

DECODING DIGITAL HOSTILITY: NON-VERBAL MECHANISMS OF HATE SPEECH IN ELECTRONIC DISCOURSE

ANNA KARAPETYAN* 
Yerevan State University

The study investigates how non-verbal elements such as emojis function as vehicles of hate speech in digital communication. While hate speech has traditionally been defined through verbal or textual aggression, contemporary online environments reveal a broader, multimodal landscape where hostility is often conveyed implicitly through images, icons, and affective cues. Drawing on qualitative multimodal discourse analysis, this research integrates approaches from critical discourse analysis and social semiotics to examine how the mentioned non-verbal sign contributes to the expression and circulation of hate in electronic discourse. Data are drawn from publicly available media posts and analysed for recurring semiotic patterns, cultural symbolism, and the interplay between textual and visual modes. The study explores how users employ non-verbal cues to reinforce stereotypes, exclude social groups, or express aggression. By illuminating the subtle ways hate operates beyond language, this research emphasizes the need to expand definitions of hate speech to encompass multimodal dimensions of online communication. Ultimately, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of how digital symbols shape affective interaction and ideological meaning in contemporary electronic discourse.

Key words: *electronic discourse, hate speech, multimodality, emoticons/emojis, affective interaction*

Introduction

While face-to-face communication allows for a wide spectrum of nonverbal expression: facial expressions, gestures, tone, and body language, computer-mediated communication (CMC) differs from it not only in style but also in the physical and sensory limitations that distinguish it from other forms of human interaction. Electronic discourse operates within a primarily textual and visual medium that lacks these immediate cues. To bridge this gap, users have developed alternative modes of expressing emotion and interpersonal stance, most notably through emoticons which are typographic representations of facial expressions made up of punctuation marks, letters,

* Աննա Կարապետյան – բանասիրական գիտությունների թեկնածու, ԵՊՀ անգլիական բանասիրության ամբիոնի ախտեսն

Анна Карапетян – кандидат филологических наук, ассистент кафедры английской филологии ЕГУ
Anna Karapetyan – Candidate of Philological Sciences, Assistant at YSU Chair of English Philology

Armenian Language

Email: an.karapetyan@ysu.am ORCID:ID <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-0520-8379>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

Մտագլեկ է՝ 04.02.2026

Գրախոսվել է՝ 18.02.2026

Հաստատվել է՝ 12.03.2026

© The Author(s) 2026

or other characters, and through emojis, graphical icons that depict a variety of facial expressions, gestures, and objects. Many software programs and online platforms, such as Microsoft Word, messaging apps, and social media systems, have automatically transformed typographic emoticons into colorful, animated emoji forms, making them more expressive and interactive within digital discourse.

Since the emergence of CMC research in the 1990s, emoticons and emojis have been recognized as “indicators of affective states, the purpose of which is to convey nonlinguistic information that in face-to-face communication is conveyed through facial expression and other bodily indicators” (Dresner & Herring, 2010, p. 250). For instance, inserting a smiling face into a message compensates for the inability to physically smile in an online exchange. The use of emoticons (*emotion + icon*) dates back to the early years (1980s) of computer-mediated interaction (Herring & Dainas, 2017), while emojis (from the Japanese *e – picture + moji – letter, character*) were introduced later, becoming widely accessible in the early 2010s when mobile devices and social networking platforms integrated them into messaging systems. While often regarded as the evolution of emoticons, emojis are visually richer and semantically broader, capable of representing not only emotions but also objects, symbols, and cultural references (Herring & Dainas, 2017). Defined by the Oxford English Dictionary (n.d.) as “a small digital image or icon used to express an idea or emotion”, emojis have thus expanded the semiotic repertoire of CMC, contributing to new, multimodal ways of expressing social meanings online.

Today, emojis have become valuable tools in text-based communication, especially within socio-emotional contexts (Derks et al., 2007; Rivera et al., 1996). They offer users an alternative means of expressing thoughts, emotions, and subtle mood shifts through limited digital channels. By adding affective cues to otherwise impersonal exchanges, these visual symbols help foster connection and engagement in socio-emotional interaction.

