

Structural and Linguistic Analysis of SMS Text Messages

Muayyad Omran Chiad
Department of English
College of Education
Kerbela University

Abstract:-

The most obvious way in which the communicative behavior has changed is reflected in virtual environments with its different modes of communication. These new modes provide a rich testing ground for theories of language change. In accordance with all the other media, the Mobile technology, in particular SMS, has brought along its own language and culture. The language of the SMS is asynchronous, a single-channel, text-based, technologically mediated discourse. It reflects the unpredictable, unrestricted new communication technology and it evolves at an incredible speed. The following study hopes to provide an understanding of SMS English by analysing interactions in these texts as constituting another form of Computer-Mediated Discourse. The analysis tackles such topics as speech acts, humor, the dichotomy of speech and writing in relation to SMS texts, and orthography. Based on more than 164 texts messages collected from the Internet and Personal correspondences, the study finds out that correspondents of SMS create new language to suit the restrictions of the media. Expressive speech acts comprise the majority among other acts because personal opinions and emotional state are conveyed in text messages intended mainly to build social relations. Humor is significant in SMS texts messages used as an attempt from correspondents to achieve relational goals. They use the established norms of writing and speaking discourse, in addition to a non-standard orthography.

1. Introduction

Mobile phone is currently a stretching tool worldwide among families and friends mainly to reinforce "existing networks of contacts" (Pool, 1977:376). With its innovative force, it has brought an important culture of communication for many communicators—lay to academic, labourers to lawyers and from women to workers on the street alike (Ahmad, 2007: online). One example of such communication includes SMS which, sociolinguistically, "consolidates these sub-communities... Each subgroup will have its own identifying styles, codes and shibboleths" (Sutherland, 2002: online) extending from single sentence greetings to informative, requestive, and directive texts such as reports, newsletters and announcements. SMS is an acronym of "short messaging service", also known as Text Messages, Text Messaging, Mobile Text Messages, Texting, or g-mail (Bernatchez, 2008: online). As put by Walther & Parks (2002 cited in Spitzberg, 2006: online), the term text is not taken to mean only the linguistic symbols, but also refers to any message form that attributes certain kind of meanings. By this, advertisements or photographs sent through a cellular phone are types of texts intended as messages. In this sense, the definition of text is evolved on the same footing with the convergence and development of technology. As technology increasingly permits virtual reality to approximate real life, until then, the determination of text is a useful working space for analysis. SMS Text Messages can serve as an important mode of communication technology. Based on Herring's framework (2001, 2004) which describes Computer-Mediated Discourse (henceforth CMD) according to several dimensions, an analysis of mediated language use can be given. Discourse is first classified according to medium and situational variables that may shape language in use. One important factor in the classification is related to *synchronicity* of participation. In asynchronous systems, messages can be written and received at

