International Journal of Philology, 16(3), 2025
Journal homepage: https://philologicalscience.com.ua/en
Received 15.03.2025 Revised 02.09.2025 Accepted 23.09.2025

UDC 81.27:316.35 DOI: 10.31548/philolog/3.2025.61

Features of language functioning and communication in social networks

Svitlana Heyko*
PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor
National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine
03041, 15 Heroiv Oborony Str., Kyiv, Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0119-7673

Olena Lauta
PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor
National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine
03041, 15 Heroiv Oborony Str., Kyiv, Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6118-0258

Abstract. The article analysed the features of communication in social networks, as well as the essential characteristics and existing classifications of hate speech and support speech. The need for a deeper understanding of these phenomena is due to their impact on society, communication norms and the need to develop effective mechanisms for countering aggression in the network. The purpose of the study was to identify, analyse and systematise communicative strategies for expressing hate speech and support in social networks. The methodology included content analysis of texts, structural and semantic modelling and sociolinguistic observation. The results of the study showed that the language of social networks is a hybrid, which is characterised by informality and brevity such as simple sentences, agrammatisms, abbreviations; multimodality such as the use of emojis, memes, images; hypertextuality and compression such as use of hashtags, links; impact of technical limitations: character limits stimulate creativity; adaptation to censorship: modification of words to bypass moderation algorithms. Hate speech is implemented through strategies of sarcasm, manipulation, the opposition "friend-stranger" and the use of modified vocabulary to bypass censorship. Supportive speech is mainly expressed through strategies of emotional support, informational assistance and the use of verbal and non-verbal markers (likes, retweets, hashtags). The interaction of polar discourses of hostility and support in the digital environment reflects the adaptation of communicative practices to the conditions of online communication and moderation algorithms. The study found that these

Suggested Citation:
Heyko, S., & Lauta, O. (2025). Features of language functioning and communication in social networks. *International Journal of Philology*, 16(3), 61-73. doi: 10.31548/philolog/3.2025.61.

*Corresponding author

Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

discourses often exist in parallel spaces (for example, in replies to the same tweet). A common strategy for both is the use of the opposition "friend-stranger". Supportive speech often arises as a reaction to hate speech, forming a mechanism of collective resistance

Keywords: hate speech; supportive speech; Internet; online interaction; networking platforms; discourse strategies

Introduction

The rapid development of digital technologies and the global popularity of social networks have led to the emergence of new forms of communication that are significantly transforming traditional language practices. Platforms such as Facebook, Instagram, X (Twitter), TikTok and Telegram form a specific communicative space with their own norms, genres and linguistic innovations. In these environments, speech takes on a multimodal character, combining verbal and non-verbal means that influence the structure and functioning of linguistic discourse. Social networks are an important tool for shaping public opinion, but at the same time they are an environment for the spread of hate speech. Alongside it, supportive language is developing as an alternative communicative practice focused on solidarity and mutual assistance. The relevance of the study is due to the fact that social networks not only reflect linguistic changes, but also actively initiate them, setting linguistics the task of understanding the mechanisms of digital language formation and its interaction with traditional forms of speech. The study of social media language is an interdisciplinary field that involves linguists, philosophers, and digital technology analysts.

British linguist D. Crystal (2021) conducted a thorough analysis of the impact of digital technologies on language and became one of the founders of the field of internet linguistics. In his works, the scientist outlined the main prospects for the development of this field of research (sociolinguistic, educational, stylistic and applied), defining their significance for understanding language processes in the digital environment, which laid the foundation for the further development of Internet linguistics as a separate field. Internet linguist G. McCulloch (2020) analysed the evolutionary changes characteristic of modern Internet communication, in particular how the digital environment affects the structure and functioning of the English language. Based on the conducted analysis, the researcher concluded that the Internet as a global space for communication generates new language practices and changes the mechanisms of meaning transmission. In the context of studying language processes in the digital environment, the article by D. Strelēvica-Ošiņa (2019) is particularly noteworthy, in which the researcher analysed the terminology used to describe linguistic correctness, emphasising the Latin origin of a significant part of the key concepts. This approach made it possible to trace the historical factors that shaped normative ideas that influence the interpretation of linguistic usage, particularly in the context of social networks.

