

Digital Discourse Practices on Social Media Platforms: A Pragmatic Analysis

Takim Ajom Okongor



takimajomokongor@gmail.com

08137945071

Abstract

The rise of social media has significantly reshaped human communication system and created digital environments where meanings are constructed through a blend of linguistic, visual, and technological resources. Platforms such as WhatsApp, Facebook, Instagram, TikTok, and X (formerly Twitter) have become global spaces for social interaction, political expression, identity performance, and formal and informal learning. This article offers a comprehensive pragmatic analysis of digital discourse practices, with a focus on how users employ language to achieve communicative goals in the technologically mediated environments. Drawing on speech act theory, politeness theory, and relevance theory, the study investigates linguistic choices, multimodality, turn-taking structures, code-switching, humour, and face-management strategies in social media communication among Nigerian users. Data were collected from naturally occurring online interactions across four major platforms and analysed qualitatively. The findings reveal that users employ a wide range of pragmatic strategies, including emoji-supported utterances, creative code-mixing, hedged expressions, and multimodal cues that replace missing contextual information. Online discourse displays hybrid features that combine spoken immediacy with written permanence, demonstrating how users negotiate meaning within the constraints and affordances of technology. The study concludes that social media has produced a dynamic communicative ecosystem where language is continually re-created, reflecting broader social, cultural, and ideological realities.

Keywords: *Social media, Human communication, Digital environment, Communicative goals*

Introduction

The last two decades have witnessed significant changes in how people communicate, largely due to the ubiquity of digital technologies. Social media has become a dominant force in shaping everyday interaction, providing spaces where individuals connect, debate issues, express opinions, and create communities that transcend physical boundaries. Unlike conventional spoken communication, digital interaction depends on technological tools that merge text with visual and audio cues, making it necessary to rethink how meanings are constructed. The emergence of digital discourse has introduced a new linguistic environment. People routinely use

emojis, short forms, hashtags, memes, screenshots, voice notes, and images to communicate ideas and emotions. These features change the complexion of discourse by adding layers of meaning that go beyond the literal interpretation of words. Communication on platforms like WhatsApp, Facebook, Instagram, and X is shaped by informal norms, shared digital cultures, platform-specific restrictions, and user creativity. As a result, digital interaction is neither purely written nor purely spoken; it sits somewhere in between, generating hybrid forms of expression.

Pragmatics, the branch of linguistics concerned with how meaning is negotiated in context, provides a useful lens for understanding communication in digital environments. Pragmatic analysis helps explain how people use language to perform actions, convey unspoken meanings, manage interpersonal relationships, and create social identities online. Given the dynamic and often ambiguous nature of digital communication, a pragmatic approach becomes essential for interpreting how meaning emerges from interactions that involve textual, visual, and symbolic cues.

This paper examines digital discourse practices on social media from a pragmatic standpoint. It explores how language users rely on context, shared knowledge, platform conventions, and multimodal resources to convey messages and interpret meaning. The paper also highlights how digital platforms shape communicative behavior and how pragmatic principles help explain these emerging forms of expression. In the last two decades, the emergence of new media technologies has ushered in profound changes in how people interact, negotiate identities, and participate in social life. Social media platforms, in particular, have become essential spaces where discourse unfolds in diverse forms. These platforms combine the spontaneity of spoken language with the permanence and portability of written texts, creating a hybrid communicative environment. As individuals engage in real-time messaging, asynchronous conversations, multimedia sharing, and public commentary, language becomes a flexible tool for interaction. Nigeria offers a particularly rich context for studying digital discourse because of its linguistic diversity and high rates of social media use. Many Nigerians rely on platforms such as WhatsApp, TikTok, Facebook, and X for entertainment, education, activism, networking, and daily conversation. These digital spaces have become arenas where language is constantly innovated and where users blend English, Nigerian Pidgin, slang, and indigenous languages to express themselves.