widely separated times. They are stored at the addressee's site or mailbox until they can be read, like E(electronic)-mail. In *synchronous* CMD, participants must be present at the same time. A person's typing is transmitted directly to the screen of the other person or group of people as in the Internet Relay Chat (IRC). Transmission, another dimension, has to do with whether or not simultaneous feedback is available; that is, whether the message is *one-way* or *two-way*. *One-way* transmission means that a message is transmitted in its entirety as a single unit, like all modes of Computer –Mediated Communication (henceforth CMC). *Two-way* means that both participants are able to hear the message as it is produced, like (face-to-face interaction). Based on this framework, SMS Text Messages are asynchronous, single-channel, text-based, technologically mediated discourse, with relatively small granularity, that is “messages are typically short”. Accordingly, with reference to CMC as a text-based format, like the instant messaging and online chat, SMS texting can be placed within the modes of CMC. As Grinter & Eldridge (2001:219) put it, cellular phones are, in effect, “mini-terminals for text-based communication”. Spitzberg (2006:online) notices that the cellular phone is a computer and will increasingly converge with all the various characteristics currently associated exclusively with computers... The interactions can be considered interpersonal computer-mediated interactions in which there are interdependent message response capabilities. Participants who have mobile phones send text messages to each other. The texts are stored in a “mail box” and can be read by the recipient at any time. Text Messages can also be sent from a cellular service provider's web page or by visiting some web sites that offer to send text messages free of charge” (Bernatchez, 2008:online). The recipient is told about the coming message by a ring and an alert that appears on the screen of the cellular phone. The research findings concerning the new language and style of CMD in comparison to the standard English or 'traditional' ways of communicating (Herring, 2001; Herring, 1996; Baron, 1998; Collott & Belmore, 1996), prove that “no matter of the medium of communication, it affects discourse”, and “each set of technological constraints means a different set of possibilities, preferences, and restrictions” (Jonstone: 2002 :180). Similarly, SMS might involve new conventional linguistic and communicative practices against the standard English. The language of text-messaging is expected to welcome inconsistency, screw of grammar and syntax, and unruliness. The aims of this study are to find out observable linguistic changes of SMS texts, the way the participants use language to construct their messages, and the kind of orthography used in such messages. The researcher hypothesizes that SMS texts are hybrid of spoken and written languages. The medium is pseudo-conversational. Text features reveal the existence of new genre. Humor and expressive speech acts are pervasive in this media discourse. The study is based on a corpus of 164 messages written in English. They are collected from some internet sites,¹ in addition to the exchange of messages between some people and the researcher. Academic research which has specifically examined the (English) linguistic/discursive practices of text-messaging of CMD is very limited and scattered. It has not caught up with the norms and practices which govern the use of this new medium and whether there is a stylistic feature for writing SMS messages. The results of this study may help to improve the sociolinguistic or discursive mapping of new communication technologies more generally and find a base of analysis which might be validated or contradicted by future studies.

¹ <http://gleez.com/>
<http://www.jijasali.com/collection.php>
<http://uniquefunnysms.wordpress.com/2007/11/11/best-collection-of-english-friendship-sms/>
<http://funnysms.pakreseller.com/english-friendship-sms.asp?pn=2>
<http://www.love104.org/collection-of-my-english-sms.html>
<http://extra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/v1/n1/a3/thurlow2002003-paper.html>
<http://www.mobileheart.com/funny-sms/english-eid-mubarak-sms-messages-8.aspx>
<http://freeenglishsms.blogspot.com/>

2.Speech Acts

Sentence has formal properties as indicative ,imperative, interrogative , and exclamatory which express potential functions when they are used in utterances,that is:statement–assertion,order–request,question,and exclam-ation respectively.Yet,there is no one to - one - correspondence between form and function.Literary,sentences refer to something due to the combination of syntactic and lexical items,while pragmatically a sentence as an utterance means something else due to combination of context.Therefore,sentence as an utterances is said to realize *indirect speech acts (illocutionary force)*.Literal meaning is the property of sentence whereas pragmatic meaning is the property of utterance(Peter Grandy, 2000:59:64) Speech acts are defined as what the speaker is doing with the utterance,their fit to the world,their expressed psychological states,and their prepositionalcontent(Johnstone,2002:196-200).According to Searle’s(1969, 1979),speech acts are categorized into a taxonomy of five main categories depending their illocutionary force.These speech acts are illustrated in Table (1)below.(cf.Nastri et al.2006:online).

Speech act	Properties of speech act	Examples
Assertive	Statements of fact, getting the viewer to form or attend to a belief	"At the library," "I have class until 5 today," "out"
Directive	The sender uses this to get the receiver to do something (i.e. a command)	"call me," "pick me up at 8," "call the cell"
Commissive	The sender commits himself to do something	"be back at 5," "I'll meet you at 7," "bars all night"
Expressive	Sender expresses feeling towards the receiver	"I hate this weather," "School sucks," "I love Fridays"
Effective	To change an institutional state of affairs	"You're fired," "Play ball," "Chapter at 7 or you're fined"
Verdictive	To determine what is the case in an institution	"I find him innocent," "strike"