A new direction in the study of language practices on social networks has been the study of the phenomenon of “brainrot language”. This term is used to refer to internet content with low informational value or potentially negative psychological effects. The concept also covers the phenomenon of excessive consumption of digital media, primarily short-form videos and texts, which can have adverse effects on cognitive functioning. This phenomenon has been studied by K. Tiffany (2021). Research into the lexical-semantic aspects of language functioning is considered promising. Ukrainian

researchers L. Tereshchenko & L. Stanislavova (2024) concluded in their work that lexical-semantic categories constitute one of the most complex levels of the language system, as they combine the lexical fund of the language and the structure of meanings. The authors analysed in detail the lexical-semantic fields covering sets of lexemes united by common meaning; lexical-semantic groups formed on the basis of a common generalised seme; and the sememe as a unit reflecting the separate meaning of a polysemous word. This approach made it possible to systematically describe the patterns of lexical meaning organisation and the mechanisms of its variation within the linguistic structure of the Internet community.

A comprehensive comparative analysis of the strategic parameters of communicative interaction between Ukrainian-speaking and English-speaking social media users was conducted by L. Shvelidze (2021). In the scientific works, the researcher outlined the mechanisms of communication conflict and cooperation in network discourse, developed a typology of communication strategies, and defined the essence of communication tactics in Ukrainian and English. An important achievement in the research was the identification of specific features of the speech behaviour of participants in the Ukrainian- and English-speaking segments of social networks and the delineation of typological trends in the functioning of communication in the digital environment. The peculiarities of the Ukrainian and French languages in the context of network communication remain relatively understudied, which highlights the need for further interlinguistic and intercultural studies.

The psychological aspect of supportive language has been studied by T.I. Buialska (2016) and A.P. Romanchenko (2024), while its linguistic aspects have not been sufficiently researched. In her article, T.M. Geiko (2025) examined the influence of social networks on the modern French language as a special communicative environment. The author analysed how vocabulary and word meanings change in digital communication, how neologisms, borrowings and new language models appear, and how specific discursive practices of online interaction are formed. The conclusions emphasise that social media are significantly transforming the communicative system of the French language, creating dynamic, flexible and context-dependent forms of speech that differ from traditional norms. Despite a significant number of studies devoted to individual aspects of Internet communication, a comprehensive analysis of the functioning of language in the context of social networks remains relevant. It is necessary to investigate in more detail how the technological features of platforms influence the ways in which messages are constructed, how users adapt linguistic means to the requirements of the digital environment, and what pragmatic, social and cultural functions language performs in online interaction.

The aim of the study was to conduct a comprehensive analysis of language of support as a linguistic phenomenon and to investigate its interaction with language of hostility in the context of French-language digital communication. Objectives: to characterise the features of Internet communication and social media language; to refine the definitions and classifications of the concepts of hostility and support; to analyse the contexts of their use and interaction. The achievement of the stated aim and objectives made it possible not only to gain a deeper understanding of the patterns of digital communication, but also to outline prospects for further linguistic and interdisciplinary research in this field.

Materials and Methods

The methodological basis of the study was a set of general scientific and special linguistic methods, the application of which ensured the systematic and multifaceted nature of the analysis. In particular, general scientific methods of analysis and synthesis were used to process

theoretical sources, generalise scientific approaches to the study of network discourse, and systematise factual material. Descriptive analysis was aimed at systematically describing linguistic and communicative phenomena, which made it possible to focus on the process of linguistic interaction in social networks within the French-speaking communicative space, identify and classify the linguistic mechanisms of forming new units in social networks, describe linguistic innovations that arise as a result of interaction between standard language and digital slang, and systematise them according to certain criteria.

The main tool of analysis was content analysis, which made it possible to systematise empirical material, identify thematic groups of manifestations of hate speech (in particular, racist, sexist and other forms of discriminatory discourse) and supportive speech, as well as track their frequency and functional orientation. At the same time, linguistic and stylistic analysis was used to identify the linguistic means and rhetorical devices used to implement the relevant communication strategies. Given the multimodal nature of online communication, the study also relied on an analysis of the interaction between verbal and non-verbal components of messages, in particular text with emojis, memes, GIF animations, stickers and video clips, which made it possible to take into account the role of technological markers in the formation of meaning. The interpretation of supportive language was carried out taking into account a psychological approach, which involves the analysis of stress coping resources and forms of structural and functional support, as well as a functional approach, which allows to distinguish between emotional, informational and network support. The combination of linguistic, psychological, and multimodal methods provided a comprehensive understanding of communicative practices in social networks and their discursive and pragmatic characteristics.

