Language in The Digital Age: The Evaluation of Online Communication

Author/s: Sidra Liaqat
Affiliation: ¹Faculty, University of Okara (Email: sidra.liaqatuo@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT:

The most important contribution of this research is the conceptualization of a multi-dimensional evaluative framework beyond prescriptions of 'correctness'. With this vocabulary and conceptual tools, scholars, educators, and professionals can discern the communication challenges that arise in the emergent communicative terrain of the digital age. Digital communication will also continue to be an area ripe for further investigation, given how fluid and constantly changing it is. Several research directions have been specifically pressing when they are built upon the present study. On the one hand, this calls for cross-linguistic and cross-cultural comparative work to establish the degree of universality vs. cultural specificity of the asymmetries discussed in this paper. Second, longitudinal research is essential to monitor the development of these norms over time, from a diachronic perspective of digital language change. Third, in light of the changing digital media landscape, research needs to turn towards the new platforms, including video-centric (e.g., TikTok) and community-centric (e.g., Discord) spaces, that have their own linguistic and social dynamics. Third, a critical future line of research here will involve understanding AI-enabled communication. Future research must explore how the growing ubiquity of AI writing assistants and large language models shapes authentic user expression and the standards against which it is judged.

1. INTRODUCTION

The advent of the 21st century has been marked by the highly accelerated diffusion of digital technologies, causing an irreversible shift in how everyday human relations are conducted. Communication, which previously relied heavily on face-to-face interactions and traditional media to mediate meaning, is now increasingly taking place on a range of online networks, such as social networking sites, instant messaging applications, email, collaborative tools, and virtual worlds. And this pervasiveness of digital communication has offered not just new conduits for conversation but a radical remaking of the ground on which our words meet to do business. While scholars worked to describe and theorize about the perceived novelty and possible decline that characterized internet-inspired forms such as Netspeak or Textese, with their use of abbreviations, non-standard orthography, and playful stylizations, yet with digital communication having blossomed from a specialized practice to a ubiquitous part of individual, social, professional, and civic life, the linguistic manifestations of this new form of interaction have turned out to be far more multifarious, nuanced, and context-bound than the initial accounts seemed to make out. Analyzing such fine-grained linguistic phenomena in these domains is thus essential for understanding current practices of communication.

The specific technical infrastructure of digital environments imposes a new set of constraints on language form and function. Factors such as synchronous vs. asynchronous communication, character length limits, the incorporation of multimodal elements (e.g., emojis, images, hyperlinks), the possibility of anonymous or pseudonymous communication, and context collapse affect how online communication takes form in unique ways that are not captured by traditional oral or written mediums. For this reason, assessing ever since the advent of communication on the web, the communication in cyberspace in many cases is turning to the traditional linguistic norms based on standardization or prescriptive grammar when it comes to grasping the functional efficiency and situated appropriateness of the online varieties. Likewise, criteria that are used to assess communicative competence from face-to-face interpersonal interaction could fail to account for the skills and conventions that must be deployed to communicate effectively in digital environments. There is, therefore, an urgent demand for systematic perspectives and methods that are able to assess the multifaceted dimensions of online communication, not only in terms of its linguistic realizations, but also with regard to its pragmatic uses, interactional patterns, and sociolinguistic values in various digital environments.

Although a significant amount of research has defined the linguistic characteristics and interactional norms of the multifarious online environments, quite limited research has been carried out to comprehensively measure these practices from an integrated standpoint. The objective of this article is to narrow this disconnection by going beyond description to analyze the nature, efficacy, and emergent norms in online communication. This is an important academic and practical question. In theoretical terms, it adds to our understanding of the real-time process of language variation and change, provides empirical support for Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) theory building, and illuminates the mutually-reinforcing relationship between technology, language, and social practice. Pragmatically, the results are applicable to a range of issues related to digital literacy curricula, best practices in professional communication in online contexts, design of communication platforms, and promotion of greater intercultural understanding in digitally-mediated interactions. There is a pressing need to explore more nuanced notions of "effective" or "appropriate" communication in the digital ecosystems beyond good/bad dichotomies of knowledge construction online.