Table (1) Coding Scheme for Analyzing Speech Acts and Quotations

SMS are parsed into their speech acts.A single message may involve more than one speech act.That is,in the message "class now, then the gym" there are two speech acts,one referring to "class now" and the other referring to "then the gym"(Nastri et al.Ibid).The analysis yields a total of 218 speech acts,with an average of 1.32 acts per a message.The proportion of each speech act category is calculated by dividing the number of speech acts in a given category by the total number of speech acts producedby the participant.Table(2)shows that the speech act structure of SMS text messages under analysis is found to be primarily expressive and directive,then assertive in nature.Expressive speech acts are accounted for 90% of all speech acts in the corpus,while directive speech acts is accounting for 72%,and assertive speech acts is of 55 %.The proportion of expressive speech acts within SMS is significantly higher than all other speech act categories.The rate at which commissive speech acts are produced is higher than effectives and verdictives.Only one effective and no verdictive speech acts are found in the corpus.The reason for this is related to the nature of effective and verdictive speech acts which are used mainly as statements of institutional settings.While SMS lacks this institutional framework,the absence of effective and verdictive speech acts is expected.

Speech act	Frequency	%
Assertive	55	24.66
Directive	72	32.28
Commissive	5	2.24
Expressive	90	40.35
Effective	1	0.44
Verdictive	0	0
Total	223	100

Table (2) Frequency and Relative Frequency of Speech Acts

The analysis reveals that three quarters of SMS texts are mainly intended to reinforce social relationships. This reflects the ubiquitous nature of such texts as firmly manifest themselves in ranging from making social formations, friendly salutations, friendship maintenance, entertainment, romance, and openly sexual and courting exchanges. Expressive speech acts show sentiments about certain events or people and are employed to achieve entertainment functions. Users also use SMS to inform each other of their personal opinions, in addition they try to convey their emotional state whether aroused, happy, sad, angry, or stressed. On the other side, there is a small chance for transactional or informational use in the corpus.

3. Humor

Humor locates so many meaning potential on the level of word semantics. Laughter, for example, does not simply signal something funny, but it also makes a particular way of reading for what is stated (Kotthoff, 2005:online). By this, humorous performances have meanings which are "only discernible in situations of performance in relation to particular tellers, audiences, settings and interactions" (Oring, 1992:31). From a sociolinguistic viewpoint, humor serves at least four social functions. It aids self presentation, facilitates the creation of common understanding, helps generate solidarity and group identity (Norrick, 1983; Palmer, 1994 cited in Baym, 1995:online) and expresses the complexities and problems of the social world. For while humor is by definition non-serious, "informal humour is frequently regarded by participants as a way of expressing serious intent and of conveying serious information without appearing to do so" (Mulkay, 1988: 69). See Baym (op.cit.) for more information. In the corpus, there are many examples of humor with 54 frequency and 33.12% a relative frequency out of the total number of messages in the corpus, suggesting that such texts contain jocular or witty components. While the main function of SMS may be to provide information on certain aspects of life, communicators use humor to build relationships with each other. Tepper (1997:45: cited in Lam, 2004 :online) points out that jokes and jocular forms of spelling stand as a mechanism for consolidating a shared culture. Correspondents make verbal adaptation showing relational intentions.

4- Presence and Physical Environment

As with textual exchanges within the CMC, due to the restrictions of such an electronic medium, the textual production of text messages in creating shared culture seems significant. The correspondents form their contributions in a systematic way through certain codes of communication, such as abbreviations, ellipsis, telegraphic style, reducing the quantity of words and sentences, and word clipping. In addition, in some messages, the physical setting is created verbally in words. Imagination is active here to build correspondents' environment by means of discursive behavior represented by the description of the physical world, therefore physicality is created. The description comes as if in reality

happening,or sometimes more than that as fictional description.Physicality becomes a context on which the virtual reality is based.Look at the following examples:

1- ("o o",)I just wana give a HUG...
 2a 'Special person' I dont get 2 see often,best wishes..

2- Knock,Knock! May I cum in2 ur world? I brought no flowers no cakes but wishes 2 keep u fresh
 3- --/ l_I Delivery
 | | _____
 L(o)_l_(o)_|
 This van is loaded with
 LOVE n CARE,

In example (1)the sender is acting as if he/she enters and implies that the recipient is in the same physical world together.Example (2) the sender is following the actual way of entering a room by knocking,then asking for the permission of his/her addressee and gives out his wishes in that discursive place.In Example (3),the sender is giving a delivery which is quite possible in real life.A sense of community is constructed as a notion associated with familiarity,sharing, and working together for the common good.Some such behaviors include the interactional rituals and routines that recur regularly in this electronic environment (such as greeting, expression of affect, humor, and playing with words),the creation of new syntactic and morphological forms (mostly through abbreviation).Such strategies reduces the perpetual barriers where correspondents are themselves involved in such virtual electronic setting.(See Bays :1998:online).Other examples are like the following:

4- ----\----
 ,--<>--=___/7
 (£ ___=-----/
 .I_I_

D0 I HAVE PERMISSION TO MAKE AN EMERGENCY LANDIN IN UR BEDROOM 2NITE

5-2-1+1=2 eyes look at u...