Observation of the language practices of social network respondents showed that the language of social networks is a kind of linguistic hybrid, combining elements of standard language, slang, argot, neologisms, graphic abbreviations, emojis, etc. The study of this phenomenon made it possible to trace how the lexical system of language, in particular French, functions in new conditions and how it adapts to the challenges of digital communication. Quantitative analysis was used to establish the frequency of individual linguistic phenomena, as well as to determine the dynamics of their use in the Ukrainian- and French-speaking segments of social networks. Special linguistic methods play an important role in the study. Comparative analysis made it possible to study the communicative behaviour of Ukrainian- and French-speaking social network users, which allowed to identify common and distinctive features of linguistic representation of social interaction. Linguistic and stylistic analysis was used to determine the stylistic and emotional-expressive load of lexical units used in online discourse, as well as to clarify the role of evaluative and expressive means in shaping the communicative effect.

The typological method was used to identify typological differences between the linguistic means of the Ukrainian and French languages in the digital environment. Contextual-interpretative analysis made it possible to study the communicative intentions of participants in online interaction, their communicative roles and the peculiarities of meaning realisation in specific communication situations. Discursive analysis helped to identify the specifics of the realisation of speech genres and speech acts in the process of Internet communication, taking into account sociocultural and pragmatic factors. Linguistic-pragmatic analysis was used to develop a typology of communicative strategies and tactics of communicants in Internet communication, and component analysis was used to determine the semantic composition of

lexical units used in network discourse. The combined application of these methods provided a comprehensive approach to the study of the linguistic and communicative features of modern online discourse and made it possible to obtain well-founded scientific conclusion.

Results and Discussion

Digital technologies have become an integral part of everyday life around the world, reflecting a high level of digital development and the deep integration of online platforms into social communication. Social networks, along with other electronic media such as news sites, blogs, mobile applications and online forums, occupy an important place in the information environment of the modern world. They have not only changed the way news is received, but have also become an effective communication tool. Government officials and members of society actively use digital platforms to interact with citizens, disseminate messages, and so on. Digital media has also become a key resource for civil society activists, particularly volunteers, who use social networks to promote their ideas and attract new supporters to socio-political activities.

Large-scale digitalisation has a significant impact on linguistic culture. Social networks contribute to the rapid spread of new words, technical vocabulary and expressions, often of English origin. Through active use in online communication, these linguistic innovations quickly enter everyday use. Entertainment media products such as reality shows, TV series and popular bloggers also play an important role in changing the linguistic environment. Charismatic presenters and fictional characters become linguistic role models, especially for young audiences. Their expressions, style of speech and communication characteristics are often imitated by viewers and gradually become established in everyday language. The internet has had a radical impact on people's everyday lives, and one of the most noticeable areas of this impact has been the change in communication methods. Social networks have made it possible to maintain social contacts regardless of distance, create personal networks, and shape public image. Online communication has become a factor that has a significant and lasting impact on both language and social processes. The term "social media language" is used to refer to the specific vocabulary, grammatical structures and writing style that have emerged in the digital environment. This type of speech is characterised by informality, active use of slang and a tendency towards conciseness: many words and expressions are shortened or take on new forms. This language system is constantly changing in response to new trends and cultural processes shaped by the values of the younger generation.

To a large extent, the language of social platforms has become a kind of marker of identity for modern youth. It allows to convey their thoughts, emotions, and beliefs in a way that is natural and understandable to their peers. Moreover, this format of communication helps to strengthen the sense of community and belonging, primarily through hashtags, memes and various elements of internet slang, which form a common cultural and linguistic space for users from different regions. Social networks are forming their own unique style of communication. These are short and witty messages, often accompanied by irony, abbreviations and hashtags. It can be visual material around which interests and communities are formed. Video sequences with sound effects are common – popular expressions, music fragments or excerpts from speeches.