The research questions includes:

1. How certain linguistic features (like lexicon, syntax, orthography, multimodality such as emojis/memes) have changed across different online communication platforms (public social media/private messaging; professional email)?

2. What are the pragmatic norms (i.e., politeness, turn-taking, implicature) of online interaction and how are they like or unlike and different from face-to face communication?

3. What standards are used by users (in a conscious or subconscious way) to measure the suitability, the effectiveness or the quality of online communication in different situations (e.g. formal vs. informal, personal vs. professional)?

4. What are the sociolinguistic aspects of these (such as identity building, community building, maintaining social relationships, and language attitudes)?

Here being an examination of online discourse from an English-centric perspective, and giving English the status of online-lingua franca, despite the limitations that it entails, the proposed study will utilize a diverse range of currently available datasets from contexts in which the technology is already omnipresent, contrasting the use of social media as a public-facing space

(e.g. data from Twitter), with semi-private instant messaging platforms (e.g. anonymised chat logs from WhatsApp, ethically sourced) and formal/professional communication (e.g. corpora of professional email, potentially supplemented by survey data on workplace norms). Data gathering will be a mixed-methods approach comprising (i) corpus-linguistic analyses of computer-mediated spoken and written language data and (ii) user-centric approaches, such as the use of surveys and possibly semi-structured interviews, to measure both behavior and attitudes. This article is not intended to offer a comprehensive overview of all digital platforms or linguistic behaviors, but instead aims to uncover important trends, ethnolinguistic criteria, and sociolinguistic properties of the selected sites. Further, recognizing the increasing relevance of visual and non-text-based communication, the main emphasis on text-based language will be maintained, with (multimodal) add-ons such as emojis as an integral part of the linguistic message.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

It summarizes valuable research relevant to the study of language in digital contexts covering (but not limited to) theoretical frameworks, topical focuses, linguistic and pragmatic characteristics, evaluation and social knowledge. It provides the basis for the present study's attempt to create a critical evaluative framework for online talk.

To understand communication in the context of digital world makes it necessary to draw upon various theoretical traditions. Theoretical foundations of Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) offer explanations about technology's influence on interaction. Social Information Processing (SIP) theory propounds that CMC lacks rich socio-emotional cues available in FtF communication. So SIP drives CMC users to develop linguistic strategies that allow them to still convey relational communication and create personal impressions. The Hyper-personal Model suggests that CMC can even make for more social desirable interaction at times due to enhanced self-presentation, selective perception and feedback loops. Additionally, the Social Identity model of Deindividuation Effects (SIDE) demonstrates that visual anonymity may enhance the salience of social group identity over personal identity which, in turn, may lead an individual to conform to group norms, including language norms. More recent work has been testing and refining these models on newer platforms, which are characterized by varied cue availability and interaction history that persists over time.

Sociolinguistics-based concepts such as the analysis of variation continue to be key in investigating the structured variation evident in online manifestations of language across various platforms, user groups and contexts. The Communication Accommodation Theory can be used to understand how users' language accommodates, or does not converge to/ diverge from, their interlocutors' online communicative behaviour for social distance control and group membership marking. The concept of Communities of Practice (CoP) has been transferred in a profitable manner to online communities in which members interact and engage collaboratively to generate collective linguistic practices and norms.

Pragmatics, the study of actual language use, is also essential for investigating how meaning is produced and inferred outside linguistic semantics in FTF. Politeness Theory offers an account of how face-threatening acts are accommodated, but its application in online settings must take into account that strategies may be adapted online in the face of less cues and other interactional processes. Growing attention is given to impoliteness and aggression on line in research together with to the negotiation of relational work more generally. The Speech Act Theory is still pertinent to explain how actions such as requesting, apologizing, or complimenting are done through language in digital texts. Third, Discourse Analysis approaches, from various perspectives, can help analyze language at the level of discourse beyond the sentence, with an investigation of textual, coherence, stance-taking, identity performance, and many other areas in which language is used to build social realities online.