6- Each time ur name appears on my phone i smile like this :)

7- Touch ur heart
 Close eyes
 Make a wish
 Say good nite
 sky so wide
 Stars so bright
 off the light
 sleep quite quite
 ..(-.-)..
 ZzzZZZZzz
 SWeet DreAms.

5-Writing Features

SMS are informal-like means of communication in which mistakes do not matter.Messages are formed by the communicative situations of the correspondents who may indeed use their basic writing training for different purposes.According to the mobile technology,the format of SMS messages is similar to the style of personal letters with (To, From, date and body). The mobile phone automatically generates them all except for the body of the message.Since the sender is identified by his number in the message,signing off seems strictly speaking redundant.This format seems standardized by mobile phone software and recognized by its users .Similar to CMD,a feature which represents the influence of writing on the SMS texts composition is the use of both greeting and farewell which might be included

within the body element. Greetings and closings in the SMS indicate a function which “acts as a boundary marker, indicating that further scrolling down is unnecessary...that no further personalized text is following” (Crystal :2001 :105). See the examples below:

8-How r u sweetie ?Why am I doing this subject?It's just so boring!cu soon xxx

9- Hi mate,how are you today?I'm watching Eden on channel 4,and I know the girl called Cliona.This is really weird .Going to the gym later on.Have a nice day Another feature which makes SMS texts similar to written language is that both of them require the correspondents to be absent physically from each other,which in fact encourages more intimacy and self-revelation.It creates and fosters extremely emotional bonds between people as if they have close proximity relationships.So,long distance romantic relationships can be carried out over SMS messages as in the message below :

10- HAD SEX!

6.Pseudo-conversation

The analysis of the data suggests that SMS messages are more dynamic and carefree.It approximates the structure and conventions of speech in the adoption of conversational features of the messages with an absent interlocutor. There are some points worth noticing here:

1-One –sided conversation in a particular way that makes them into a sort of exchange on either side of the sequence “question” and “answer” .Each of the parts are given the name “move” by Sinclair and Coulthard(1975:26-27) and Sinclair and Brazil(1982:49),as in the examples below show:

11-Hello, How R U?
FINE..!
R U bored from MY SMS!
S o r y

12-AS IF, wot ugly unrespectin minga has got u? only jokn fatsy, I new ud
laf,dats i sent it-erd ur doin levis proj,did u 12 borrow mine?

2-Echo-questions to start a self–pair part conversation ,such as the example below:

13- -Have I told you latley how much I am in love with you??? No?? Think about it, have a great life...

3-Lower and Upper Case Letters .

SMS texts writers show inattention to case sensitivity of English letters by using lower case letters in situations of the upper case and vice versa. There is a random use of the capital letter, or a complete message in the lower case or upper case which sounds bizarre to the casual reader. The use of lower case may occur at the beginning of sentences, or with proper names, which shows grammatical and lexical mistake respectively. In addition, capitalization may be used to indicate intonation, or to add emphasis and sometimes shouting voice . Consider the following examples:

14-u stupid girl,why ru upset & worried?

15-Hello.Me and laura want2go2jive2moro .

16-WHEN U GOIN BACK?LOVE ME X

17-Then u will know how it feels
in missing a friend like YOU

18-morning,how are you today?

19- R WE DOIN LUNCH THIS WK?CHE

In example(18),the message begins with the greeting(morning) and the interrogative mood asking for confirmation,each starts with a lower case form.The second message,exemplified in(19),uses the upper case either to indicate loudness of voice or they serve as substitutes for aural cues to attract the attention of other individuals.

