected. When an emoji is added to a conversation, it, in a similar fashion to utterances, acts as a locution that has an illocutionary force which invites by convention a response, i.e., a perlocution. When emojis are incorporated in an online message between interlocutors, all stakeholders cooperate, taking into account their knowledge of the norms of speech in their culture, to have a mutual interpretation of them. While this may be easier to handle among people of the same culture since they conventionally associate functions with certain emojis, it could be tricky when interlocutors involved online belong to different cultures.

Emojis in CMC and their interpretations and functions are constantly subject to change due to netizens’ need to better express themselves since the written medium lacks some important communication aids such as facial expressions, gestures and paralinguistic cues, which are all present in face-to-face interaction. While social network and application developers do their best to create emojis that cover all users’ needs, the revolutionary dynamic nature of CMC makes it extremely difficult for developers to fully and timely fulfill these needs. Let us take the *Face Blowing a Kiss* emoji 😘 as an example. While according to emojipedia this emoji is added to represent ‘a kiss goodbye’ or ‘good night’ or to add more ‘affection’ in a conversation, it, based on comments from the Jordanian subjects of this study, could be also used to threaten the other interlocutor as in (1) or to end a conversation that did not go well as in (2). For the readers’ convenience, illustrative examples are presented at three levels: (1) Arabic script, (2) Arabic transcription (see appendix), and (3) English glossing.

(1) 😘

أشخصه لما أحكي لحد دير بالك على حالك بصيغة تهديد

Ana basteqdimu lamma athki: lahadd dir ba:laq sala: ha:laq bi:si:kiit tahdi:id

‘I use it when I want to tell someone in a threatening tone that they better watch out’.

(2) 😘

استخدمه لما بدي أنهمي نقاش واستفز حد مقهور

Basteqdimu lamma bididi: anahi: niqa:i wa bastafriz had maghu:r

‘I use it when I want to end a conversation and provoke an annoyed interlocutor’.
In other words, this emoji is not used entirely for the purpose originally intended by its creators. In fact, some respondents even noted that this is the most fake emoji as can be seen in (3).

ٍـبَأَّنِـهَـمَّ مَا أَكْـذَـبُ هَـالَوَـجَـهَٰٓ وَبِبَنْـقِـهِـرَ كَٰـتِرَمَّ ـنَـلَّـيـ بِـيـعَـتْـلِي يَاـ بَـحْـسَـه هِـيْـكَ خَـبْـيْـثَ (3)

jaː ʔallaː maː ʔakðaːb halwidʒih wa bangahir kθiːr min ʔilli bibʕaθli ʔijaː bahirakiːr biːk ḥabiːθ

‘Oh my God how fake this emoji is. I get mad at people who send it to me because it is malicious’. Put differently, one can see from these examples that similar to verbal utterances, emojis have direct and indirect illocutions. In fact, Jordanian online interlocutors were able to tell from the context the intended function of each emoji. This remark that was brought to the researcher’s attention by some of the subjects indicates that they through employing Grice’s (1975) cooperative principle deduct the intended function of the emoji they encounter.

Bringing the communicative functions of emojis to the fore and analyzing them quantitatively and qualitatively is of paramount value because emojis compensate for the lack of paralinguistic cues in CMC. They foster communication and help language users better interpret and understand each other’s online messages. Furthermore, knowing the communicative functions of emojis cross-culturally minimizes misunderstandings that could occur when an emoji evolves beyond its initial function and eventually develops as a pragmatic marker with multiple illocutions and functions in different cultures.

**CMC: An Overview**

CMC refers to a fast-growing hybrid means of communication that enables interlocutors worldwide to exchange ideas and information through computer networks. Traditionally, the two main means of communication are spoken and written. However, the growing role of the Internet and the development of technology resulted in the introduction of this relatively new mode of communication. The differences and similarities between CMC and both traditional written and spoken means of communication have been a topic for a long and ongoing debate between linguists. While Crystal (2001) considers CMC to be a new linguistic norm, code and electronic revolution, Segerstad (2002) argues that CMC is not a language in its own right but a deviation from...
the standard norm of language, a mere medium or a variant adapted to suit certain situations in the Internet. For Herring (2014) and Hamdan (2021) CMC is a unique hybrid register which relies on a blend of features from both traditional modes of communication in addition to features of its own.

Apparently, chatters’ obsession with communicating effectively under time pressure, to say the least, motivates them to initiate, use and develop a variant form of the standard language or even the spoken one which includes conscious or subconscious excessive use of fragments, misspellings, emojis and abbreviations such as u for ‘you’, z for ‘is’ and c for ‘see’ (Segerstad, 2002). However, unlike the standard norm of writing, these abbreviated forms cannot be said to be misspellings because they are only characterized in this way to achieve the principle of economy. According to Freiermuth (2011: 147), interlocutors here strive to keep pace with a very dynamic and interactive environment replete with multi-threads of conversations that start and then unfold abruptly. If online interlocutors, especially chatters in synchronous CMC, wish to take their time and write every word without using short contracted forms or emojis, they might end up disoriented and may fail to keep pace.