The style of digital language is largely determined by the technical limitations of social platforms. For example, Twitter still imposes a 140-character limit per post, which encourages users to shorten their thoughts as much as possible, often sacrificing grammatical or stylistic correctness. As a result, abbreviations, symbolic substitutions, and various shortcuts have

become commonplace not only for ordinary users but also for media representatives. The language of social networks is also significantly influenced by content censorship, especially when it comes to topics considered sensitive, such as violence, suicide, sexuality, or politics. To avoid automatic blocking, users deliberately distort the spelling of words, replacing individual letters with symbols that are similar in form or sound. Such practices have become not only a way to circumvent censorship, but also part of a new visual and linguistic aesthetic that is actively forming in the digital environment.

Internet communication, particularly on social media, has created a unique communicative environment with its own rules and norms. The language of social media (computer-mediated communication) is considered a separate sociolinguistic phenomenon characterised by a number of specific features (Geiko, 2025). At the syntactic level, simple short sentences, frequently used incomplete and one-clause sentences are most common. Such sentences do not overload the text and keep the recipients' attention. The phenomenon of agrammatism is also common. The text producer deliberately deviates from the norms of syntax and punctuation. Punctuation marks may be absent, incorrectly placed, or deliberately overused. In addition, the concept of language varieties is blurred in the social media environment. In addition to the usual styles and registers, the choice of font, writing system and punctuation also play a meaningful role. For example, there is a so-called Greeklish on the Internet, which is Greek written in the Latin alphabet.

The language used in online communication is close to colloquial speech, as it has characteristics such as emotionality, expressiveness, informality, and evaluative reactions. Most often, such language is not formal in nature. Based on the example of the French language, the main aspects of the influence of social networks on the language system will be considered. Firstly, there is a noticeable emergence of hashtags for keywords or phrases preceded by the symbol '#' (octothorpe), used to structure text messages by topic or type. They create a parallel language where a common lexical unit can unite thousands of like-minded people. For example, cult hashtags that have been lexicographically recorded on the Internet include #ThrowbackThursday, #FoodPorn, and #Selfie.

Secondly, there is a significant spread of various abbreviations, primarily acronyms and abbreviations, which indicates the activity of the word-formation subsystem of the French language. Certain restrictions on the use of symbols in social networks contribute to the linguistic creativity of speakers-users, thanks to which a multitude of acronyms and abbreviations have appeared, enriching the vocabulary of everyday communication, such as lol (laughing out loud), mdr (mort de rire), OMG (Oh my God). Thirdly, an important aspect is the emergence of ideograms – emojis. These iconographic symbols of emotions and objects/items have become a universal means of communication, making them more functional than simple linguistic signs and essential elements of online conversations, as they convey certain emotional concepts more concisely than simple lexemes.

Next, it is worth mentioning the surge in neologisms caused by the active creativity of users. Many original words and expressions appear on social media, mostly occasionalisms, which are transient due to the specificity of their denotation. Such units are on the periphery of the lexical-semantic system of the French language. For example, during the World Cup, the term Mbappémania appeared to describe the enthusiasm for the play of young footballer Kylian Mbappé. Others enter the common vocabulary, such as "tweeter" and "liker," which refer to common practices on social media. Finally, there are new linguistic challenges related to communication through interactive game formats, where users have to follow certain rules. For example, lipograms are texts written without using one or more

letters of the alphabet. In this way, the potential of communication is developed and diversified, particularly in its linguistic and conceptual dimensions (Geiko, 2025). Thus, social media platforms create a favourable environment for borrowing, while activating native lexemes and word formation tools.

Other features of social media language are also emerging as alternatives. First and foremost is hypertextuality: in a network environment, linear text can be transformed into non-linear hypertext. In addition, online communication is characterised by a compressive language-creating process, where alphanumeric symbols are formed according to the principle of homophony: ok1- aucun, pl1- plein. Furthermore, there is a phenomenon of reterminology, i.e. the use of an existing term in a new meaning or in a different field. For example, the word virus began to be used to refer to an "internet virus" (Holubovska, 2015). Among other features of the language of social media, informality and brevity can also be highlighted. Communications are characterised by simple syntactic constructions, deliberate deviations from grammatical and punctuation norms (agrammaticalisms), as well as the active use of abbreviations, acronyms and initialisms, which is due to the desire for efficiency and often technical limitations of platforms (Antonyuk & Hoza, 2023).