Traditional linguistic frameworks do not fully capture the communicative dynamics of social media. This makes a pragmatic approach valuable, because pragmatics focuses on how meaning is generated through context, intention, and inference rather than through structure alone. Digital communication often lacks physical cues such as tone, facial expression, and gesture, yet users still manage to interpret each other's intentions through markers such as emojis, punctuation choices, memes, GIFs, abbreviations, tagging, and quoting. These elements provide contextual information that compensates for the absence of physical presence. This article thus explores digital discourse practices using pragmatic theories that illuminate how users create, interpret, and negotiate meaning. By analysing actual social media data, the study illustrates the complexity of digital interactions and demonstrates how

communicative behaviour has evolved alongside technological advancement. The purpose is to provide a detailed and original examination of how language functions in online environments and to contribute to scholarly conversations on digital pragmatics.

Literature Review

Digital Discourse and Online Communication

Digital discourse refers to the ways individuals produce, share, and interpret meaning through technologically mediated platforms such as Facebook, WhatsApp, X (formerly Twitter), Instagram, TikTok, and discussion forums. As communication has increasingly shifted to online spaces, scholars argue that digital discourse represents a significant transformation of traditional patterns of interaction. Unlike face-to-face conversation, which is governed by physical presence and immediate turn-taking, online communication operates within flexible, multimodal, and asynchronous environments that reshape pragmatic behaviour (Herring, 2019). Through these platforms, users create meaning not only through words but also through emojis, GIFs, memes, hashtags, and visual cues that function as pragmatic resources.

The rise of social media has blurred the boundaries between spoken and written communication. Online messages often combine features of both modes, producing what Crystal (2011) calls “hybrid digital language.” This hybridity is evident in the use of conversational markers (“lol,” “hmm,” “you dey mind them?”), abbreviations, and informal styles that simulate speech, even though the medium is technically written. Such hybrid forms influence how intent is conveyed and interpreted, and they require users to rely on contextual and pragmatic cues to infer meanings that are not explicitly stated. From a pragmatic perspective, the meaning of digital messages is heavily dependent on context, both situational and technological. Features such as thread structure, comment sequencing, and platform affordances shape how users manage politeness, face needs, and conversational implicatures. For example, the option to “like,” “react,” or “retweet” offers alternative forms of participation that do not resemble traditional spoken feedback tokens. These affordances themselves become part of the pragmatic system of online conversation, allowing users to express alignment, disagreement, sarcasm, or humour with minimal language.

Another important element of digital discourse is the use of multimodality. Emojis function as affective markers, signalling tone or emotion that might otherwise be ambiguous in written text (Danesi, 2017). GIFs and memes also carry culturally shared meanings and can act as shorthand expressions for complex attitudes. Their interpretation, however, depends on shared pragmatic knowledge within online communities. Misinterpretations often occur when participants lack familiarity with the symbolic conventions or humour embedded in digital artefacts. Online communication is also characterized by its reduced social cues, which can either encourage freer expression or lead to misunderstandings. The absence of physical co-presence means that communicators rely on inferencing skills to interpret

intention, irony, or implicit meaning. Studies show that users often employ explicit markers such as emojis, punctuation exaggeration, or meta-comments (“no offence,” “just joking”) to prevent pragmatic failure. In this way, digital discourse highlights the importance of pragmatic competence in navigating technologically mediated environments.

Furthermore, social media platforms have created new forms of discourse practices tied to their unique communicative cultures. On Facebook, interaction tends to be more extended and narrative-driven, while Twitter promotes brevity and intertextuality through hashtags and quoted retweets. WhatsApp encourages intimate, group-based communication shaped by local sociolinguistic norms. These platform-specific conventions influence participants' pragmatic choices, such as how they request, complain, express gratitude, show solidarity, or negotiate meaning.