Forms of CMC can be differentiated on two parameters: the number of recipients of a message and the synchronicity of the communicative event (Al Sa’di & Hamdan, 2005; Hamdan, 2012). For the first parameter, there is one-to-one dialogue (e.g., e-mail, Instant Messaging (IM) and Short Message Service (SMS) and one-to-many dialogue (e.g., listservs, newsgroups, Multi-User Dimensions (MUDs) and Matters of Opinions (MOOs). As for the synchronicity of communications, CMC can be divided into asynchronous (delayed communication) such as email and online discussion boards, and synchronous (real time communication) such as chat or IM (Crystal 2001). The focus of the study is on the communicative functions of emojis in one-to-one synchronous dialogue.

**Literature Review**

In one of the earliest studies on non-verbal communication in CMC, Dresner and Herring (2010: 249) study emoticons, which are
often “characterized as iconic indicators of emotion”. The researchers argue that this conception fails to account for some of their important functions, suggesting instead that they are indicators of the illocutionary force of the textual utterances they accompany. In the current study, though, I will show that an emoji can, in fact, form a text in its own right and its own merits. Dresner and Herring (2010) further identify three functions of emoticons:

- [1] emotion, mapped directly onto facial expression (e.g., happy or sad);
- [2] non-emotional meaning, mapped conventionally onto facial expression (e.g., a wink as indicating joking intent; an anxious smile);
- [3] illocutionary force indicators that do not map conventionally onto facial expression (e.g., a smile as downgrading a complaint to a simple assertion) (ibid.: 263).

Skovholt, Gronning and Kankaanranta (2014) examine the communicative functions of emoticons in workplace e-mails. Similar to Dresner and Herring (2010), Skovholt, Gronning and Kankaanranta (2014: 780) argue that emoticons as used in workplace emails do not primarily indicate writers’ emotions and that instead they act as contextualization cues which organize interpersonal relations in written communications and interactions:

“[Emoticons] serve 3 communicative functions. First, when following signatures, emoticons function as markers of a positive attitude. Second, when following utterances that are intended to be interpreted as humorous, they are joke/irony markers. Third, they are hedges: when following expressive speech acts (such as thanks, greetings, etc.) they function as strengtheners and when following directives (such as requests, corrections, etc.) they function as softeners” (Skovholt, Gronning & Kankaanranta, 2014: 780).

In a recent study, Li and Yang (2018) examine the pragmatic functions of emojis in the Chinese context, particularly in Wechat. The researchers classify emojis’ pragmatic functions into seven, namely: attitude / emotion signal, attitude / emotion intensity enhancer, illocutionary force modifier, humor, irony, turn taking / giving, and backchannel device. Further, they report that the top three emojis in the Chinese context are (1) thumb up, (2) rose, and (3) Chinese traditional way of greeting and thanks. Finally, the findings of their study show that Chinese users tend to use more positive emojis than negative ones.
In a very recent study, closely related to the current study in scope, Hamdan (2021) explores the communicative (pragmatic) functions of Facebook *likes* on status updates. The findings of the study show that in the Jordanian context, “the like button is not solely used to show appreciation as originally envisaged by Facebook” and that “it has developed as a pragmatic marker with eight functions”, namely (1) showing unreserved approval and admiration, (2) courtesy and maintaining contact, (3) notifying a user that a post is seen and followed, (4) indicating reserved approval, (5) showing flattering and apple polishing, (6) inviting friends to see a public post, (7) ensuring receipt of notification of comments, and finally (8) showing mockery of published content.

**Methodology**

The data of the study were collected in four stages. For the reader’s convenience, each stage is introduced under a separate subheading.

*The First Stage*

Since this study investigates the communicative functions of the most commonly used emojis in the Jordanian context, the researcher thought that the best technique for collecting relevant data is to use introspection as a means for the participants to reflect on their use of emojis in terms of the purposes, situations, circumstances and settings in which they use them while interacting with their virtual interlocutors. Introspection is an empirical method of enquiry through which subjects reflect on their present or past experiences (Schwitzergebel, 2010). Apparently, this includes reflection on conscious and/or subconscious use of language. In a slightly different context, Hamdan (2005) used this technique to gain insights into the type of communicative strategies used by Jordanian university students while interacting with binomials such as bread and butter, hide and seek, facts and figures. The researcher applied this technique which took the form of a shared a post on his Facebook account in which he asked his Jordanian-Arabic speaking virtual friends to report in a comment the ten most common emojis they use. The post makes it clear that if a respondent cannot report ten, he/she may report less. In actuality, 159 of the 174 compiled comments reported what they thought to be the ten most common emojis, while
six reported the nine most common emojis and nine reported the most common eight emojis.