4-The use of words and phrases that show the oral language of a text such as :

see you , wanna , woh! , onomatopoeia and interjections as in (ZzzZZZZzz , ahh , ohh , ah.ahh.ah..ah , mmmm , looooong)

5-The unprepared talk,mistakes caused by inattention to the standard language forms,and the omission of punctuation marks similar to the most modes of CMC .

SMS data present a different picture to the written standards and frequently contain forms that would be considered ungrammatical,such as the use of omitted pronouns,lack of concord or omission of auxiliary verbs In message(16) above,“WHEN U GOIN BACK?” ,the deletion of verb “ to be” is an example of such ungrammaticalities.Furthermore,“ punctuation tends to be minimalist in most situations...It is an important area,for it is the chief means of a language has for bringing writing into direct contact with the prosody and paralinguistics of speech”(Crystal:ibid:89).Spontaneity may lead to these misspellings and the use of unconventional punctuation,diction,and capitalization in such an electronic discourse(Abdullah,1998:online).Users try to compensate them by the representation of the nonstandard punctuation marks which go away from the normal rules of writing where clause and sentence structure are clearly defined.In addition,they repeat certain punctuation marks for the purpose of exaggerating their emotional involvement,or they use different punctuation marks to add more contextual force or emphasis,like the use of exclamation marks.The sprawling dots may be used to indicate a change from one point to another.See the following examples :

20-HAV A GREAT EID!!!!!!

21-"Is it really raining again?!?!?!"),

22-If you have failed in love or dont have anyone that special.... Dont worry!!!

23-Succes becomes 'NEVER'... But as soon as u think 'WHY NOT NOW',

Success surely will become 'YOURS' ...!

The participants here use the textual representation of auditory information such as prosody,facial expressions,eye contact,body language and other contextual cues as a communicative strategy,which is quite common in oral type of communication.Bolter(2001:73) notices that “the desire to contextualize in this way shows that the implicit model is not written or printed text at all,but face to face conversation or perhaps conversation on the telephone”.By this, phone users create a number of compensatory strategies to replace social cues normally conveyed by other channels in face-to-face interaction which leads to an informal kind of communication(Crystal:2001:107)and very unusual use of language (Henry: 2002:online).

By the same token,individuals include incorrect punctuations,and abbreviations as well as intentional misspellings, or intentional sometimes to get more interpersonal effect .

24-ye i am ok but wht happn to u no mails since loooooong

25-- thats your personal matter!

26- R u bak already khevwine?!i am not comin 4 anuva 2 wks,but khevwine,

u r the sexiast thing since sliced bread!c & sexiast then sliced bread!oh my

luv.I miss u so!x

In these examples,there is a tendency to write as if speaking spontaneously.By this,a kind of informal language is established which serves the effect of solidarity and personal relationships."The use of non-standard orthography is a powerful expressive resource...which can graphically capture some the immediacy, the authenticity and flavor of the spoken word in all its diversity...and has the potential to challenge linguistic hierarchies..."(Jaffe, 2000:498).The non-standard orthography is noticeable because producing these text-based messaging is highly cost effective in time and space which represent the major factors of constraints.It is worth noticing that the inattention does not reflect low education level, nor is it vague or unintelligible.Rather it is quite natural for those who are engaged in this type of interaction(Crystal,ibid:111).Furthermore,as analysis of the corpus indicates,there is another type of orthography of interest.It relies on the shared knowledge or ‘shared conventions’of the frequent users of mobile SMS messages.For example,the non-standard spelling of “please” as "plz" or “yours” as “urs”, shorthands such as “comin” for “coming”or clippings like “ walks” as “Wks” or “ very well “ as “v wel” may be understandable only to the group of people for whom the term "plz"

and “yours” have been previously established as referring to these words, and acronyms, such as “cu” for “see you”, or “coz” for “because”. These examples are characterized as “SMS speaking”. Writers of such texts often write while ‘involved’ in the exchange of the information as if they are facing each other in real life. Therefore, messages are written in a conversational tone or style.

7.SMS Unique Features

Other informal features which are neither spoken nor written are represented by the common use of ellipsis. The corpus shows the use of short sentences without subjects or the use of minor sentences. This represents the case of a person who is in a hurry and wants to save time, for example:

27- Wanna come to tesco?