Traditionally, hate speech has been conceptualized as a linguistic phenomenon, a verbal or textual act that explicitly vilifies, insults, or dehumanizes individuals or groups on the basis of protected characteristics such as race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or disability. In this classical sense, hate resides in the language itself: in the words, phrases, and discursive structures that encode prejudice or perpetuate stereotypes. However, in contemporary digital environments, the boundaries of hate speech have become increasingly fluid and multimodal. Online hostility often transcends words, manifesting instead through paralinguistic and visual cues such as emoticons, emojis, memes, reaction icons, and other interactional symbols that can implicitly circulate hateful meanings or reinforce exclusionary ideologies. Such non-verbal elements may amplify or legitimize discriminatory discourse without explicit verbal aggression, functioning as subtle but powerful carriers of bias and social othering.

Consequently, understanding hate speech in digital contexts requires an expanded analytical framework – one that acknowledges the interplay between language, image, and interaction. This study approaches the phenomenon of non-verbal hate expression through a **(1) qualitative multimodal discourse analysis** that integrates perspectives from **(2) critical discourse analysis** and **(3) social semiotics**. It aims to explore how non-verbal cues such as emojis participate in the construction and circulation of hate in online communication. Specifically, the paper seeks a response to

1. How emojis contribute to the implicit expression or reinforcement of hate speech in electronic discourse,
2. In what ways these visual and affective signs function to shape the hateful tone and meaning of online interactions,
3. What semiotic and discursive mechanisms allow these non-verbal elements to operate as tools of exclusion, irony, or aggression within digital communities.

By addressing these issues, the paper seeks to disclose how digital symbols, often perceived as playful or benign, can also become vehicles of hostility and social division. The analytical section that follows examines selected instances of electronic discourse to trace how hate operates beyond language, revealing the subtle, multimodal dimensions through which online hostility is expressed, normalized, or contested.

Theoretical overview and methodology

According to Walther and D'Addario (2001), emojis can play a key role in the decoding of text messages in computer mediated communication. This means that the mentioned non-verbal, affective cue can strengthen text messages. For example, it can shift the orientation of a message in the opposite direction, just like in the case of sarcastic utterances (Lo, 2008). When two components are pointed in opposite affective directions (positive and negative), the linguistic aspect has a greater effect on the overall affective appraisal of the message, i.e., the negative element in a message, whether verbal or visual, can impact comprehension and cause the message to be understood differently. For example, a positive message with a smile is rated higher than a purely positive message, and a negative message with a supporting frown is rated to be more negative than a purely negative message. Scholars argue, though, that emojis do not have “the power to turn the valence of the verbal message around” (Luor, 2010, p. 894).

The force of reaction icons, including emojis, is especially evident in hate speech, where they function to intensify the affective tone of a hostile utterance. A single reaction icon can transform an apparently neutral statement into one charged with irony, contempt, or aggression. For example, the use of a laughing or winking face following a derogatory comment may signal mockery or ridicule, strengthening the literal aggression. In this way, the non-verbal elements of digital discourse participate in complex acts of meaning-making that extend beyond the surface of language.

As already mentioned in the Introduction, to uncover the subtle processes of the usage of emojis in online hate speech, the study employs qualitative multimodal discourse analysis (MDA), integrating principles from critical discourse analysis (CDA) and social semiotics (SS). MDA provides a framework for interpretive investigation of multiple semiotic modes (textual, visual, and affective) which interact to produce meaning in digital environments (Kress, 2010; Machin, 2013). CDA, in turn, is based on the ideological and power dimensions of discourse, focusing on how certain communicative practices reproduce social inequalities or normalize prejudice (Fairclough, 1995; Van Dijk, 1998). From a social semiotic perspective (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001), these symbols operate as tools that users mobilize to construct and negotiate social relationships, values, and ideologies. They are not simply decorative symbols; they are socio-culturally situated signs whose meanings depend on shared conventions and contextual cues.

By combining the three approaches, the research captures both the micro-level dynamics of emoji use and the macro-level structures of meaning in which these practices are embedded. Within online communities, their specific combinations or appropriations can acquire meanings associated with particular ideologies, including hate-based or extremist discourses. For instance, certain symbols may be recontextualized as markers of racial superiority, political allegiance, or exclusionary group identity. Through repetition and circulation, these symbols gain new connotative layers, forming part of the multimodal expression of online hate.