**The Second Stage**

The researcher compiled 174 comments / responses with 1716 emoji tokens (henceforth, data set (1) on the basis of which he was able to identify the most common emojis by dividing the number of occurrences related to each emoji by the total number of tokens, i.e., 1716. The researcher then chose to include in the analysis the emojis that were suggested to be common by five percent or higher of the participants. The remaining less frequent emojis were not entertained any longer. The number of emojis that matched this criterion was six as shown below in a descending order (1 = most frequent; 6 = least frequent):

1. 😊 The **Face with Tears of Joy**
2. 👍 Like
3. ❤ The **Red Heart**
4. 😊 The **Slightly Smiling Face**
5. 😘 The **Face Blowing a Kiss**
6. 😊 The **Winking Face**

Further details on the quantification of the targeted emojis are provided in table 1 in the next section.

Following the identification of these emojis, the researcher, decided to exclude the *like* emoji as it was fully examined in a previous paper by Hamdan (2021) as replicating that study is not among the goals of the study at hand. To make up for this exclusion, the researcher provided a summary of the functions of the *like* emoji in the literature review.

**The Third Stage**

To identify the set of functions of each of the remaining five emojis, the researcher once again resorted to introspection, sharing another post on his Facebook account in which he asked the same previous group of his virtual friends to report to him when each of them tends to press each emoji and for what purposes. The researcher thus compiled 166 comments / responses for each of the five targeted emojis. After a careful examination of these comments, the researcher found that most of them provided one function for each emoji and a few of them reported two functions for some emojis. However, some of these comments were not helpful to understand ‘when and why some
emojis were used’. In such cases, the researcher contacted their writers for clarification. Consequently, the researcher discarded 10 comments. Eventually, the number of responses / comments on the basis of which the researcher developed a preliminary set of the communicative functions of each emoji and their context (henceforth, data set 2) dropped to 156 and the total number of functions that were identified from these comments was 780.

**The Fourth Stage**

The proposed set of functions (data set 2) was then subjected to a validation process by a panel consisting of two linguist jurors and three senior students from the Department of English at the University of Jordan whose native language is Jordanian Spoken Arabic. They were asked to review each function as reported by the respondents with a view to determining the validity of the researcher’s identification of the proposed communicative functions that each emoji conveys. Most of their judgments were compatible with those of the researcher. However, they noted that some functions were overlapping (e.g., showing appreciation and showing admiration), suggesting more appropriate replacements. A total of 17 functions for the five emojis were finalized. The acceptability of these validated functions was tested against the intuition of 261 Jordanian BA students at the University of Jordan whose native language is Jordanian Spoken Arabic (none of whom were among the researcher’s virtual friends who gave the data sets (1) and (2) selected from an established Facebook group administered by the students of the Faculty of Foreign Languages. This set of data (henceforth, data set (3) were collected through an online task. The researcher opted for this technique to validate the data because it was not possible to initiate face-to-face communication with the subjects due to COVID-19 since universities in Jordan shifted to online learning and no students were taught on campus while the data collection was underway. The online task took the form of a five-point Likert scale to help the subjects give their judgments (agree, strongly agree, indeterminate, disagree and strongly disagree). Further, the task also offered the subjects a chance to add additional functions in case they were not covered in the task and/or provide feedback on the proposed functions and related illustrative tokens. Consequently, two new functions were added, namely, (1) using the slightly smiling face emoji to express sarcasm and mockery, and (2) using the face blowing a kiss
emoji to indicate a threat. The functions that were judged acceptable (i.e. agree or strongly agree) by ten percent or more of the participants were included in the analysis. A total of 19 communicative functions were finalized after the validation process. These functions were thought to be the ones that fairly represent the use of each emoji at this point in time by the Jordanian-Arabic speaking subjects. One limitation of this study though is that males are underrepresented in the study due to the fact that the overwhelming majority of students who completed the online introspection survey were females and thus the gender variable was not considered in the analysis.

**Compliance with Ethical Standards**

All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national committee (Institutional Review Board / Deanship of Academic Research / University of Jordan. Ref. no 118-2021 and with the Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. This article does not contain any studies with animals performed.

Informed consent was obtained from the participants.
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**Results**

**The Five Most Commonly Used Emojis in the Jordanian Context**

The findings of the study showed that the five most commonly used emojis in the Jordanian context based on data set 1 are: (1) *Face with Tears of Joy*, (2) *Red Heart*, (3) *Slightly Smiling Face*, (4) *Face Blowing a Kiss*, and (5) *Winking Face*. For the readers’ convenience, Table 1 shows the number and percentage of tokens associated with each of these emojis.

A glance at table 1 suggests that the Face with Tears of Joy is more likely to be the most frequently used emoji in the CMC of the Jordanian subjects. Interestingly, the high and frequent use of this emoji may yield support to the findings of a report submitted by IPSOS, a global market research company, that monitored and tracked online posts by Jordanians since the first COVID-19 case was recorded in
The Communicative Functions of Emojis: Evidence from Jordanian...