Academic inquiry into language on the Internet has also grown up in parallel with the technologies themselves. The earliest studies were largely confined to textual communication environments such as e-mail, Usenet, MUDs/MOOs, and chat rooms. These studies often pointed to new linguistic phenomena: abbreviations, acronyms, emoticons, playful orthography as well as the colloquialism of spelling and auto-correcting.Such was the case with emergent "Netspeak" or whatever it was named, usually presaged on some degree of hand-wringing over the diminishing of literacy standards. Since the widespread use of mobile phones, research has also investigated S M S language or "Textese", its structure and its purported effects on formal language skills.

Web 2.0, and specifically social media (Facebook, Twitter), blogs, and wikis, also began to stimulate more research on user-generated content, social networking practices, and the multiple modes of language use in more public or semi-public spheres. More recently, research examines the linguistic dimensions of visually centric platforms (Instagram, TikTok), the

affordances of instant messaging on apps such as WhatsApp or Messenger, the language of online movements (#BlackLivesMatter, #MeToo), and the effect of AI-mediated communication tools (e.g. PORs, chatbots, Apps with predictive text). This development symbolises a shift from conceiving of digital language as monolithic to a realization of its heterogeneity within and across platforms, contexts and communities.

Digital communication is marked by extensive linguistic innovation and variation on many levels. Lexically, the internet environment is a fertile area for neologisms, acronyms (eg, LOL, BRB, ICYMI), initialisms, shortenings, blendings, and the recycling of existing words. Once rather straightforward metadata tags, Hashtags (#) now comprise multifaceted pragmatic and discursive markers that can indicate anything from topic or stance to ironical or community membership. Syntactically, on-line writing is often marked with the hassles of colloquial speech, including incomplete sentences, ellipsis of complementizers, stringing of clauses, and clausal simplicity, especially in synchronous or quasi-synchronous modes. But syntactic complexity in general is extremely variable as a function of medium, genre, and communicative function.

Orthographic variation is another characteristic, including such things as nonstandard spellings (e.g., thru, nite), phonetic respelling (cuz, wanna), creative punctuation (—), and the absence or excess of capitalization (stylistic minimalism versus ALL CAPS for emphasis or shouting). These variations however, are not simply errors, as they often convey social or stylistic import. Importantly, modern online speech is inherently multimodal. Emoticons and secondarily emojis are conventionalized ways of communicating emotion, disambiguating illocutionary force, softening interaction or text, and adding affect to text (e.g., text messages). Internet memes (of simultaneous image and text) are complex cultural units that are intertextual references, allowing for quick engagement in a shared discourse. The relation between text and images is becoming more and more significant in online multimodality. In addition to structural aspects, the pragmatic dimension of how language is being employed to achieve communicative purposes changes quite considerably online. The control of social politeness and interpersonal rapport is maintained by adapting strategies and while FtF cues are missing, social cues are explicitly controlled through lexical choices (emojis, punctuation, e.g. exclamation marks) and interactional pacing. However, the risk of misinterpretation is still high and things like flaming and cyberbullying show the difficulties of dealing with impoliteness on the web.

This is in marked contrast to spoken dialogue where turn-taking is quite different and where asynchronous (and quasi-synchronous) devices such as overlap, silence, and use of deictics have a different status to formulating a theory of turn-taking e.g., email, forums, instant messaging - all of which, of course, have different conventions for signalling the end of a turn or the beginning of a new one. Control over context collapse — the disappearance of diverse audiences in a single, flattened context, common on social media — demands complex strategies of audience design and also organizes self-presentation and disclosure. Users make use of a range of linguistic and multimodal resources to express affect, stance, and evaluation that includes intensifiers, expressive orthography, emojis, and participation in affective publics through sharing, liking, and commenting.

Measuring the 'quality' or 'effectiveness' of internet communication is difficult and to some extent contested. One of the earliest concerns was about the potential detrimental effect on formal literacy; however research often gives a different picture as users tend to adjust their style to the environment. Studies on user perception show that users judge formality, appropriateness and clarity in a context dependent manner. What's considered acceptable in a casual WhatsApp conversation would not be the same in a professional email. Theorising digital literacy scholars, call for digital literacies based on a critical approach, moving beyond mastery of technical abilities and toward a range of critical capacities including understanding of genre conventions, second readership and ethics. Attitudes towards web vernaculars overlap on a broad spectrum, some research suggesting a censuring and enhancing prescriptivism and some more attention and appreciation for digitized language forms. The criteria for evaluation themselves are a site of struggle.