Multimodality: The text component is combined with visual (emojis, memes, images, GIFs) and audio information. Emojis and emoticons perform a compensatory function, replacing non-verbal means of communication (facial expressions, gestures, intonation). Adaptation to censorship: To circumvent moderation algorithms, users deliberately distort the spelling of banned words by replacing letters with similar symbols (e.g., "n@zi"), which has become part of the visual and linguistic aesthetics of the digital environment (Määttä, 2023). Each social platform forms its own communicative style. Network X (formerly Twitter) is characterised by conciseness, a high concentration of irony and sarcasm, and the use of hashtags to participate in public discussions (Adawiyah, 2023).

Communication on the intern*et al*so has a number of features. It can be carried out using written text, images, video and audio files, as well as through sharing and liking. Despite this number of means of communication, the most common is the use of written text. The most common types of communication on social media include posts, stories, comments, reviews, and private chats (Antonyuk & Hoza, 2023). Since social networks allow for the rapid dissemination of content and responses to it, online messages, prioritising immediacy, may rely less on verified sources and neglect the principle of objectivity (Mabillard *et al.*, 2024). It is also worth noting that due to the physical absence of a communication partner, the communicator can express their thoughts and feelings more freely (Udovichenko & Samoilenko, 2021).

A characteristic feature of communication on social networks is the expression of support and hostility. Hate speech is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon, for which there is no single definition in the scientific community. Within the scope of this study, hate speech is defined as derogatory, discriminatory statements based on social prejudices and directed at a person or group of persons because of their membership in a particular social, ethnic, religious, gender or other category. There are a number of approaches to classifying hate speech. By thematic focus: Spanish researchers distinguish between racist, sexist, ideological and violent hate speech (Brändle *et al.*, 2024). By explicitness: the German school proposes a dichotomy between explicit (direct insults, threats) and implicit (negative stereotypes, misinformation, minimisation of historical facts). By social affiliation of the victim: manifestations of xenophobia, anti-Semitism, Romaphobia, Afrophobia, etc.

Discursive features of hate speech encompass a variety of lexical, pragmatic and stylistic features. These include the use of sexist

expressions directed against both women and men, the use of slurs and vulgarisms with derogatory connotations. Another characteristic feature is the use of controversial symbols, nicknames and hashtags, particularly those referring to groups involved in hate crimes. Such messages are often manipulative or deliberately distort facts, and may contain sarcasm, irony, ambiguous wording, personal attacks, biased attacks and accusations of lying, deception or ignorance (Papcunová *et al.*, 2023). An important discursive feature of hate speech is its clear focus on an object. Hate speech is a verbalised form of primary, undefined emotions (domestic affects) that do not have a specific object in themselves. When these emotions are expressed in speech, they become directed, i.e. they turn into hostility towards someone or something. Another characteristic feature is the use of so-called "magic words" or discursive "fetishes": repeated terms or expressions that, through excessive use, lose their original meaning and context, turning into emotional triggers and a kind of "advertising slogans" that function almost automatically (Voirol & Martini, 2023). Some researchers analyse direct hate speech as a manifestation of exclusion, denial and annihilation – processes aimed at depriving a particular person or group of their right to exist. Indirect hate speech, on the other hand, can take the form of denying or minimising hateful actions or historical facts, i.e. downplaying their significance (Moïse & Hugonnier, 2019). Since posts with overtly negative vocabulary are often removed by moderation algorithms, hate speech on social media rarely uses openly negative epithets. A much more common practice is to modify keywords to bypass algorithms, for example, replacing the letter "a" with "@" (Määttä, 2023).

The compositional features of the discursive characteristics of hate speech also include the actualisation of the binary opposition "in-group-out-group", which contributes to the polarisation of society. A clear antonymic position is created between "us", the members of a certain group, and "them", the opposing group, whose dissent causes dissatisfaction. Stylistic features lead to the use of so-called "magic words" or fetishes, which, through repetition, lose their original meaning and become emotional triggers, as well as the modification of vocabulary to circumvent moderation (Voirol & Martini, 2023). Thus, the discursive features of hate speech are: the use of pejorative, sexist vocabulary and vulgarisms; manipulation, sarcasm, irony, distortion of facts; actualisation of the "in-group-out-group" opposition; use of "magic words" and modification of vocabulary.