The study adopts an interpretative research design, focusing on naturally occurring data from publicly accessible social media platforms. Posts, comments, and interaction threads that exhibit potential hate-related content are sampled using purposive selection criteria, specifically, instances where non-verbal cues/reaction icons accompany explicit textual expressions of hostility. To ensure ethical compliance, only publicly available data are used, and no personal identifiers are retained. Attention is given to the sequencing, placement, and contextual framing of emojis within the message. The analysis proceeds in three stages:

1. **Descriptive phase:** Identifying and categorizing the non-verbal elements that accompany or replace verbal text (e.g., smiling face, fire, clown, skull, or animal emojis).
2. **Interpretive phase:** Exploring the affective and semiotic functions of these elements to see whether they reinforce, subvert, or disguise hateful meanings.
3. **Critical phase:** Interpreting how these multimodal combinations contribute to broader patterns of exclusion, stereotyping, or ideological alignment within digital discourse.

Through this layered analysis, the study aims to trace the trajectories of hate, from explicit verbal aggression. This theoretical and methodological framework seeks to humanize the study of hate speech by recognizing the emotional and symbolic complexity of digital interaction. Emojis, though small and seemingly trivial, carry emotional resonance and social significance that shape how users experience and respond to hostility online. By examining these multimodal forms of expression, the study seeks to contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of digital affect, ideology, and the everyday performance of hate in electronic discourse.

Multimodal analysis of hate: emojis and online hostility

Today's digital communication is not shaped by words alone. Every reaction icon or visual cue that accompanies a message carries meaning. The meaning can be playful, ironic, and, at times, deeply hostile. In the virtual world where text and image intertwine, the expression of hate has evolved into a subtle, multimodal practice. What was once expressed through explicit language can now be delivered through a symbol sign whose significance depends on shared cultural understanding.

In this chapter we will explore the small but potent visual elements, emojis, that participate in the production and circulation of online hostility. When placed alongside, or even in place of verbal text, these symbols shape a still more emotional discourse, and are commonly viewed as tools of irony, mockery, and also serve as affective amplifiers of exclusion, aggression and hatred. The latter is especially typical of “hostile comments that are common to a number of types of unwanted behavior including harassment and aggression” (Liu et al, 2018).

Thus, in this chapter we will examine selected instances of electronic communication to uncover how emojis function within hateful exchanges, how they act in the interplay between image and text, how they negotiate meanings and embody ideological stances. These cases will reveal that in the digital age behind every emoji lies a complex interaction of intent, interpretation, and affect, that the language of hate is not only what is said, but also what is *shown through* emotion. By decoding these layers, we can better grasp how digital users construct, disguise, or challenge hate through the multimodal resources of contemporary online communication.

Let us discuss the following example by Placeholder (6 March 2024) from the Facebook:

Placeholder: *Who thought this recipe was a good idea... 🤢🤢🤢🤢🤢🤢 seriously I'm traumatized.*

In the comment, the writer basically expresses strong disgust at a recipe on Facebook. The words *Who thought this was a good idea; seriously I'm traumatized* already show exaggerated disappointment and hate. But the real meaning becomes clearer when we look at the post as a whole. The line of 🤢 and 🤢 emojis adds a visual layer that makes the emotional reaction feel even stronger. These emojis are widely understood as signs of intense and disgust. The alternating pattern creates a kind of rhythm that makes the disgust feel louder and more intense. The **anger and disgust emojis strengthen the dislike into a performance of revulsion**. Even though the target is just a recipe, the structure follows patterns we often see in negative online comments: the text questions the decision behind the post (*Who thought this was a good idea?*), and adding the emojis to the verbal comment – creates a strong, dismissive reaction. In online culture, disgust emojis are sometimes used not just to show dislike but to mark something as embarrassing or worthy of being made fun of. While this example is not a personal hate towards another person, it still uses the same tools that can make online comments feel hostile. The phrase *I'm traumatized* is an exaggeration in casual digital language, but paired it with dramatic emojis, it expresses a lot of online negativity and hostility. Thus, the text alone shows strong dislike and exaggeration, the emojis alone signal extreme disgust, together, they turn a simple *This doesn't look good* as a vivid, performative expression of hatred.