Online language uses do not exist in a vacuum, but are thoroughly connected to other sociocultural mechanisms. The choice of language is one of the most salient ways in which individuals enact and negotiate gender, age, ethnic, sexual and social identities in the digital realm. Common language, slang, and interactional rules are key themes in the production and on-going maintenance of online communities and networks and a sense of belonging and shared identity has to date been viewed one of the most important of these. Additionally, also in the online domain, are spaces for language ideologies to be expressed, challenged, and solidified. Discussions over purity of language, the worth of non-standard varieties, and English's impact online reveal fundamental societal power structures and cultural ideals.

Although the present literature has shaped an excellent theoretical background, a comprehensive historical evolution, a profile of linguistic resources, pragmatic imprint and a social-cultural take of the phenomena in ternet discourse. This has led to the testing and extension of prototype CMC theories, a cataloging of linguistic innovation, analysis of pragmatic strategies, and issues related to identity and community connections. Nevertheless, the majority of research is descriptive of an event or platform. Although evaluation in terms of user perception, or literacy debate discussions, are referred to by research in this field, there is still a large void for the development of comprehensive and systematic frameworks for evaluating online communication based on language form, pragmatics, and interactional context, user perception and sociocultural meaning. Current heuristics are fragmented, context-dependent, or have normative bases grounded implicitly on features of non-digital artifacts. The present study attempts to connect these approaches by explicitly concentrating on evaluation. It aims to adopt the criteria that users themselves use; to analyse the ways in which linguistico-pragmatic features condition perceptions of what is effective or appropriate across different digital contexts; and to explore wider implication, for understanding communicative competence in the digital age, drawing on current data across modalities and platforms, that we might need in 2025 to reflect the multimodal and platform-diverse reality online interaction.

3. METHODOLOGY

This section presents the methodology that was used to address the research questions. It describes the research design, instruments and data collection procedures across data sources, how both quantitative and qualitative data are analyzed, and the ethical framing of the study. With the aim of obtaining a holistic view of online communication, whereby large scale linguistic patterns are combined with the subtleties of individual users, a sequential explanatory mixed methods design is chosen for the present study. The double stage approach is organized as:

In the first phase, we will gather and analyze quantitative data from large-scale, multi-genre corpus and a broad-based online survey. At this stage, we aim to establish broad trends (RQ1) and measurements of attitudes (RQ3), especially test measurements of evaluations across situation-types. Gathering and analysis of qualitative data via semi-structured interviews, this phase is intended to interpret and make sense of the statistical trends and results from Phase 1. By selectively recruiting participants who have responded to the survey, this phase aims at

increased understanding of ad-hoc practices (RQ2), the rationale for the evaluation of communications (RQ3), and the sociolinguistic aspects of online communication (RQ4). This mixed method design was selected to enable the application of in-depth qualitative research to complex sample data, which will provide a richer and more rounded appreciation of the topic than either approach could achieve alone.

Collecting quantitative data in the first phase, we initially gathered the following quantitative data: The corpus have three components which include modern English language communication of not less than two million words generated between the period of January 2024 – December 2024. We collected 1.5 million tweets using the official Twitter/X interface. Tweets have been filtered to ensure they are in English and have been geotagged to users within Anglophone countries (e.g. US, UK, Canada, Australia) to provide a representative source of data in which to study while holding constant broad cultural variables. It has been constructed from publicly available, anonymized datasets (i.e., the modern equivalent of Enron corpus) and in collaboration with an organization that granted access to a completely anonymized set of their internal emails under a limited data usage agreement. Around 250k words of the data from WhatsApp have been collected with a data donation approach. Volunteers, surveyed online and enlisted, have been asked to retrieve and gift select chat histories. Clear instructions were given on how to target chats where all participants are consenting, and to run an included script to automatically anonymize names, locations, phone numbers or any other personally identifying information if a transcript is to be submitted as part of a report of abuse.