Supportive language is conceptualised in this study as multidimensional communication aimed at providing assistance, emotional encouragement, and expressing approval or solidarity with the views or actions of others. Contemporary scientific literature distinguishes three leading approaches to its analysis. The psychological approach considers social support as one of the key resources for overcoming stress, proposing a distinction between structural (quantitative characteristics of social contacts) and functional (qualitative parameters of interaction) support. The communicative approach focuses on speech strategies and tactics. Within this approach, a distinction is made between internal support (verbalisation of one's own beliefs) and external support (interaction with other communicators) (Buialska, 2016). Support tactics include support itself, praise, consolidation, gratitude, and other types of supportive speech (Romanchenko, 2024).

The functional approach classifies support according to its social functions. Emotional support includes expressions of comfort, empathy and encouragement. Informational support involves providing advice, instructions and relevant information. Self-esteem support is achieved through affirmation of a person's values and competencies. Network support provides a sense of belonging to a community. Practical and tangible support manifests itself in specific proposals for solving problematic

situations. It is worth noting that online communication is dominated by informational support, which is most often represented in the form of advice; emotional support is the second most common type (Millette & Boislard, 2023). Forms of expressing support on social networks are diverse. They are verbal, expressing direct words of support, appeals, comments. They are also non-verbal/technological, expressed through likes, retweets (with or without comments), the use of supportive hashtags, changing avatars or profile names to show solidarity (Aubanelle, 2022). The characteristics of supportive discourse are its dialogical nature, cooperative model of interaction, contextuality, meaningfulness, and interdiscursivity – the ability to integrate into other types of discourse (Buialska, 2016). One way to show support is by sharing posts and tweets. Reposting (retweeting) can take two forms: without comment or with an added opinion, which creates an additional metadiscursive level.

Other means of expressing support include the choice of nickname and profile photo. On social network X, it is important to distinguish between the username, which begins with @, and the account name. Most often, it is the account name that is changed to show support. This is for pragmatic reasons: the account name is more visible due to its location and bold font, and it also provides broader discursive possibilities – up to 50 characters compared to 15 for the username. The profile photo, which embodies the user's digital identity, can also be easily changed according to communicative intentions, in particular to express solidarity (Aubanelle, 2022). Studies have shown that users who post their own face on their avatar and use their real name receive more polite and personalised responses because their profiles are perceived as more socially "present" (Feng *et al.*, 2013).

Hashtags can also be a means of supporting a particular person or phenomenon. They perform a classificatory function, but at the same time can carry interpretative or metadiscursive meaning (Aubanelle, 2022). Research has found that these discourses often exist in parallel spaces (e.g., in responses to the same tweet). A common strategy for both is the use of the "in-group-out-group" opposition. Supportive language often arises as a reaction to hate speech, forming a mechanism of collective resistance. The results of the study show that social media language is shaped by specific communicative conditions that distinguish it from traditional forms of writing and oral interaction. One of the key features is the high degree of dynamism of linguistic means: new lexical units, memes, hashtags and abbreviations appear extremely quickly and spread thanks to the network effect. The results are consistent with the study by L. Shvelidze (2021), which points to the speed of linguistic transformations. This confirmed the assumption that digital discourse is a self-regulating, adaptive system that responds to changes in the social context almost instantly.

An important trend is the growing role of multimodal means of communication. The use of emojis, GIF animations, stickers, reactions, and video clips serves not only a decorative but also a meaningful function, complementing or even replacing the verbal component. The results confirm the conclusions of V. Sikorska *et al*. (2024). Participants in communicative interaction actively use these means to convey emotional nuances, irony, or pragmatic intentions, which in traditional written speech would require detailed descriptions. The data obtained demonstrate that emojis and other non-verbal elements act as markers of interpersonal closeness and social engagement. The phenomenon of fragmentation and non-linearity of communication attracts particular attention. O. Kudelska (2023). The presence of comments, threads, reposts, and instant reactions creates a polycentric discourse in which messages can be reinterpreted or broken away from their original context. This leads to a change in the logic of constructing statements: users often focus not on a consistent presentation of their thoughts, but on

maximum clarity within a short fragment. Thus, a communicative strategy of "minimal semantic blocks" is formed, characteristic of platforms where audience attention is a limited resource.