Digital discourse also reflects emerging power relations and identity performances. Users strategically deploy linguistic and multimodal resources to construct online identities, align with communities, or challenge dominant ideologies. Hashtags, for instance, serve as pragmatic tools for indexing social stance and mobilizing collective meaning (Zappavigna, 2012). Through such practices, online communication becomes not only a means of interacting but also a space for social negotiation, resistance, and identity display. In sum, digital discourse and online communication represent evolving landscapes where language, technology, and social context intersect. These environments require users to engage in continuous pragmatic negotiation, making them important areas of study within contemporary linguistics. By examining the pragmatic strategies that shape interaction in these digital spaces, researchers gain deeper insights into how meaning is constructed, maintained, and transformed in modern society. Digital discourse studies highlight the fluid and evolving nature of online communication. Crystal (2011) describes online language as a blend of spoken and written forms, where users adapt linguistic practices to fit the affordances of each platform. Herring (2010) observes that users often imitate conversational patterns in online writing by incorporating repetition, emphasis, emotive markers, and conversational turn-taking through comment threads.

Pragmatic Dimensions of Digital Communication

The shift from face-to-face interaction to digital communication has introduced a new layer of complexity to the study of pragmatics. While the fundamental goal of communication, sharing meaning, remains constant, the strategies people use to achieve this goal in online environments differ significantly from those used in spoken interactions. Digital spaces alter how speakers express intentions, interpret messages, manage politeness, build relationships, and negotiate meaning. As a result, online communication provides a rich platform for examining how pragmatic principles operate in technologically mediated contexts.

One of the most significant pragmatic dimensions of digital communication is the way users manage context. In traditional communication, shared physical surroundings, tone of voice, and immediate feedback help participants infer meaning. Online settings, however, limit these cues. Users must therefore rely on

alternative resources such as emojis, punctuation, screenshots, memes, and platform-specific tools to recreate the missing context. These semiotic devices act as pragmatic signals that help clarify tone, emotional stance, or communicative intent. For instance, the addition of a smiling emoji may soften a criticism, while a GIF can convey sarcasm that might otherwise be misunderstood in plain text. Because these cues are optional, their presence or absence can shape how a message is interpreted, making context construction a deliberate and strategic act.

Another key dimension is politeness and face management. Digital interaction often lacks the conventional social signals found in spoken dialogue, which means users must adopt new strategies to maintain interpersonal harmony. On platforms like Facebook or WhatsApp, individuals employ hedges (“I think,” “maybe”), disclaimers (“don’t take this the wrong way”), and mitigating emojis to soften potentially face-threatening acts. At the same time, the relative anonymity of the internet can reduce social accountability, sometimes resulting in heightened impoliteness, trolling, or aggressive discourse. This dual nature of online communication that enables both connection and conflict, highlights why pragmatic competence is essential for navigating social media interactions.

A further pragmatic aspect involves turn-taking and conversational management. Traditional conversation depends on immediate, linear exchanges. Digital communication, however, is shaped by asynchronous and overlapping contributions. Messages can appear out of sequence, replies may be delayed, and conversations can branch into multiple threads. Users rely on quoting features, tags, and explicit references (“as you said earlier...”) to maintain coherence. This shifting structure affects how conversational implicatures are generated and interpreted, since meaning often relies on the assumed connections between distributed messages. The structure of digital threads therefore becomes a pragmatic resource in itself. Digital communication also introduces distinctive forms of indexicality, where linguistic and visual choices point to identity, stance, or group affiliation. Hashtags, for example, function as pragmatic markers that signal alignment with social movements, ideologies, or trends. A simple tag like #NoWahala or #EndSARS carries layers of shared meaning that go beyond the words themselves. Memes operate similarly, conveying attitudes or cultural knowledge that only insiders can fully interpret. These indexical cues help users construct online personas and negotiate their place within virtual communities.

Implicature is the process by which speakers mean more than they explicitly say, takes on new forms in digital environments. Online spaces are fertile grounds for indirect meanings, especially humour and irony. A seemingly neutral sentence can become sarcastic when accompanied by a specific emoji or GIF. Conversely, the absence of such cues can create unintended meanings or misinterpretations. This makes the inferential burden on users particularly high, since they must constantly interpret subtle signals embedded in multimodal texts. The frequent misunderstanding of tone in chat conversations demonstrates how digital communication amplifies the importance of shared pragmatic knowledge.