The report concluded that ‘jokes and humor’ is the prevailing theme of Jordanian citizens’ social media content nowadays. Kayed (2020) posits that this report “tracked a total of around 109,300 posts from March 2 until March 18, 2020 and used a social intelligence and analytics application to analyze around 31,700 organic public conversations”. Kayed (2020) further points that the analysis of the report uncovered that 28 per cent of online content pointed to Jordanians easing tensions by spreading humor in order to remain positive throughout this difficult time”.

Table 1
Number and percentage of tokens associated with the five most commonly used emojis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Emoji</th>
<th>Frequency of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Face with Tears of Joy</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Red Heart</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Slightly Smiling Face</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Face Blowing a Kiss</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Winking Face</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Communicative Functions of the Five Most Commonly Used Emojis

In this section, a detailed account of each emoji in table 1 along with its communicative functions is presented and examined. For the readers’ convenience, each emoji is addressed thoroughly under a separate subheading.

The Face with Tears of Joy Emoji 😂

Analysis of data [set 3] shows that the Face with Tears of Joy 😂 was used to convey five communicative functions. Recall that the identified communicative functions of the targeted emojis were tested against the intuitions of 261 Jordanian Arabic-speaking BA students. The results of the acceptability judgment tasks with regard to the Face with Tears of Joy Emoji are presented in table 2. As is clear the proposed functions were not judged equally acceptable. The rate ranges
from 77.4 percent for expressing extreme laughter (the most frequent) to 20 percent for ending an ongoing conversation (the least frequent).

Table 2
Numbers and percentages of judgments for the communicative functions of the Face With Tears of Joy emoji 😂

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Acceptability judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Expressing extreme laughter</td>
<td>202 77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Showing courtesy and maintaining contact</td>
<td>124 47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Teasing and showing mockery</td>
<td>111 42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Softening a tensed situation</td>
<td>98  37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ending an ongoing conversation</td>
<td>52   20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is a brief account of each function along with illustrative examples extracted from the responses (data set 2).

Expressing Extreme Laughter
This is the function that was originally intended for the emoji by its developers when it first came into existence. 77.4 per cent of the subjects agree that they include this emoji in their conversations when they want to convey happiness and joviality as in:

اذا كنت فارطة من الضحك
ʔanaː bastaχdimu ʔiðaː kunt faːr tāt a min ʔiddihik
‘I use it when I am bursting out of laughter’

One interesting finding that was brought to the researcher’s attention by many subjects as part of their feedback on the given tokens is that real laughter is more often characterized by multiple use of this emoji as in (5) while lack of it, more often than not, characterizes a false laughter used mainly for courtesy.

عند فكاهة تسلنا
ʔiðaː hāteːt ʔakθar min wahad minnu bikuːn ʔiθi ʔifij bidahhik ʕan dżad. law wahad yaʃni: badhak tasliːk
‘If I use multiple tokens of this the emoji, this entails that I am laughing for real, but if I only send one token of it, then it is only for courtesy’.
Showing Courtesy

About 47.5 per cent of the subjects reported that they do not laugh when they send this emoji and that instead their real motive for using it is showing courtesy. It is occasionally used in cases where the other interlocutor says something that is not funny as in 6 below:

(bust畜مه لمة لیکن الیشی ملی بضحک بس مطضیره اینی ایعیه من باب المجاملة (6)

‘I fake a laugh by sending it for courtesy purposes when what is said is not funny’.

The subjects also reported that they use it in cases where the other party says something that is not understood clearly as in example 7.

لما اکون یولا فایهما کتیر علی الیشی اینی اسکل الموضوع بیعی ضحکه (7)

‘When I do not understand what is said, I send this emoji to maintain contact and show courtesy’.

Teasing and Showing Mockery

42.5 per cent of the subjects reported that they use this emoji for teasing purposes or for mockery. In example 8, the emoji is used to tease and provoke the other interlocutor.

لما اکون بیتاوی مغ حدا وبی انرفزه بیعی هذاء الیموجی (8)

‘When I am fighting online with someone and I want to tease him, I send this emoji’.

When it comes to mockery, it can be either of others or of oneself as in 9.

تأخیل عالدووم وآعضویی إندیار (9)

‘I arrived late to work and was issued a warning notice’.

Softening a Tense Situation

The lack of paralinguistic cues and facial expressions, the pressure and demand of timely responses coupled with turn taking issues such
as disrupted turn adjacency and floor-keeping are all factors that create a fertile environment for misunderstanding and miscommunication to take place between interlocutors in CMC. This is especially the case when face-threatening acts like criticisms (and disagreements) are involved. 37.5 per cent of the subjects reported that they use this emoji to either prevent a situation from escalating especially if the overall mood became tense and palpable or to de-escalate and soften an already heated and tensed situation or conversation.

أحياناً يفضل استخدامه لما يكون الموضوع جدي وبحس إنه ممكن يتحول لزعل فمن باب كسر الحاجز.

“I use it in serious situations when I feel that the situation is getting tense in order to break the ice’.