We developed and implemented an online survey using Qualtrics with an intended sample size of about five hundred persons. The survey included: Age, sex, profession, level of education, and self-reported digital communication behavior. A set of short scenarios introducing example online messages (e.g., requests, apologies, disagreement expression) in varying communication contexts (e.g., email, WhatsApp, social media comment). The appropriateness, clarity, politeness and effectiveness of each message have been rated by participants on a 7-point Likert scale. Items to assess student attitudes of different linguistic phenomena (e.g., the use of emojis in professional contexts, rebus writing, abbreviations.). Participants have been recruited via university mailing lists, professional community, and snowball approach on social media. From the subset of survey participants who consented to be contacted for a follow-up study (N> 500) a purposive sample of 20-25participants has been selected. Here, sampling might try to maximise variation in age, professional orientation and attitudes identified in both

the survey as in the sample by choosing participants with either most descriptive or most prescriptive attitudes. Interviews occurred by secure video conference, having a duration of 45-60 minutes, and audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. The interview protocol included questions at: The rationalization for the survey scores in terms of message effectiveness for them. In person experiences of communication errors on the Web. Techniques for expressing tone and building relationships online. Perceptions of their language practices in terms of identity and community links.

The three corpora are computer-processed and analyzed in corpus linguistics software (AntConc and Sketch Engine). This analysis involved: creating frequency lists and keyword analyses to compare lexical choices across platforms; examining collocates to relate back to common syntactic and phrasal patterns; and quantifying the use of specific attributes such as emojis, hashtags, or acronyms. Demographics data and that of attitudes have been summarised using descriptive statistics. We have employed inferential statistics such as ANOVA and t-tests to ascertain whether there are differences in evaluative ratings based on participant demographics or message context.

Interview transcripts and illustrative qualitative examples associated with the corpora will be accessible and coded on a qualitative data analysis software (NVivo 14). A reflexive, thematic analytical approach has been used to search for, analyze, and represent patterns in the data. The coding is inductive (data-driven) and deductive (informed by the research questions and the literature review). To analyze more in depth some excerpts of the interactions developed in the session, we relied on principles of Discourse Analysis (DA) concerning "Language as doing social actions". At the concluding section, quantitative and qualitative findings will be integrated in order to present a sound and complete interpretation. Quants will help us answer the 'what' (e.g., "participants under 30 tend to rate emails with emojis as noticeably friendlier"), will help us with the 'why' and 'how' (e.g., "interview data indicates that younger professionals use emojis as a means to deliberately neutralize the perceived coldness of the email medium, and hence, establish rapport in a flat-hierarchy workplace"). Indeed, this integration is a main factor in the mixed-methods design's explanatory potential.

All survey and interview respondents were shown an information sheet and given digital informed consent to participate. Donations of WhatsApp data will be subject to a separate consent process, to ensure that participants confirm that they have permission to share their WhatsApp data with all people in the chat they are donating. The project is fully respectful of

your privacy. Corpora was purged of using automated scripts followed by a search using a txt.file with all terms belonging to each of the known legitimate and hits are manually examined. Survey responses have been decoupled from email addresses. An alias has been used for all interviewees in transcripts and publications. All electronic data is stored on password protected and encrypted university servers. The data management plan ensures that data is available for no one other than the original research team and will be destroyed upon expiration of the applicable data retention schedule.

4. RESULTS

This section presents the empirical results based on the corpus, survey, and interview data, which are organized according to the study's research questions. There was significant, platform-constrained linguistic variation observed through corpus analysis. Through keyword comparison, the analysis of the differences between the two forms (Log-likelihood test, $p <. 001$) found informal lexical items to be stat- istically significant positive keyness items in the WhatsApp corpus when compared to the Email corpus. This set included words shorted for lexical reasons (e.g. 'info', 'tho') and initialisms ('idk', 'omg'), a type of words which virtually does not exist in professional data. Emoji density differed substantially among the platforms (Table 4.1). Density over the WhatsApp dataset (25.3 emojis per 1,000 words) was higher than twice of that over Twitter (11.8/1k words) and had an additional orders of magnitude than the one observed across the Professional Email dataset (0.2/1k words). Functional characterisation also revealed that while in the Email corpus 98 percent of the emojis appeared in the final salutation, in WhatsApp, 65 percent were part of mid-utterance or standalone conversational turns.