Another crucial dimension is intertextuality, the practice of linking or referencing

other texts to enrich meaning. Digital platforms encourage intertextuality through retweets, quoted messages, shared posts, hyperlinks, and remix culture. These practices allow users to build layered meanings that draw on collective experiences. A reused meme, for example, carries its original meaning but takes on new implications in a fresh context. Understanding these layers requires familiarity with cultural trends, platform conventions, and group norms, making intertextuality a central pragmatic feature of online discourse. The economy of expression in digital communication also shapes pragmatic choices. Platforms like X (Twitter) impose character limits, encouraging brevity, abbreviation, and creativity. Users condense ideas into compressed units that rely heavily on implicature and shared assumptions. Even on platforms without formal limits, the fast-paced nature of online conversation pushes users toward short, punchy expressions. This economy can create efficiency but also increases the reliance on inferencing to decode meaning.

Finally, digital interaction foregrounds audience design, the process by which speakers tailor their language to imagined or actual listeners. Unlike private conversations, social media posts often reach multiple audiences simultaneously such as friends, strangers, colleagues, and broader public groups. Users therefore adjust their pragmatic strategies to manage these overlapping audiences, sometimes switching registers, styles, or identities within the same platform. The awareness of a potentially wide and unpredictable audience influences not only what people say but also what they choose not to say. Overall, the pragmatic dimensions of digital communication reveal a communicative landscape where meaning depends on more than words. Technology introduces new resources, challenges, and opportunities for interaction. Understanding these dimensions helps researchers explain how people interpret one another in online spaces, how misunderstandings arise, and how digital platforms influence the evolving norms of communication in contemporary society.

Pragmatics provides insight into how users rely on context to interpret ambiguous or incomplete messages. Yus (2011) explains that relevance theory accounts for the inferential processes that occur in interpreting brief or multimodal digital messages. Tagg (2015) also notes the use of pragmatic markers in mobile communication, such as ellipses, repeated letters, and informal expressions that signal attitude and interpersonal meaning.

Online Politeness and Face Negotiation

Interactions online often involve delicate negotiations of politeness. Locher and Watts (2005) argue that politeness is not fixed but rather co-constructed through interaction. On social media, politeness strategies include hedging, the use of emojis to soften tone, and humorous remarks that reduce face-threatening effects.

Multimodal Communication

Kress and van Leeuwen (2001) emphasize that meaning in digital communication often emerges from the interplay of text, images, sound, layout, and symbols. Social media thrives on multimodal messaging, where images, GIFs, emojis, memes, and icons substitute or complement verbal communication. These multimodal elements are essential tools for conveying attitudes, emotions, and reactions.

Digital Identity Construction

Digital identity construction refers to the ways individuals present, negotiate, and manage their sense of self in online environments. With the rise of social media platforms, instant messaging applications, and interactive online spaces, identity is no longer fixed or tied strictly to physical presence. Instead, it becomes fluid, performative, and shaped by the technological affordances of digital communication (boyd, 2014; Papacharissi, 2015). In these spaces, people craft identities through language choices, visual displays, interaction patterns, and participation in online communities. Digital identity, therefore, is not simply who a person is, but how they choose to appear—and be interpreted—in virtual contexts. One of the key features of digital identity is its performative nature. Users deliberately curate images, posts, usernames, emojis, and stylistic patterns that project desired personalities or social roles. Goffman's (1959) classic idea of “presentation of self” finds new relevance in online communication, where individuals perform identity before often invisible, diverse, and unpredictable audiences. For example, a user on Instagram may adopt a polished, aesthetic persona, while on Twitter, the same individual may use humour, sarcasm, or political commentary to project a different version of themselves. Each platform encourages particular identity performances shaped by its norms, interface, and communicative culture.