A trend towards increased personalised communication has also been identified (H. Matsiuk, 2021). Users are increasingly forming individual language styles, which are manifested in the choice of specific language markers, the use of emojis and special ways of formatting text. This practice contributes to the construction of digital identity, but can complicate mutual understanding between representatives of different online communities with their own norms and traditions of communication. In addition, a correlation has been found between linguistic behaviour and the linguistic rights of ethnolinguistic communities, as well as issues of linguistic identity, linguistic-national relations and language planning O. Mykhalchuk (2024).

Despite the convincing results, the study has certain limitations. First, the analysis covered mainly the most popular social networks, while niche platforms with specific audiences were left out. Second, the work was based on the analysis of public texts, while private messages may demonstrate different patterns of linguistic behaviour. Future research may focus on comparing linguistic strategies in different digital environments and identifying universal mechanisms of online communication formation. Overall, the results suggest that social media language is a unique communicative phenomenon that combines features of traditional writing, oral interaction, and multimodal digital content. Its development reflects social changes, technological innovations, and new forms of interaction between people, making this area promising for further linguistic and interdisciplinary research.

Conclusions

The study found that communication on social networks is a complex interdisciplinary phenomenon that combines linguistic, philosophical, and socio-analytical approaches. The language of social networks is shaped by rapid digitalisation, which determines its hybrid, dynamic, and rapidly changing nature. It is characterised by informality, multimodality, hypertextuality, content compression, as well as dependence on technical limitations and moderation algorithms that stimulate linguistic creativity and adaptation. Social networks are a space where polar communication strategies, in particular hate speech and supportive speech, function simultaneously. Hate speech is defined as a set of derogatory and discriminatory statements directed at individuals or groups, expressed through sarcasm, irony, negative framing, wordplay, and manipulative language techniques, often adapted to circumvent censorship. Supportive language is interpreted as a multidimensional communicative practice aimed at solidarity, providing emotional and informational support, expressing approval, and consolidating the community. It is implemented through verbal and non-verbal means, including positive connotation vocabulary, emojis, hashtags, and symbolic changes in user accounts. The most common strategy was the transmission of emotions, while the strategy of supporting self-esteem was less represented. Common to both types of discourse is the strategy of constructing the "in-group-out-group" opposition, which indicates a high level of polarisation in digital communication. The results confirmed the ability of users to adapt language strategies to the conditions of online interaction and demonstrate the importance of analysing supportive and hostile language for a deeper understanding of the mechanisms of modern Internet communication, as well as for further research in the field of digital linguistics, content moderation, and media literacy. Prospects for further research include a comparative study of the implementation of hate speech and supportive language in different types of online

communities, as well as research into the impact of moderation algorithms and artificial intelligence on the formation, transformation and masking of communication practices. Another promising area is the analysis of multimodal means (emojis, memes, visual symbols) in combination with verbal elements as tools of emotional influence and polarisation.

Acknowledgements

None.

Funding

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

[1] Adawiyah, R. (2023). *Mini research: Language and social media*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/106797085/LANGUAGE_AND_SOCIAL_MEDIA.

[2] Antonyuk, H.D., & Hoza, V.S. (2023). Internet speech and social media: An analysis of the use of linguistic means in users' comments on forums and social networks. *Scientific Notes of Ostroh Academy National University, Philology Series*, 19(87), 79-82. doi: 10.25264/2519-2558-2023-19(87)-79-82.

[3] Aubanelle, C. (2023). *Markers of alignment and opposition in political discourse on Twitter*. (Doctoral dissertation, Sorbonne Nouvelle University, Paris, France).

[4] Brändle, G., Cáceres-Zapatero, M.-D., & Paz-Rebollo, M.-A. (2024). Feeling hatred: An analysis of the perceived severity of hate speech in the Spanish population. *Spanish Journal of Sociology (RES)*, 33(2), article number a219. doi: 10.22325/fes/res.2024.219.

[5] Buialska, T.I. (2016). The interdiscursive potential of expressing communicative support in contemporary English. *Scientific Notes of Ostroh Academy National University, Philology Series*, 62, 52-55.

[6] Crystal, D. (2021). *Internet linguistics*. London: Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9780203830901.

[7] Feng, B., Li, S., & Li, N. (2013). Is a profile worth a thousand words? How online support-seekers' profile features may influence the quality of received support messages. *Communication Research*, 43(2). doi: 10.1177/0093650213510942.