Corpus	Tokens (Words)	Total Emojis	Density (per 1k words)	Top Emoji by Frequency
WhatsApp	254,830	6,447	25.3	😂
Twitter	1,512,450	17,847	11.8	❤️
Email	251,200	51	0.2	😊

Table 4.1: Comparative Emoji Density and Frequency Across Corpora

Syntactic analysis estimated a higher proportion of fragments in conversational corpora: 15.3% and 11.2% of utterances for WhatsApp and Twitter respectively, whereas for Email only 2.1% of utterances are fragments. Initial conjunctions occurred 4.5 times as often in WhatsApp compared to emails, suggesting a less written-like syntax which is similar to spoken dialogue. The remaining solution is the pragmatic and interactional conventions. A qualitative examination of 200 request sequences in each corpus also indicated that 85% (170/200) of requests in the Email corpus included at least two instances of some form of linguistic mitigation (e.g., hedging, modal verbs, interrogative syntax). By contrast, 68% (136/200) of requests in the WhatsApp corpus were direct imperatives (e.g., "send the doc"), especially when interlocutors were high-familiarity. For 55% of the transactional sequences in the WhatsApp subcorpus, a single emoji (mostly 👍, 🙏, or 👌) was the closing turn. This token served as a lightweight receipt and sequence-closing coin; an institutionalized way of wrapping up the sequence as efficiently as possible.

User judgments were not about absolute correctness, but they were made using context-sensitive criteria. A one-way ANOVA of survey data (N=512) provided confirmation that context was the strongest predictor of message appropriateness ratings. The assessment of an informally-worded request ("hey u, need that report asap!! thx!!! ") was influenced by the platform condition to a greater degree, $F(3, 2044) = 432.5$, p 50) participants belonged to and what they reported as acceptable for using emojis in professional emails, $\chi^2(1, N=348) = 54.2$, $p <. 001$. This finding suggests that there is a (statistically) significant and locally-based, generationally-conditioned redefinition of what counts as professional communication, taking place in the digital world.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This section discusses the results of the previous section, and attempts to place them in the context of the existing literature as reported in the literature review chapter. It summarises the findings to respond to the general research questions, suggests a refined model to assess online communication, and reflects on theoretical and practical implications of the study, and also on the limitations of it. The findings of this study provide a more nuanced picture of language in the age of the digital, as it pushes back against overly simplistic narratives to show a more intricate web of technological, contextual and social practices. {There are three key themes which emerge from the synthesis of findings: the centrality of contextual variation, the

restructuring of pragmatic work and the contribution of language to the indexing of social and generational belonging.

Observations show, however, that the view of a monolithic digital language in the form of some "data language" or "Netspeak" is no longer possible. The marked linguistic contrast between the Professional Email, public Twitter and private WhatsApp corpora — in terms of lexis, syntax, and emoji use across modes — lends credence to the sociolinguistic assertion that language use is to the core an index of context. The affordances of each platform (such as Twitter's character limits, WhatsApp's conversational immediacy, or email's formality) intersect with developing social norms, resulting in communicative ecologies that are specific to each. The results of the evaluative survey, where evaluating users rated the same message as appropriate in one platform yet inappropriate in another, are evidence that users have a nuanced, but automated understanding of such variation. This goes beyond the early CMC notion of universal cue reduction, and lends support for a model of users as strategic agents, deploying the resources of a particular channel to meet their communication ends.

Our findings suggest not a decline in pragmatic norms, but an a robust adaptation of relational work to the digital medium. The lesser use of mitigation in email requests rather than in WhatsApp may be an indication not that politeness is not achieved in the latter but that the members have different expectations about their face-work needs. In addition, the strategic deployment of punctuation, capital letters and emojis to guide tone according to the interviewees is evidence that they were actively attempting to reinstall what lack of design of affect, absence of relationship and presence of textuality took out. Not decorative features, they serve as functional habitus able to accommodate the articulation of illocutionary force and affect. The conventionalization of single-emoji turns as back-channeling devices is a particularly clear case of a new, effective pragmatic norm arising to address interactional challenges of quasi-synchronous, text-based chat.