28- Just had hair cut & look like a ginger medussa .

29- u stupid girl, why ru upset & worried?

In these examples, there is an omission of the words “ you “ and “are” indicating a characteristic feature neither written or spoken. As mentioned by (Baron, 2000:257), this kind of omission happens in CMC which most closely resembles the telegram or the cables jargon of cablegrams . Furthermore, message chain is another characteristic, known as “threading” which enables a quick response by editing some previous messages to suite the new body message depending on the preferable strategy of the sender. Sometimes, the sender manipulates each time a thread of messages to suite with a new text or to give strength to his idea . A feature which is inherent in SMS texts, “ a single piece of text may be preserved throughout a thread of messages, via forwarding or replying to the author, each screen incarnation gives it a different status and may be present in a different form”(Crystal, op.cit.118), indicated in the following message which is comparatively longer jokes or word-plays forwarded from messenger to messenger.

30-I met U as a stranger, I leave U as a friend, as long as the world stands,
our friendship nv ends. All friends nv split N even if they do they will
meet again.

31-Oh my Dear, Forget ur Fear,
Let all ur Dreams be Clear,
Never put Tear, Please Hear,
I want to tell one thing in ur Ear
Wishing u a very Happy "NEW YEAR"!

8-Conclusions

and

Recommendations

SMS discourse is a hybrid of spoken and written languages. The medium is pseudo-conversational. It is used often to convey short notes or responses to participants. The style is informal in which correspondents mostly try to establish a personal relationship with each other. The messages are not very carefully composed or edited for style, therefore examples of misspellings occur. Text features reveal the existence of new genre in its own unique conventions through the use of abbreviations, clippings, new spellings and emoticons. Humor and expressive speech acts are pervasive in this discourse because messages are intended mainly to build relationships among individuals . It is recommended that students are made aware of the situational, contextual and cultural factors and the relationship between people involved in each communication. Therefore, these students should know who they are writing to, for what purpose, and in what situations in order for them to make a decision on the choice of words and level of formality when writing. Samples of normal written texts and SMS texts can be examined, and then students are asked to identify features of formal and informal languages, punctuation commonly used in writing as opposed to the punctuation used in electronic communication . A future research can investigate correlations of demographic characteristics such as (age and gender) with satisfaction with SMS relationships . It may indicate which groups of people find

Journal of Kerbala University , Vol.6. No.4. Humainies . 2008

such relationships most problematic.SMS text messages represent communication needs;such populations could be identified .

Appendix(1) Clipped Forms Non-standard orthography

Clipped forms	Full Forms	Letter/number	Meaning
nothin	Nothing	1	one
wil	Will	4	four
dont	Don't / do not	U	you
mornin	Morning	2 always	to always
evenin	Evening	2gdr	together
askin	Asking	ur	your
sumwher	Somewhere	4 Hundread	4 hundred
feelin	Feeling	2 care	to care
writn.	Writing	4 me	for me
happn	Happening	b	be
comin	Coming	n	and
til	Till	3	three
doin	Doing	some1	someone
unespectin	Unsuspecting	2day	today
Chees	Cheese	2moro	tomorrow
Ye	yes	D	do
Min	minutes	owrds 2	towards
fo	for	2u	to you
		2c	to see
		2gdr	together
		4evr	forever

Appendix(2) Unconventional Spelling

Unconventional Spelling	Conventional forms	Unconventional Spelling	Conventional forms	Unconventional Spelling	Conventional forms
whn	When	wht	what	Uve	You have
/wen	Them	msgs	messages	itz	Its
EM	Does	lways	always	everyb	Everybody
Dis	Night	btn	between	lata	Later
NITE	Don't	wks	walks	Luv	Love
Dont	People	anuva	anniversary	sexia	Sexier
ppl	Knew	def	deaf	wnt	Went
knw	Lasts	proj	project	myb	Maybe
lst	Every	tho	though	abv	Above
evry	Last	Spk	speak	ud	You would
lst	Yourself	ho	how	nv	Never
yf	Always	sth	something	ur	You are
alwys	Stay	becau/ Bcoz	because	urs	Yours
sty	Together	laf	laugh	jokn	Joking
2gdr	Forever	levis	Levi's	luk	Look
4evr	Maybe	willnt	Will not /	hv	Have
myb	Want	Thigs	Things	meanz	Means
wnt	Make	sumwher	Somewhere	eyez	Eyes
mk	there	X-mas	Christmas	laf	Laugh
thr	please	enuf	Enough	rite	Right
Pls	towards	X- citement	Excitement	Eery	Every
owrds	never	Xpose	Expose	hv	have
nvr	yesterday	cum	Come		
ystrdy	called	Dreamz	Dreams		
cal'd	over	Yo	You		
ovr	just	ye	Yes		
jst	return	Gud Morg	Good morning		
retrn					