لما تدخل نقاش جاد أنت وصديقك وتختلفوا في وجهات النظر وتحاول تانتقد وجهة نظره من دون ما يقلب الموضوع زعل بتحت هذا الشكل في نهاية النقاش لحتى تطري الجو.

‘You insert this emoji towards the end of your conversational turn to soften a tense situation that results when you enter a serious argument with your friend and have an opposing point view’.

لما بدي انتقد حد على اشي او صفة فيه بس ما بدي اياه يزعل مني انو عن طريقة مزح

‘I use it when I want to criticize something in someone but without this driving him mad’.

Jordanian’s employment of the Face with Tears of Joy emoji here is meant to minimize threat to the positive face of the other interlocutor, especially in cases of disagreement! This yields support to findings reported by Hamdan and Mahadin (2021). They posited:
“One way to explain this finding [Jordanians’ non-confrontational and non-aggressive behavior in expressing disagreement] is to appeal to the general tendency of Jordanians to give considerable weight to courtesy in their daily conversations, which sometimes makes them suppress their actual sharp negative feelings or bold disagreements” (Hamdan & Mahadin, 2021: 360).

**Ending a Conversation**

20 per cent of the subjects reported that they use this emoji when they want to end a conversation, especially when they lose interest or when they run short of words and have nothing else to add.

> استخدامي اله لإنهاء الحديث اني ببعثه وخلص انه مضلش كلام عندي

> ‘I use it to end a conversation as I have nothing left to add or say.’

Put differently, some users, borrowing Searle’s (1975) terms, use this emoji to perform a directive illocutionary act to make the other interlocutor or recipient stop interacting.

**The Red Heart Emoji 😍**

While the function for the Red Heart emoji according to emojipedia.org, an online emoji dictionary, is expressing love or admiration, the findings of the current study show that it has three other functions as shown in table 3.

**Table 3**

*Numbers and percentages of judgments for the communicative functions of the Red Heart emoji 😍*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Acceptability judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Expressing affection and admiration</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Showing respect and courtesy</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Expressing gratitude</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Expressing content and happiness</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is a brief account of each of these functions along with illustrative examples.
Expressing Affection and Admiration

66.6 per cent of the subjects associated the Red Heart emoji with expressing feelings of love, affection or admiration towards someone, making this function the most frequent among the four functions of this emoji.

One way to explain the popularity of this emoji as a marker of love and affection is through anecdotal evidence about the heart being considered the hub of love in songs, proverbs, poetry and interpersonal communication to the extent that a person may show admiration of someone by calling him/her galbi ‘my heart’. Actually, this function has a long history; lovers before the Internet era used to draw the red heart in their love letters.

Showing Respect and Courtesy

59 per cent of the subjects reported they use this emoji either to show respect, for instance when they want to pleasantly end a conversation, or as a courtesy marker when for example they react to an idea or a suggestion they do not support from the inside, but, send the red heart out of courtesy. Below are illustrative examples.
In example 16 above, the subject flouts the maxim of quality proposed by Grice (1975) through a white lie by sending the Red Heart emoji to a friend who asked how her dress looks like when the sender actually does not like it.

Social factors like who is talking to whom, where (in a group or a private chat), about what and for what purpose in addition to social dimensions like solidarity, power and formality are all variables that influence the function of each emoji in a given conversation. In the absence of paralinguistic cues, online interlocutors in an attempt to decode the communicative function of an emoji that serves multiple functions depend on borrowing or extrapolating conventions from face-to-face communication (see Dresner & Herring, 2010: 262). The use of the heart to indicate respect is a good example of conventions borrowed from face-to-face non-verbal communication.

**Expressing Gratitude**

A picture is worth a thousand words. In their attempts to show how thankful and grateful they are when words are not expressive enough, 28 per cent of the subjects said they resort to the Red Heart emoji in their online communications.

> يستخدم هذا الإيموجي للتعبير عن الشكر والامتنان الشديد
> ‘I employ this emoji to express great gratitude and thankfulness’.

**Expressing Content and Happiness**

When participants want to show they are pleased or happy with a certain thing, they sometimes use the Red Heart emoji as reported by 11 per cent of them.

> لما أكون كثير مبسوطة مثلا ممكن احكي شريت تلفون جديد
> lamma ʔaku:n kθiːr mabsuːta maθalan mumkin ʔahki: ʃareːt tilifoːn ʔiʤdiːd.
> ‘I send it when I am so happy. I might for instance say, ‘I bought a new phone’.

From this example, one can see that the Red Heart emoji is sometimes sent as an independent visual utterance response and sometimes as a comment on a preceding utterance.
While referring to this function, some subjects reported that they started to use another emoji instead of the Red Heart emoji to express their happiness and content which is the Smiling Face with Red Heart Eyes 😍. To verify this, however, further data collection and investigation is needed.

Now, that we are done exploring the communicative functions of the previous two emojis, let us turn to the Slightly Smiling Face, which is described by many subjects as the most fake of all emojis.