The study offers fairly compelling proof that the particular linguistic resources used in online communication play an Important part in identity work and the negotiation of social norms. The age-graded difference in emoji choice— notably the split between the "crying laughing" 😂 and "skull" 💀 emojis as markers of amusement—represents an instance of language variation in the making, with a specific form taking on the status of a generational badge. This is consistent with the predictions of the SIDE model that cues to group identity can become highly salient under specific conditions. The large ideological gap among age cohorts regarding

what is considered acceptable in terms of use of emoji at work furthermore illustrates that norms of digital communication are not settled, but an active site in which we are negotiating broader societal shifts towards formality and relationality in the workplace.

Drawing from the empirical results, and in particular the tripartite criteria that feature in our theme-based analysis of user interviews, we would argue that a sweep analysis of online communication needs to move beyond a crude binary of "correct/incorrect" or "formal/informal". Alternatively, success can be measured along three intertwined dimensions of communication: Does the message work to perform its primary, instrumental function clearly and efficiently? This dimension values clarity and goal orientation Fun and community are the two dimensions, in large part, where English prefers to have fun with the language and meet goals. In the light of the context, does the message adequately create, maintain, or modify the desired interaction with others? This dimension measures the moderation of tone, politeness and social harmony.

Is the message in line with the anticipated or appropriate linguistic, generic, and social norms of the particular context or community of practice? This dimension involves user expectations and the symbolic value of conformity with in-group norms. A message can succeed on one dimension and fail on another (like, say, a brutally honest email that accomplishes the task at hand but damages a relationships). So we achieve not effective but harmonious "communication" on the Internet not as a result of having one or all, but finding a compromise among these three dimensions with respect to the goals of the communicator. Theoretically, the study speaks to CMC and sociolinguistic theory by offering multi-platform, contemporary evidence for a context-based model of digital language. It argues that users are agentive actors adapting technology to their social needs, and provides empirical evidence for treating pragmatic conventions as flexible resources rather than constant rules. The proposed framework represents a more sensitive alternative to a prescriptive model of communicative competence.

These findings have much to offer across multiple areas. Pedagogy should avoid the taught rejection of "textisms" or the prescription of "correct" language and instead concentrate on the cultivation of students' metalinguistic knowledge and rhetorical agility. Adopting the proposed 3D framework would enable students to analyse and generate communicatively effective texts in various digital contexts. Companies need to incorporate the culture that encourages evolving and contextual appropriate communication policies other than static cookie cutout

style Guides. Training should also train staff on the importance of relationship management in general, and how to telephone as a professional in various formats. Technology companies need to be aware of the social and pragmatic consequences of their design decisions. The resources and design of features such as emoji sets, reaction buttons, and editing tools may either support or restrain expressions of nuanced sentiment.

Although this study is comprehensive as a mixed-methods study, there are some limitations that suggest implications for future research. The restriction to English is essential for the level of detail learned, but limits the generalizability of the findings. Cross-cultural and cross-linguistic work is required to investigate how these processes operate in different cultural settings. The research evaluated three main platforms but these were not exclusive. Future work should consider other popular environments, including image and video based platforms (e.g., Instagram, TikTok) and community-based platforms (e.g., Discord, Reddit), which have different communicative ecologies. We could not collect data directly from WhatsApp; though, collected sample data suffers from self-selection bias. Moreover, the professional email corpus may not generalize to all domains. This research acts as a scan of the current climate, describing the present normalities and between generations. Necessary for such changes is longitudinal research in order to establish how these norms change over time and in order to map the trajectory of language change in these communities.