Another significant dimension is the multimodal nature of identity construction. Identity online is built through text, images, videos, emojis, GIFs, hashtags, and audio messages. These multimodal elements serve as symbolic tools for expressing mood, social belonging, humour, or attitude. As Kress (2010) argues, multimodality expands the communicative resources through which individuals project identity. For example, the repeated use of certain emojis (such as the fire emoji or the praying-hands emoji) can index a user's cultural background, affective orientation, or membership in specific online communities. Similarly, the choice of filters, meme formats, or profile colours may signal aesthetic tastes or ideological leanings. Digital identity is further shaped by social interaction and audience perception. Unlike offline identity, which relies on physical co-presence, digital identity emerges through continuous engagement with others in virtual spaces. Likes, comments, shares, retweets, and mentions function as feedback mechanisms that reinforce or challenge self-presentations (Marwick & boyd, 2011). Through these interactions, individuals learn what aspects of their identity are accepted, celebrated, questioned, or rejected. The audience, therefore, becomes co-author of the individual's online identity. This interactive dimension means that identity construction is not merely self-generated but socially negotiated.

The concept of context collapse the merging of different audiences into one space, is also central to digital identity. On platforms like Facebook or TikTok, posts can reach friends, family members, colleagues, and strangers simultaneously. This blending of audiences creates pressure on users to manage multiple identities at once (boyd, 2014). To navigate this challenge, individuals often switch language registers, alter privacy settings, or maintain multiple accounts (such as “main” and “private”

accounts). These strategies help users preserve face, avoid misunderstandings, and maintain consistent self-presentation across varied networks. A further aspect of digital identity construction is community affiliation. Through hashtags, group membership, slang, humour, and shared symbols, users align themselves with particular cultural, geographic, or ideological groups. Zappavigna (2012) notes that hashtags serve not just as search tools but as markers of social bonding. For example, tags like #BlackTwitter, #NaijaNoDeyCarryLast, or #BookTok do more than categorize content—they index belonging and signal identity. Participation in these communities reinforces a sense of shared meaning, guiding how individuals talk, what they value, and how they present themselves publicly.

Digital identity is also intertwined with anonymity and pseudonymity, which offer opportunities for experimentation. Online environments allow individuals to present alternative or idealized selves, challenge social norms, or conceal aspects of their offline identity. Suler's (2004) notion of the “online disinhibition effect” explains how anonymity can encourage openness, creativity, and sometimes hostility. Pseudonymous spaces like Reddit or gaming forums allow users to reveal parts of their identity they might hide offline, enabling complex layers of selfhood that combine authenticity, aspiration, and experimentation.

Lastly, digital identity construction raises issues of authenticity, privacy, and surveillance. While many users strive to present authentic versions of themselves, social pressure, platform algorithms, and the desire for visibility often influence what identity is displayed. Papacharissi (2015) argues that authenticity online becomes a performance shaped by both personal intentions and social expectations. Meanwhile, concerns about data tracking and privacy shape how individuals negotiate the boundary between what is public and what they choose to keep private. In essence, digital identity construction is a dynamic, multilayered process shaped by individual choices, technological affordances, social interactions, and cultural norms. It reflects a world where communication is increasingly mediated by screens, and where identity is constantly being negotiated, curated, and interpreted. Understanding how people construct identity in digital spaces is crucial for analyzing online behaviour, social belonging, and the evolving nature of communication in contemporary society.



Language Evolution in New Media Contexts

Scholars have long established that technological innovation influences language use. Early works by Crystal (2006) identified “Netspeak” as a unique blend of spoken and written elements. With the rise of Web 2.0, users gained increased power to generate content, leading to user-driven linguistic creativity (Herring, 2013). The result is language that is fast-changing, playful, multimodal, and highly context-dependent. New media linguistics focuses on features such as: -non-standard spelling, -shortened lexical forms, -emojis and GIFs, -hashtagging, -hybrid, -discourse forms, -conversational threads. These provide clues to users' attitudes, emotions, and intentions.