**The Slightly Smiling Face Emoji 😊**

Described by many of the subjects as ‘annoying’, ‘fake’, ‘mean’ and ‘negative’, the Slightly Smiling Face emoji 😊 is one of the most controversial emojis among the Jordanian subjects, making its use a delicate matter that is worth a highlight. This is especially the case for Internet users who belong to other cultures in order to avoid communication breakdowns or misunderstandings.

In this regard, it is interesting to note that ‘expressing happiness’, the direct illocution of this emoji and the main function originally intended for it by its developers, is considered by the subjects (data set 3) to be the least common, whilst expressing disapproval, discontent, shock and disinterest is the most common composite function as can be seen from table 4.

**Table 4**

*Numbers and percentages of judgments for the communicative functions of the Slightly Smiling Face emoji 😊*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Acceptability judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Expressing disapproval, discontent, shock and disinterest</td>
<td>211 (81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Teasing</td>
<td>58 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Expressing sarcasm or mockery</td>
<td>51 (19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Expressing content and happiness</td>
<td>29 (11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is a brief account on each function along with illustrative examples.

**Expressing Sapproval, Siscontent, Shock and Disinterest**

Contrary to expectations, the Slightly Smiling Face emoji 😊 was found to be a marker of dissatisfaction by 80 per cent of the subjects.
A high percentage of the subjects reported that they frequently use this emoji when they do not approve of something said or written by their interlocutor(s). They added that they also use it when they are discontent and shocked by an action performed by their interlocutor(s), or when they lose interest in the conversation and want their interlocutor(s) to know that they do not want to talk about a certain topic anymore or that they even do not want to continue talking to each other at that time. Below are illustrative examples.

(19) لما يكون في اختلف بالرأي مع شخص وهو مش راضي يقتنع بوجهة نظرك ومصر على كلامه وانت زهقت من النقاش ببعثه.

lamma ʔiju:? fi: ʔiχtila:f birra?j maʕ fa:ʃ w huwwa muf ra:di jiqtiniʃ biwi듯h bt naqarak w mussir ʕala kala:mu w ʔinta zihiqit min ʔinniga:f maʕu babʕaθu

‘When there is a disagreement and the other interlocutor sticks to his guns not willing to accept my view, I use it to show that I am fed up and got bored of arguing’.

(20) لما يكون قصدي (حل عني مش طايقك.


‘When I challenge my friend that something will happen and it then happens. It is as if I am telling my friend ‘you see! I told you so!’

Teasing Others when Winning a Challenge

22 per cent of the subjects reported that they use this emoji for teasing purposes when they prove someone wrong or when they win a challenge or an augment.

(21) لما أتحدى صديقي انه الشغلة الفلانية حتصير وفعلا تصير )انه شفتي كلامي.


‘When I challenge my friend that something will happen and it then happens. It is as if I am telling my friend ‘you see! I told you so!’

Expressing Sarcasm or Mockery

19.5 per cent of the subjects reported the use of this emoji to express sarcasm or mockery; some even report its synonymity with ‘for real’, ‘you must be kidding’ when two expressions are used to mock someone.
Expressing Content and Happiness

11 per cent of the subjects use the Slightly Smiling Face emoji 😊 to show that they are happy.

In light of the foregoing discussion, it is important to note that according to some subjects, assigning happiness with this emoji is diminishing since there are newer emojis that better express happiness without having negative connotations. In the words of Doaa’, a subject in this study:

‘I stopped using this emoji long time ago because there are other emojis that better express how I feel. To me, it is a trend that is on its way to extinction’.

Some of the alternatives to this emoji which were cited by some respondents but require further analysis in future research to see if they are more associated with expressing happiness or not include the Smiling Face with Smiling Eyes emoji 😊 and the Hugging Face emoji 😘.
The Communicative Functions of Emojis: Evidence from Jordanian...

The Face Blowing a Kiss emoji 😘

Described as ‘sly’ and ‘the most fake emoji’ by some of the respondents and as ‘cute’ and ‘sincere’ by others, the Face Blowing a Kiss 😘 is another controversial emoji that has positive and negative attributes. It is used by the subjects to convey four functions as shown in table 5.

Table 5
Numbers and percentages of judgments for the communicative functions of the Face Blowing a Kiss emoji 😘

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Acceptability judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Sending love</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Showing courtesy</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Ending a discussion or a conversation</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Indicating a threat</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is a brief account of each function along with illustrative examples.

Sending Love

47 per cent of the subjects reported that they employ this emoji when they want to express their love to their interlocutors or when they want to give them a virtual kiss.

‘I use it to send love to those who are very close to me’.

Showing Courtesy

While for some subjects, the Face Blowing a Kiss 😘 is honest and sincere, for others, (35 per cent), it is only used to show courtesy, especially when sending or responding to compliments.