The increasing prevalence of AI-mediated communication (e.g., grammar checkers, predictive text, large language models) could also be a source for future work regarding the shaping influence of AI on user practices and evaluative norms. This paper aimed to provide a multi-level taxonomy of online language behaviour, in order to go beyond description to gain a richer perspective on how written language in digital form is used, represented, and evaluated. The research has combined corpus-, survey-, and interview-based data in order to explore the dynamic relationship between technology platforms, linguistic forms, pragmatic functions, and social significance. From this inquiry, three main findings were made. First, there is no such thing as one single "digital language"; language use differs more or less systematically across different platforms, and it does so as it is shaped by their technological affordances and the social contexts they mediate. Second, users are not passive recipients of technologies but agentive actors who actively reshape and innovate pragmatic schemata—he/§ strategies — such as politeness, tone modulation, and interaction management — to adapt them to relational needs of media in which they are textually participating. Third, digital linguistic stylisations

are powerful resources for image creation, especially in terms of generational identification, and represent a prime location for the negotiation of communicative standards and language beliefs in an ongoing process.

Its guiding research questions were answered empirically in this study. We have shown that linguistic and semiotic variation occurs in predictable ways between platforms (RQ1); that pragmatic practices are systemically re-purposed to manage interaction and relationship online (RQ2); that users apply a calculus of practicality, relational performance, and normative alignment to communication (RQ3); and that these linguistic activities are associated with significant identity work and the shaping of social norms (RQ4).

The most important contribution of this research is the conceptualization of a multi-dimensional evaluative framework beyond prescriptions of 'correctness'. By suggesting that communication in the on-line world must be treated as a function of the interrelated components of functional effectiveness, relational appropriateness, and normative alignment, the research provides a more comprehensive and therefore more valid model not only for explaining, but also for teaching, digital communicative competence. With this vocabulary and conceptual tools, scholars, educators, and professionals can discern the communication challenges that arise in the emergent communicative terrain of the digital age. Digital communication will also continue to be an area ripe for further investigation, given how fluid and constantly changing it is. Several research directions have been specifically pressing when they are built upon the present study. On the one hand, this calls for cross-linguistic and cross-cultural comparative work to establish the degree of universality vs. cultural specificity of the asymmetries discussed in this paper. Second, longitudinal research is essential to monitor the development of these norms over time, from a diachronic perspective of digital language change. Third, in light of the changing digital media landscape, research needs to turn towards the new platforms, including video-centric (e.g., TikTok) and community-centric (e.g., Discord) spaces, that have their own linguistic and social dynamics. Third, a critical future line of research here will involve understanding AI-enabled communication. Future research must explore how the growing ubiquity of AI writing assistants and large language models shapes authentic user expression and the standards against which it is judged.

REFERENCES

Baym, N. K. (2015). *Personal connections in the digital age* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.

Biber, D., & Egbert, J. (2018). *Register variation online*. Cambridge University Press.

boyd, d. (2014). *It's complicated: The social lives of networked teens*. Yale University Press.

Crystal, D. (2011). *Internet linguistics: A student guide*. Routledge.

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

Darics, E. (2020). *Digital business discourse*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Giles, H., & Coupland, N. (1991). *Language: Contexts and consequences*. Thomson Brooks/Cole.
(Foundational for Communication Accommodation Theory)

Herring, S. C. (Ed.). (2013). *Pragmatics of computer-mediated communication*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Kádár, D. Z., & Haugh, M. (2013). *Understanding politeness*. Cambridge University Press.
(Relevant to relational work and digital politeness/impoliteness)

Page, R., Barton, D., Unger, J. W., & Zappavigna, M. (2014). *Researching language and social media: A student guide*. Routledge.

Seargeant, P., & Tagg, C. (2014). *The language of social media: Identity and community on the internet*. Palgrave Macmillan.

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

Thurlow, C., & Mroczek, K. (Eds.). (2011). *Digital discourse: Language in the new media*. Oxford University Press.

Walther, J. B. (1996). Computer-mediated communication: Impersonal, interpersonal, and hyperpersonal interaction. *Communication Research, 23*(1), 3–43.
(Foundational SIP/Hyperpersonal Model reference)

Zappavigna, M. (2015). Searchable talk: Hashtags and social media. *Social Semiotics, 25*(3), 274–291.