On Instagram, the CNN posted a photo of the famous pop star Beyoncé and an attached material entitled *Beyonce makes Grammy history for most wins ever by a female artist* (15 March 2021). The verbal material reads: *Beyoncé made Grammy history for the most wins ever by a female artist with 28 awards. The singer nabbed four gramophones on Sunday after winning best R&B performance for Black Parade; best music video for Brown Skin Girl; and best rap performance and best rap song with Megan Thee Stallion for the remixed Savage. Beyoncé is now three wins away from the all-time record of 31, held by late conductor Georg Solti (Kevin Winter/Getty Images for The Recording Academy)*. The following comment is under the post:

fcuk_the_nwo: *Yes I'm sure this was an award for her singing 🤔*

The verbal comment of the author, nicknamed fcuk_the_nwo, expresses skepticism and dismissiveness. It implies that Beyoncé did not deserve the award based

on talent. However, the full meaning of the comment becomes clearer once we consider the clown emoji. In everyday online culture, the clown emoji is often used to call someone foolish, fake, undeserving and embarrassing. In this case, it communicates ridicule which, when paired with a sarcastic sentence, intensifies the hostility. The comment does not express mild disagreement, it rather expresses direct contempt. It does not say *I don't think she deserved it*, it says it *She is a joke*, and this matters in the context of hate or bias. In discussions of public figures, especially non-whites like Beyoncé, such comments can tap into broader patterns of minimization of achievement, dismissive or mocking attitudes toward success, subtle forms of devaluation. While the comment does not explicitly state a hateful slur, the **clown emoji amplifies the ridicule/mockery and the overall negative tone** of the verbal message and signals alignment with a community that uses such symbolic cues to delegitimize certain groups or individuals. Thus, the hostility is performed through a symbol that readers instantly recognize. As to multimodal meaning, it functions in the following way: the text expresses sarcastic skepticism, the emoji alone – general mockery or ridicule, and the text + emoji – targeted contempt. This combination allows the commenter to maintain deniability. The overall analysis illustrates how (1) emojis intensify or sharpen negativity, how (2) symbolic cues can carry socially coded meanings, and finally, (3) how multimodal communication blurs the lines between explicit and implicit aggression. In short, the clown emoji works as a subtle but powerful way to convey disrespect and delegitimation, showing how non-verbal digital symbols contribute to hostile online discourse.

On Instagram, the CNN posted a photo of Meghan Markle entitled *They were willing to lie to protect other members of the family, but they weren't willing to tell the truth to protect me and my husband* (8 March 2021). The verbal material reads: *Meghan, Duchess of Sussex, and Prince Harry lifted the lid on life in the British royal family in an explosive interview with Oprah Winfrey Sunday night. Meghan said she was silenced after she married Harry and joined the royal family. Tap the link in our bio for 11 things we learned from the bombshell (CBS)*. A comment runs as follows:

Madam.royall: She is a big L I A R!!!! 🤡🤡🤡🤡🤡

The aggressive and accusatory statement with added emphasis through capitalization and multiple exclamation marks which dramatize the situation, explicitly accuses Meghan of being a *liar*. This exaggeration signals heightened emotional intensity because, rather than expressing a neutral disagreement, it constitutes a direct attack. This aligns with patterns of performative hostility frequently observed in online discourse. The **goblin/demon mask emoji amplifies disgust, hostility, and moral condemnation**. Its repetition in its turn creates a visual rhythm, intensifying the emotional signal still more. The emoji does more than reinforce the verbal accusation – it visually dramatizes hostility and hatred, converting the textual claim into a performative act. While the emoji alone functions as a visual marker of hostility and moral judgment, signaling disgust and negative affect, the text + emoji combination creates a performative attack that is emotionally charged and socially legible, thus signaling alignment with a community that views Meghan negatively, leveraging shared semiotic understanding of the emoji to reinforce group identity and implicit bias. Although the comment does not explicitly reference race, gender, or class, it participates in broader discourses in which public figures are delegitimized and attacked. The exaggerated text and repeated emojis allow the user to enact aggression in a socially

recognized and impactful manner, while the symbolic play of the emoji offers some deniability. Similar to the Beyoncé clown emoji incident, the demon mask emoji functions as a symbol of extreme hatred. Thus, the overall analysis shows that the emoji (1) conveys an affective, social, and ideological message, (2) its repetition transforms a verbal insult into a multimodal performance of exaggerated hate and hostility. This example illustrates how online hate can operate through both linguistic and visual channels to produce socially legible hostility and demonstrates how emojis can participate in online delegitimation without the use of overtly hateful language.