Appendix(3)Accentualization and Misspelling

Accentualization		Misspelling	
Cos/coz	Because	haly	Holy
EM	Them	accasion	Occasion
Dis	Does	HApY	Happy
C	See	Wlaking	walking
v	Have	latley	Lately
m	Him	utery	Utterly
fo	For	unsuspectin	Unsuspecting
wid	Would		
Fal	Follow		
wid	Would		
kinda	Kind of		
wot	What		
hun	Honey		
waz	Was		
Bit	But		
ye	Yes		
da mornin	That morning		
da evenin	That evening		
laf	Laugh		
wana/wanna	Want to		
bak	Back		

Appendix(4) Emoticons and Onomatopoeia

Emoticons	Meaning	Onomatopoeia	
(c _____,)	Big Smile	ZzzZZZzzz	
! =)	Keep smiling	ahh	
: -)	smiley	ohh	
..(-.-).. ZzzZZZzzz	Sleeping	ooh	
😊	Smiley face	mmmm	
:))	joke marker (Laughing)	Oh	
(é	ANGEL	ah.ahh.ah..ah	
(é	In DISGUISE	looooong	
(') >?</ /	F*CK OFF!	woh!)	
(è é)	them two	ooohhh	
>?<	ugly		
<()>	looking for you		
**			
(""")	Mmmm, interjection		
(")_(")	Friends		
!!!!	Exclamation		
@	At		
o,,,o /),/) (' ; ') (' ; ')	You and me forever		
* * ("")()	Bye		
((((((_ ,))))))	scared		
XXX	Kisses		
* * * *	What ?		
???	Exaggerate Question		
:)	Love You		
!!!	exclamation		
(""),,,("") "***	Sweet Dreams		
+ / &	And		
(o)	say		

References

Abdullah, Mardziah Hayati(1998)”Electronic Discourse: Evolving Conventions in Online Academic Environments. ERIC Digest.” Retrieved on 2/2/2008 from the WWW: <http://www.ericdigests.org/>