© Hamdan Hady
‘I occasionally use it with those with whom I do not have a strong relationship to show courtesy when responding to something they said or wrote.’

**Ending a Discussion or a Conversation**

29.5 per cent of the subjects reported that they use this emoji as a replacement to ‘bye’ when they want to end the conversation or have nothing else to add.

بنبعثه آخر الحديث عشان ننهي المحادثة لما ما يضل شي ينحكى (26)

bnibʕaθu ʔaːxir ʔilħadiːθ ʔaʃaːn ninhiː ʔilmuhadaθi lamma maː jddal fiː jinhakaː

‘I send it to end a conversation when I have nothing to add’.

**Indicating a Threat**

It is interesting to note that 20.6 per cent of the subjects reported that they use the *Face Blowing a Kiss* emoji in online fights or quarrels to threaten and warn their interlocutors.

انا بستخدمه لما أحكي لحد دير بالك على حالك بصيغة تهديد (27)

ʔanaː ʔaʃtaχdimu lamma ʔaħkiː laħad diːr baːlak ʕalaː ħaːlak biʃiːʁi tahdiːd

‘I use it to tell someone in a threatening tone that they better watch out’.

**The Winking Face Emoji 😏**

Analysis of the data revealed that this emoji is associated with two functions only, viz., (1) threatening, and (2) showing agreement as shown in table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Acceptability judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Indicating a threat</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Showing agreement</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Indicating a Threat**

87.7 per cent of the subjects reported they use the Winking Face to threaten other interlocutors online. The threat could be serious in some cases, but in other cases, it is only a form of teasing between friends, especially if say user A who sends this emoji knows that user B, his/her virtual friend is lying about something and user A wants user B to know that his/her lie is not working.

\[ \text{بستخدمه للتهديد بين صاحباتي لما كون ماسكة عليهم ممسك} \] (28)

\[
\text{I use it with my close friends to threaten and tease them when I know they are lying or hiding something from me’}.
\]

**Showing Agreement**

37.5 per cent of the subjects reported that they employ this emoji when they want to show that they are on the same page with their interlocutors or that they are in agreement with them.

\[ \text{انا بستخدامه لما اكون متفقة مع الشخص أو عجبني رأيه} \] (29)

\[
\text{’I use it to show agreement with someone or appreciation of their views’}.
\]

**Conclusions**

The findings of this study show that the five most common emojis in the Jordanian context, like aside, are (1) the Face With Tears of Joy 😢, (2) the Red Heart ❤️, (3) the Slightly Smiling Face 😊, (4) the Face Blowing a Kiss 😗, and (5) the Winking Face 😘. A total of 19 communicative functions of the these five emojis were identified. Further, the findings of the study show that some emojis have some major functions and some minor ones. For instance, the Slightly Smiling Face emoji 😊 was employed by 80 percent of the subjects (data set 3) to express disapproval, while it was employed by 22 percent, 19.5 percent, and 11 percent respectively to express (1) teasing, (2) sarcasm and mockery, and (3) content and happiness. In addition
and in line with the findings in Golato and Teleghani-Nikazm (2006), Dresner and Herring (2010), and Maiz-Arevalo (2015) the findings show that emojis are not only used to show emotions, but can also act as markers of illocutionary force, as face saving devices, and as boosters of rapport. Using Searle’s (1975) taxonomy of speech acts, the findings reveal that the set of emojis examined in this study can be employed to perform multiple illocutionary acts including but not limited to expressive acts (happiness, admiration, discontent, etc.), directive acts (e.g., directing the addressee to stop typing or arguing) and as declarative acts (e.g., threatening). Moreover, the findings of this study yield support for Petra’s et al. (2015) division of emojis into positive, negative, or neutral. However, the findings of this study differ from those in Petra et al. (2015) in that the same emoji can in actuality fill all three sentiments depending on context, social distance and social factors like who is talking to whom, where, and for what purpose.

Finally, the researcher posits that although emojis are evolving and developing at a rapid pace, becoming more diverse, pervasive and integral in our daily communications, sharing even some of the characteristics of human language such as arbitrariness, they remain a mode of communication within CMC. At this stage, they can mainly play the role of non-verbal cues that help us understand the intended message and function as a parallel lingua franca limited in domains of use to CMC.

Since the data of this study were provided by a Jordanian sample, consisting mainly of females, further research may investigate how males and females perceive the same emojis and whether there are some emojis and some functions that are gender-specific or not. Another interesting variable to explore is the age variable. Unfortunately, this variable was not taken into account in this study because the majority of the subjects who took part in this study are in their early twenties and mid-thirties, but it is definitely a variable that is worth exploring.