Pragmatics in Digital Communication

Pragmatics investigates how users perform actions with language. Digital pragmatics extends these principles into online environments where traditional clues are reduced. Users rely on inferencing, shared knowledge, and digital cues to interpret meaning. The absence of physical co-presence increases the need for explicit indexing of tone, stance, and emotion. Users therefore use emojis, punctuation, GIFs, and memes to provide pragmatic force. In Nigeria, linguistic creativity is especially pronounced. Social media discourse frequently blends humour, sarcasm, regional languages, and cultural references. Understanding these elements requires both contextual and pragmatic knowledge.

Speech Acts in Social Media Interaction

Speech Act Theory proposes that utterances perform social actions: requesting, warning, thanking, promising, and complaining, among others. In online communication:

- A meme can function as an insult. A GIF can serve as a congratulatory gesture.
- 
- Hashtags can perform declarations (#WeMove, #SayNoToCorruption).

Thus, speech acts in digital spaces extend beyond verbal language to include multimodal signals.

Politeness, Impoliteness, and Facework Online. Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory explains how speakers protect their face needs. In social media communication, politeness takes modified forms because users lack tone-of-voice cues. They rely on emojis, hedges, abbreviations, and indirect phrasing to soften face-threatening acts. Examples include:

“Pls can you help check this?”

“No vex o, but I think...”

“Abeg, small correction...”

Impoliteness is also common online, amplified by anonymity and the public nature of platforms. Nigerian online spaces frequently feature playful insults, a culturally embedded form of humour and solidarity.

Multimodality in Digital Communication

Kress (2010) argues that communication is increasingly multimodal. Digital discourse combines: linguistic text, images and videos, emojis sound clips, formatting choices, temporal patterns (typing indicators, message timing). These multimodal elements shape meaning. For instance, a laughing emoji can signal humour or mockery depending on context.

Code-Switching and Identity Construction



Examples are as following: “E choke! Congrats my guy!”; “Omo, this thing weak me.”. These expressions resonate culturally and communicate complex meanings efficiently.

Theoretical Framework

The study is anchored on an eclectic theoretical framework, drawing insights from multiple theories to capture the complexity of the subject under investigation:

Speech Act Theory

This was developed by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969); the theory explains how utterances perform actions. On social media, users perform speech acts through text, emojis, memes, and multimodal cues, such as thanking, complaining, promising, or criticizing. Next is Grice's Cooperative Principle and Implicature. Grice (1975) explains how communicators infer meaning by assuming cooperation. In digital contexts, users often violate maxims deliberately, especially for humor, sarcasm, or indirect criticism.

Politeness Theory

Brown and Levinson's (1987) model helps explain how users maintain face in digital spaces, especially through emojis, hedging, indirectness, and other softening devices.

Relevance Theory

Sperber and Wilson (1995) propose that communication relies on cognitive efforts to infer intended meaning. This theory is especially useful in analyzing memes, abbreviated messages, and symbolic expressions.

Computer-Mediated Discourse Analysis (CMDA)

Herring's (2004) CMDA framework provides tools for examining structural and pragmatic aspects of online interaction, such as turn-taking, threading, and multimodal meaning. These theories collectively explain how meaning is produced, interpreted, and negotiated in digital environments.

Methodology

Research Design

A qualitative descriptive design was adopted to allow for detailed interpretation of naturally occurring online discourse. Pragmatic analysis is interpretive and context-dependent, so qualitative methods offer the flexibility needed to examine meaning-making in digital spaces. Data were collected from: WhatsApp chats, Facebook public comments, X (Twitter) threads, Instagram captions and replies. Each platform provides different communicative affordances, giving a broad view of digital discourse practices.

Sampling Procedure

Purposive sampling was used to identify discourse samples rich in pragmatic features. Only posts or chats demonstrating clear speech acts, politeness strategies,

humour, identity marking, multimodality, or code-switching were selected.