Journal of Kerbala University , Vol.6. No.4. Humainies . 2008

- Ahmad, Imran Naeem (2007) "Cell phones changing the lives of the poor" . Daily Times Monday, March 26 . Retrieved on 2/2/2008 from the WWW <http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp>
- Baron, N.(1998) "Letters by phone or speech by other means: The linguistics of email". Language and Communication 18, 133-170.
- (2000)Alphabet to Email .London :Routledge .
- Baym, N. (1995b). "The Performance of Humor in Computer-Mediated Communication". Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 1 (2). Retrieved January 21,2007 from the WWW: <http://www.usc.edu/dept/annenberg/vol1/issue2/baym.html>
- Bays, Hillary (1998) "Framing and Face in Internet Exchanges : A Socio-Cognitive Approach". Linguistik online 1, 1/98 Retrieved January 21, 2007 from the WWW : <http://www.Linguistik-online.de/>
- Bernatchez , Eric (2008)"What does SMS Text Messages mean?". About, Inc., The New York Times Company .Retrieved on 5/2/2005 from the WWW : <http://www.about.com> .
- Bolter,Jay David(2001)Writing Space.London:Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Clark, H. H. (1996). Using Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collott, M., Belmore, N.(1996) "Electronic language: A new variety of English".In Susan C, Herring (Ed.), Computer-mediated communication: Linguistic, social and cross-cultural perspectives Philadelphia: John Benjamins.(pp. 13-28).
- Crystal, D. (2001)Language and the Internet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grinter, D.E., Eldridge, M.A.(2001) "y do tngrs luv 2 txt msg?". In W, Prinz, M, Jarke, Y, Rogers, K, Schmidt & V, Wulf (eds), Proceedings of the seventh European Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work.Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers. (pp, 219-238).
- Henry, Julie(2002) "Delete text message style, say examiners" . Retrieved on 5/2/2008 from the WWW : <http://www.tsleducation.com/>
- Herring, S. C. (2004). "Computer-Mediated Discourse Analysis : An Approach to Researching Online Behavior". In Barab, S. A.; Kling, R.; & Gray, J. H. (eds.), Designing for Virtual Communities in the Service of Learning New York: Cambridge University Press. pp. 338-376.
- (2001). "Computer-Mediated Discourse". In D. Tannen, D. Schiffrin, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), Handbook of Discourse Analysis .Oxford: Blackwell.(pp. 612-634).Also retrieved on 5/3/2008 from the website: <http://odur.let.rug.nl/~redeker/herring.pdf>.
- (Ed.)(1996).Computer-Mediated Communication: Linguistic, Social and Cross-Cultural Perspectives Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (pp. 81-106). Also retrieved on 5/3/2008 from the website <http://www.slis.indiana.edu/faculty/herring/cv.html>
- Jaffe, A.. (2000)"Introduction: Non-standard Orthography and Non standard Speech". Journal of Sociolinguistics, 4(4), 497-513.
- Johnstone ,Barbara (2002)Discourse Analysis.Blackwell Publishing. Oxford.
- Kotthoff , Helga (2005) "The Pragmatics of Performance and the Analysis of Conversational Humor" to appear in Feyaetrts , k (2005) Humor .Special Issue on Cognitive Humor Research . Also retrieved on 5/3/2008 from the website [http://home.phfreiburg.de/kotthoffr/literatur/Pragmatics%20of%20performance%20\(Anfang\).pdf](http://home.phfreiburg.de/kotthoffr/literatur/Pragmatics%20of%20performance%20(Anfang).pdf)
- Lam ,Wan Shun Eva (2004) "Second Language Socialization Bilingual Chartroom : Global and Local Considerations". Language Learning & Technology .Vol. 8, No. 3, September 2004, pp.44-65 .Retrieved on 11/ 12/ 2007 from the Web Site : <http://llt.msu.edu/>
- Mulkay, M. (1988). On Humour: Its Nature and its Place in Modern Society. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Nastri, J., Peña, J., and Hancock, J. T. (2006).The construction of away messages:A speech act analysis.Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication.11(4), article 7.Retrieved On 21/2/2006 from the webs Site: <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol11/issue4/nastri.html>

Journal of Kerbala University , Vol.6. No.4. Humainies . 2008

- Norrick, N. R. (1993). Conversational Joking: Humor in Everyday Talk. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Grundy, Peter (2000) Doing Pragmatics .London: Arnold
- Oring, E. (1992) Jokes and their Relations. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.
- Palmer, J. (1994). Taking Humour Seriously. London: Routledge.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech Acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1979). Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spitzberg, B. H. (2006). "Preliminary Development of a Model and measure of Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) Competence. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication. 11(2), article 12. Retrieved on 13 /2/ 2007 from the Web Site: <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol11/issue2/spitzberg.html>
- Sutherland, J. (2002) "Can u txt? John Sutherland Asks what Texting is Doing to the English language - and Finds it all a Bit :- (" ". The Guardian Newspaper. November 11 . Retrieved on 4/2/2008 from the Web Site : <http://guardian.co.uk/mobile/article/0,2763,837709,00.html>
- Tepper, M. (1997) Usenet Communities and the Cultural Politics of Information. In D. Porter (Ed.). Internet culture .New York: Routledge. (pp. 39-54).
- Pool, I. de S. (Ed.). (1977). The Social Impact of the Telephone. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Sinclair, J. MaH., Brazil, D. C (1982) Teacher Talk. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. MaH and Caulthard, R. M (1975) Towards an Analysis of Discourse. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zhao, S. (2006). Do Internet Users Have More Social Ties? A call for Differentiated Analyses of Internet Use. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication. 11(3), article 8. Retrieved on 12/2/2005 from the Web Site: <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol11/issue3/zhao.html>