Other emojis that intensify hate and hostility and contribute to the expression and circulation of hate in electronic discourse include:

☹️ The **angry face emoji** conveys anger, frustration, annoyance, and emotional intensity. When used in a comment, it amplifies the expression of anger and makes it difficult to interpret the message as mild irritation. In this sense, the emoji functions as an emotional amplifier: it signals the sender’s heightened emotional state and can make accompanying criticism feel more forceful, confrontational and hateful.

😡 The **face with symbols over the mouth** represents extreme rage, cursing, or moral outrage. It visually substitutes for words the sender may choose not to type, adding a sense of shock, aggression, hatred. This emoji intensifies the perceived severity of the statement and contributes to a hostile, emotionally charged tone.

👹 The **angry face with horns** suggests malicious intent, hostility, or a form of mischievous aggression. It heightens the sense of ill will and often makes the accompanying text feel more threatening or intense.

💀 The **skull emoji** is commonly associated with death or destruction, but in online contexts it signals extreme disdain or the “end” of patience. It conveys strong negativity and adds a dramatic tone that amplifies feelings of exasperation, disgust, contempt, hatred.

👎 The **thumbs down emoji** signals disapproval, rejection, or dislike. Much like its offline counterpart, it serves as a clear nonverbal cue that reinforces the user’s negative assessment, making the emotional stance explicit and difficult to overlook.

Overall, these and other so-called hate or negative-affect emojis function in several key ways:

- They add a nonverbal layer that makes emotional expression more vivid than text alone.
- They increase the perceived intensity of the message.
- They mirror offline emotional cues by visually representing heightened anger, frustration, disgust, or hostility.

In this sense, hate-coded emojis operate as a form of emotional punctuation. They do more than illustrate a message – they magnify it, signaling urgency, intensity, animosity, hatred. When paired with verbal statements, they produce a more emphatic and sometimes more confrontational affective impact.

Conclusion

Understanding hate speech as a multimodal phenomenon is therefore essential for capturing how hostility actually operates in digital contexts. Online environments enable forms of aggression that are distributed across text, image, and affect, creating

communicative practices that are at once more implicit and more intense. Recognizing these dynamics does not mean treating every emoji as inherently harmful, but rather acknowledging that their meanings are flexible, context-dependent, and shaped by the social ideologies circulating within digital communities.

The findings demonstrate that emojis can function as affective intensifiers, ideological cues, and socially coded markers of contempt, ridicule, hatred. When paired with hostile text, they transform a simple criticism into a multimodal performance of disdain; when used alone, they may implicitly communicate attitudes that would be more easily recognized as hateful if expressed verbally. By highlighting these dynamics, the analysis emphasizes the need to rethink conventional definitions of hate speech that privilege explicit linguistic content.

Most importantly, this research argues for the expansion of hate speech frameworks beyond strictly verbal definitions. By paying attention to the affective and symbolic power of emojis, scholars, platforms, and policymakers can better understand how hostility is expressed, normalized, and sometimes masked in electronic discourse. As digital communication continues to evolve toward increasingly image-based and affect-driven forms, scholars, platform designers, and policymakers must consider the multimodal mechanisms through which harmful meanings are constructed and shared. Recognizing the semiotic and emotional complexity of emojis allows for a more nuanced understanding of digital hostility and a more comprehensive approach to addressing it.

ԱՆՆԱ ԿԱՐԱՊԵՏՅԱՆ – Ատելության խոսքի ոչ խոսքային մեխանիզմները էլեկտրոնային դիսկուրսում – Ներկայացվող ուսումնասիրությունը դիտարկում է ոչ խոսքային տարրերի՝ հատկապես էմոջիների դերը ատելության խոսքում: Թեև ատելության խոսքը ավանդաբար սահմանվել է որպես բանավոր ազդեցիկ, սակայն ժամանակակից հարթակները բազմաձևապես պատկեր են, որտեղ թշնամական վերաբերմունքը հաճախ արտահայտվում է անուղղակիորեն՝ պատկերների և հուզական նշանների միջոցով: Տվյալները հավաքվել են հանրայնորեն հասանելի մեդիա հրապարակումներից և վերլուծվել են նշանագիտական կառույցների, մշակութային խորհրդանիշների, ինչպես նաև տեքստային ու տեսողական ձևերի փոխազդեցության լույսի ներքո: Ուսումնասիրությունը բացահայտում է, թե ինչպես են օգտատերերը կիրառում էմոջիները՝ կարծրատիպեր վերարտադրելու, սոցիալական խմբերից դուրս թողնելու կամ ազդեցիկ արտահայտելու համար: Հոդվածում ընդգծվում է ատելության խոսքի սահմանումների ընդլայնման անհրաժեշտությունը՝ կարևորելով առցանց հաղորդակցման բազմաձևալի բնույթը:

Բանալի բառեր – էլեկտրոնային դիսկուրս, ատելության խոսք, բազմաձևալիություն, էմոջիներ, հուզական փոխազդեցություն

АННА КАРАПЕТЯН – Невербальные механизмы речи ненависти в электронном дискурсе. – В данном исследовании рассматривается роль невербальных элементов — прежде всего эмоджи — как носителей высказываний ненависти в цифровой коммуникации. Несмотря на то, что традиционно речь ненависти понималась как форма вербальной или текстовой агрессии, современные онлайн-среды формируют более сложное мультимодальное пространство, где враждебность нередко передаётся имплицитно —

посредством изображений, иконок и эмоциональных сигналов. Материалом служат общедоступные публикации в медиа, изученные с точки зрения повторяющихся семиотических моделей, культурной символики и взаимодействия текстовых и визуальных модальностей. Работа показывает, как пользователи задействуют невербальные средства для укрепления стереотипов, исключения социальных групп или выражения агрессии. Выявляя тонкие механизмы функционирования ненависти вне рамок языка, исследование подчёркивает необходимость расширения определения речи ненависти с учётом мультимодальной природы онлайн-коммуникации.

Ключевые слова: *электронный дискурс, речь ненависти, мультимодальность, эмоджи, эмоциональное взаимодействие*

References

- Derks, D., Bos, A. E. R., & von Grumbkow, J. (2007). Emoticons and social interaction on the Internet: The importance of social context. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23(1), 842-849. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2004.11.013>
- Dresner, E., & Herring, S. C. (2010). Functions of the nonverbal in CMC: Emoticons and illocutionary force. *Communication Theory*, 20(3), 249-268. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2010.01362.x>
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Herring, S. C., & Dainas, A. (2017). Nice picture comment!: Graphics in Facebook comment threads. In G. Meikle (Ed.), *The Routledge companion to social media and politics* (pp. 237-254). Routledge.
- Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. Routledge.
- Kress, G. & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication*. Arnold.
- Liu, P., Guberman, J., Arbor, A., Culotta, A. (2018). Forecasting the presence and intensity of hostility on Instagram using linguistic and social features. arxiv, 1804.06759(1), 1-10. <http://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1804.06759>
- Lo, S. (2008). The nonverbal communication functions of emoticons in computer-mediated communication. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 11(5), 595-597. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cpb.2007.0132>
- Luo, T., Wu, L. L., Lu, H. P., & Tao, Y. H. (2010). The effect of emoticons in simplex and complex task-oriented communication: An empirical study of instant messaging. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(5), 889-895. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2010.02.003>
- Machin, D. (2013). What is multimodal critical discourse studies and why are people saying such terrible things? *Critical Discourse Studies*, 10(4), 347-355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2013.813770>
- Oxford English Dictionary. (n.d.). *Emoji, n*. In *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. <https://www.oed.com/>
- Rivera, K., Cooke, N. J., & Bauhs, J. A. (1996). The effects of emotional icons on remote communication. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 99-100). ACM Press. <https://doi.org/10.1145/257089.257139>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage.
- Walther, J. B. & D'Addario, K. P. (2001). The impacts of emoticons on message interpretation in computer-mediated communication. *Social Science Computer Review*, 19(3), 324-347. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089443930101900307>

Sources of Data

- Beyonce makes Grammy history for most wins ever by a female artist. (15 March 2021). *Instagram*. https://www.instagram.com/p/CMbN6-hIwfm/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link
- Placeholder. (6 March 2024). *Facebook*. <https://socialmedia.example/post/12345>
- They were willing to lie to protect other members of the family, but they weren't willing to tell the truth to protect me and my husband. (8 March 2021). *Instagram*. https://www.instagram.com/p/CMKYAQbHfjC/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link