Data Analysis Technique

Three pragmatic frameworks guided the analysis: Speech Act Analysis identified direct and indirect illocutionary acts, emphasising how users perform actions through language and multimedia. Politeness Strategy Analysis examined facework including hedging, mitigation, emoji use, and discursive softeners. Relevance Theory Explained how users infer meaning using minimal textual cues supported by emojis, GIFs, timestamps, and shared knowledge.

Discussion

The findings demonstrate that online communication is governed by pragmatic reasoning rather than strict grammatical structure. Meaning is shaped through shared knowledge, platform culture, and multimodal tools. Because digital interactions lack physical cues, users rely heavily on emojis, punctuation, memes, and images to express attitudes, soften criticism, and facilitate understanding. Social media communication is inherently dynamic. People shift identities depending on context, switching between formal and informal tones and employing linguistic creativity. The fluidity of politeness norms online reflects the nature of digital spaces where social distance varies widely. While some interactions promote solidarity, anonymity and distance sometimes encourage impoliteness. Also, Multimodality emerges as a central feature of digital pragmatics. Users deploy visuals not just to decorate messages but to perform speech acts, display emotions, and negotiate meaning. Hashtags also play a significant role in shaping conversations by framing topics and signaling ideological alignment. Overall, digital discourse practices illustrate the adaptability of human communication in technologically mediated environments.

Hybrid Nature of Digital Language

Digital discourse combines feature of spoken and written language. For example, WhatsApp messages often display spoken-like structures (“You hear me?”), while tweets resemble written mini-commentaries. This hybridity creates new interactional norms that rely on concise phrasing, informal tone, and rapid turn-taking.

Function of Emojis and GIFs. Emojis play crucial pragmatic roles including softening criticism, indicating sarcasm, supporting humour, clarifying ambiguous tone, for example, “You try small sha ” signals light teasing rather than insult. GIFs, often taken from comedy skits or Nollywood scenes, carry strong cultural resonance. A single GIF can express frustration, disbelief, excitement, or mockery.

Code-Switching as a Social and Pragmatic Tool

Switching between English and local languages is widespread. Code-switching serves functions such as: emphasising emotional states, performing cultural authenticity, building in-group solidarity, signalling humour or sarcasm. A tweet like “This government no get shame at all” mixes English and Pidgin to convey strong criticism with relatable tone.

Humour and Sarcasm in Online Conversation

Humour is a dominant feature in Nigerian digital discourse. Users employ: hyperbole, playful, ockery, ironic comments, humorous memes. Humour performs pragmatic functions such as: easing conversational tension, strengthening group bonds, criticising indirectly, resisting authority through satire

Turn-Taking and Conversational Flow

Turn-taking occurs in unpredictable intervals. Messages may be responded to immediately or hours later. Quoting messages helps maintain coherence in group chats. Tagging is used to draw specific participants into conversations.

Public Commentary and Opinion Formation

Social media platforms serve as opinion spaces. Political discourse often uses hashtags, retweets, and brief comments to express ideological stances. Users employ persuasive speech acts to influence public opinion.

Inferencing under Reduced Cues

Because digital spaces lack physical cues, users rely on textual and visual indices. Relevance theory explains that readers infer meaning by integrating: prior knowledge, emojis, timing, and multimedia context. A short reply like “Okay.” can be read as agreement, sarcasm, or dismissal depending on emoji use or previous messages.

Findings

Social media communication is deeply context-dependent and relies on inferential reasoning.

Emojis, memes, and GIFs contribute significantly to meaning-making, functioning as pragmatic devices. Politeness strategies online differ from traditional norms, often relying on humor, emojis, and indirectness. Code-switching is a common identity practice, especially in multilingual contexts. Digital discourse is characterized by brevity, creativity, and multimodality, driven by platform affordances. Social media discourse is deeply multimodal, integrating text, images, emojis, memes, and GIFs to convey pragmatic meaning. Users frequently employ politeness strategies, especially hedging and emoji use, to maintain social harmony. Code-switching functions as a powerful identity marker and pragmatic resource. Humour and sarcasm are central communicative strategies, especially in Nigerian digital spaces. Speech acts often take non-verbal forms, showing expanded definitions of communication online. Inferencing is essential due to reduced contextual cues. Turn-taking patterns display flexibility, supported by tagging and quotation functions.