A final recommendation is to examine the communicative functions of the same emojis explored in this study but in other languages to see to what extent they show a tendency towards universality.
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Appendix
Key to transliteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic alphabet</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>﴾</td>
<td>ʔuχt</td>
<td>sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺗ</td>
<td>ﺘ</td>
<td>ʔalδ3</td>
<td>snow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>ﺝ</td>
<td>δģundiː</td>
<td>soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>ﺡ</td>
<td>ﻩ�a:n</td>
<td>horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>ﺧ</td>
<td>ʔaruf</td>
<td>sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>ﺟ</td>
<td>δanab</td>
<td>tail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺛ</td>
<td>ﺛ</td>
<td>zudญา:d3</td>
<td>glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>ﺝ</td>
<td>ﻣuɾta</td>
<td>police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>ﺱ</td>
<td>sunduːq</td>
<td>box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>ﺕ</td>
<td>duːʔ</td>
<td>light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ط</td>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>ta:.lib</td>
<td>student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ظ</td>
<td>ﺩ</td>
<td>δalaːm</td>
<td>darkness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ع</td>
<td>ﺡ</td>
<td>ﺡasal</td>
<td>honey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غ</td>
<td>ﺯ</td>
<td>ʔuraːb</td>
<td>crow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ق</td>
<td>ﺣ</td>
<td>qaːʔid</td>
<td>leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>و</td>
<td>ﺔ</td>
<td>waɾaʔa</td>
<td>papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>يَ</td>
<td>ﻦ</td>
<td>jasaːr</td>
<td>left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(فتحة)١</td>
<td>ﺪ</td>
<td>qaraʔa</td>
<td>he read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ضمّة)١</td>
<td>ﻦ</td>
<td>muɾaʔa</td>
<td>cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(كسرة)١</td>
<td>ﺔ</td>
<td>ʕid</td>
<td>count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مد طويل ١</td>
<td>ﺪ</td>
<td>ka:.tib</td>
<td>writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ضمة طويلة و</td>
<td>ﺪ</td>
<td>huɾu:b</td>
<td>wars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كسرة طويلة ي</td>
<td>ﺪ</td>
<td>dʒiːl</td>
<td>generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diphthongs (أصوات علة مركزية)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aw</td>
<td></td>
<td>mawz</td>
<td>banana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aj</td>
<td></td>
<td>sayf</td>
<td>sword</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

АНОТАЦІЯ
Мета. У статті розглядаються комунікативні (також відомі як прагматичні) функції найпоширеніших п’яти емодзі в йорданському контексті, як їх сприймають та розуміють йорданські користувачі Facebook.
Методологія. Збір даних проводився у чотири етапи. Спочатку дослідник розмістив на своєму обліковому записі у Facebook пост, у якому попросив своїх віртуальних друзів, які говорять йорданською та арабською мовами, повідомити в коментарях про найбільш поширені емоди, які вони
використовують. Дослідник зібрав 174 коментарі / відповіді з 1716 маркерами емодзі. По-друге, отримані токени були використані для визначення п'яти найпоширеніших емодзі. По-третє, щоб визначити набір функцій кожного емодзі, дослідник опублікував ще один пост, у якому попросив ту саму попередню групу повідомити, коли кожен з них схильний натискати кожен емодзі і для яких цілей. На основі отриманих коментарів був укладений попередній список функцій. Нарешті, запропоновані функції були перевірені двома йорданськими лінгвістами, які розмовляють арабською мовою, і трьома студентами старших курсів факультету англійської мови Йорданського університету. Більшість їхніх суджень збіглись з думкою дослідника. Для подальшого підтвердження даних прийнятність виявлених функцій була перевірена на інтуїцію 261 йорданським студентом бакалавріату Йорданського університету.

Результати. Результати показали п'ять найпоширеніших емодзі в їорданському контексті, а саме: (1) обличчя зі слюзами радості, (2) червоне серце, (3) злегка усміхнене обличчя, (4) обличчя з поцілунком, (5) обличчя, яке підморгує. Крім того, емодзі використовуються не тільки для демонстрації емоцій, але й можуть виступати у якості маркерів іллокутивної сили як засоби збереження обличчя і як засоби зміцнення раппорта. Набір емодзі, розглянутий у цьому дослідженні, може бути використаній для виконання 19 різних іллокутивних актів, включаючи, але не обмежуючись експресивними актами (щастя, захоплення тощо), директивними актами (наприклад, вказівка адресату припинити щось робити) та декларативними актами (наприклад, небезпека). Емодзі використовуються як передачі функцій, передбачених їх творцями. Навпаки, з часом емодзі починають широко відходити від свого семантичного імпорту, набуваючи широкого спектру нових іллокуцій.

Висновки. Дослідження дозволяє зробити висновок, що, хоча емодзі розвиваються та еволюціюють швидкими темпами, стаючи все більш різноманітними, поширеніми та невід’ємними у нашій повсякденній комунікації, розглядаючи навіть деякі характеристики людської мови, такі як довільність, вони залишаються способом спілкування у межах комп’ютерно-опосередкованої комунікації (КОК). На даному етапі вони можуть відігравати роль переважно невербальних підказок, які допомагають нам зрозуміти передбачуване повідомлення, і функціонувати як паралельний лінгва-франк, обмежена у доменах СМС.
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