Conclusion

The analysis above demonstrates that digital discourse on social media is complex, dynamic, and culturally rich. Nigerian users employ an array of pragmatic strategies to construct meaning, manage relationships, and express identities in digital environments. Social media has created communicative contexts where language evolves rapidly, combining written and spoken elements with visual and technological cues. This highlights the need for continuous research in digital pragmatics and reinforces the importance of teaching digital communicative

competence alongside traditional literacy skills. The study reveals that digital discourse on social media platforms is a rich site for pragmatic exploration. Online communication blends linguistic and non-linguistic cues to create meaning, and users depend heavily on context and shared understanding. The pragmatic strategies observed—speech acts, implicature, politeness, identity work, and multimodal expression, highlight the complexity of communication in digital environments. As social media continues to evolve, pragmatic competence becomes essential for navigating interactions effectively.

This study recommends the incorporation of digital pragmatics into language education to help learners interpret online messages more accurately. It further recommends that more research should be encouraged on African digital discourse, particularly in the multilingual communities.

The research also recommends that researchers and scholars should work to promote responsible digital communication by educating users about tone, politeness, and online etiquette. In addition to the above recommendations, social media platforms should develop features that reduce miscommunication, especially in intercultural contexts.

References

- Androutsopoulos, J. (2015). Networked multilingualism: Some language practices on Facebook. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 19(2), 185–205.²
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
- Boyd, d. (2014). *It's complicated: The social lives of networked teens*.³ Yale University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987).⁴ *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.⁵
- Crystal, D. (2011). *Internet linguistics: A student guide*. Routledge.⁶
- Danesi, M. (2017). *The semiotics of emoji: The rise of visual language in the age of the Internet*.⁷ Bloomsbury Academic.
- Goffman, E. (1959).⁸ *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Doubleday.
- Grice, H. P. (1975).⁹ Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (pp. 41–58).¹⁰ Academic Press.
- Herring, S. (2004). Computer-mediated discourse analysis: An approach to researching online behavior. In S. Barab, R. Kling, & J. Gray (Eds.), *Designing for virtual communities in the service of learning* (pp. 338–376). Cambridge University Press.
- Herring, S. (2010). The co-evolution of computer-mediated communication and computer-mediated discourse analysis. In S. Herring, D. Stein, & T. Virtanen (Eds.), *Handbook of pragmatics of CMC* (pp. 3–31).¹¹ Mouton de Gruyter.
- Herring, S. (2015). Computer-mediated discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis*

- (2nd ed., pp. 320–341). Wiley-Blackwell. (Note: The provided source was confusing; I've formatted this as a chapter in an edited book, assuming this is the intended source based on common knowledge of Herring's work.)
- Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. Routledge.
- Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2001).¹² *Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication*. Arnold.
- Locher, M., & Watts, R. (2005).¹³ Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1(1), 9–33.
- Marwick, A. E., & Boyd, d. (2011). I tweet honestly, I tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience. *New Media & Society*, 13(1), 114–133. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444810365313>
- Papacharissi, Z. (2015). *Affective publics: Sentiment, technology, and politics*. Oxford University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.¹⁴
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995).¹⁵ *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
- Suler, J. (2004). The online disinhibition effect. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 7(3), 321–326. <https://doi.org/10.1089/1094931041291295>
- Tagg, C. (2015). *Exploring digital communication: Language in action*. Routledge.
- Yus, F. (2011). *Cyberpragmatics: Internet-mediated communication in context*. John Benjamins.
- Zappavigna, M. (2012). *Discourse of Twitter and social media: How we use language to create affiliation on the web*. Bloomsbury.