[8] Geiko, T.M. (2025). Social media in the communicative dimension of the French language: Lexical-semantic and discursive aspects. *Bulletin of Science and Education*, 4(34), 357-370. doi: 10.52058/2786-6165-2025-4(34)-357-370.

[9] Holubovska, I.O. (2015). The language of social networks as a novel linguistic phenomenon. *Linguistic and Conceptual Worldviews*, 5, 49-56.

[10] Kudelska, O. (2023). The effectiveness of social media in teaching English. *Contemporary Studies in Foreign Philology*, 1(23), 264-272. doi: 10.32782/2617-3921.2023.23.264-271.

[11] Mabillard, V., Zumofen, R., & Dubois, P. (2024). *Public communication on social media: Challenges, risks, and perspectives*. Quebec: University of Quebec Press.

[12] Matsiuk, H. (Ed.). (2021). *Sociolinguistics: An integrative research approach*. Lviv: Ivan Franko National University of Lviv.

[13] Määttä, S.K. (2023). Linguistic and discursive properties of hate speech and speech facilitating the expression of hatred: Evidence from Finnish and French online discussion boards. *Internet Pragmatics*, 6(2), 156-172. doi: 10.1075/ip.00094.maa.

[14] McCulloch, G. (2020). *Because Internet: Understanding how language is changing*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

[15] Millette, M., & Boislard, M.-A. (2023). "Come on, it's not that bad!": Social support and expertises in exchanges about sexual inexperience among young adults on Reddit. *Questions de Communication*, 43, 33-60.

[16] Moïse, C., & Hugonnier, C. (2019). Homophobic discourse. Testimony as an alternative discourse. *Semen: Revue de Sémio-Linguistique des Textes et Discours*, 47, 121-136. doi: 10.4000/semen.12795.

[17] Mykhalchuk, O. (2024). Language and territory: Sociolinguistic parameters of linguistic identity. In B. Azhniuk (Ed.), *Language and war: Dynamics of the language system and language policy* (pp. 411-459). Kyiv: Dmytro Buraho Publishing House.

[18] Papcunová, J., Martončik, M., Fedáková, D., Kentoš, M., Bozogáňová, M., Srba, I., Moro, R., Pikuliak, M., Šimko, M., & Adamkovič, M. (2023). Hate speech operationalization: A preliminary examination of hate speech indicators and their structure. *Complex & Intelligent Systems*, 9(3), 2827-2842. doi: 10.1007/s40747-021-00561-0.

[19] Romanchenko, A.P. (2024). Communicative support in media discourse during the wartime period: Specifics of implementation. *Scientific notes of V.I. Vernadsky Taurida National University Series Philology Journalism*, 1(1), 59-66. doi: 10.32782/2710-4656/2024.1.1/10.

[20] Sikorska, V., Nenov, I., Nogai, V., & Didur, L. (2024). Language discourse in social networks: An analysis of linguistic means and communicative strategies in the online environment. *Black Sea Philological Studies*, 5, 123-128. doi: 10.32782/bsps-2024.5.18.

[21] Shvelidze, L.D. (2021). *Linguistic means of implementation of communicative strategies in the social media discourse*. (PhD dissertation, Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University, Vinnytsia, Ukraine).

[22] Strelēvica-Ošiņa, D. (2019). The language of correctness: Some terms of Latin origin. *Antiquitas Viva*, 5, 185-194. doi: 10.22364/av5.16.

[23] Tereshchenko, L., & Stanislavova, L. (2024). Lexical and semantic categories: A linguistic perspective. *International Humanitarian University Herald Philology*, 65, 128-131. doi: 10.32782/2409-1154.2024.65.27.

[24] Tiffany, K. (2021). *Maybe you missed it, but the Internet "died" five years ago*. Retrieved from https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2021/08/dead-internet-theory-wrong-but-feels-true/619937/.

[25] Udovichenko, H.M., & Samoilenko, H.A. (2021). Certain language means of emotions expression in superior internet communication. *Academic Studies. Series "Humanities"*, 3, 153-159. doi: 10.52726/as.humanities/2021.3.22.

[26] Voirol, O., & Martini, É. (2023). The discursive construction of hatred: Affects, fascist agitation, and the politics of resentment. *Réseaux*, 241(5), 39-77. doi: 10.3917/res.241.0039.

Особливості функціонування мови та здійснення комунікації у соціальних

Світлана Гейко
Кадидат філософських наук, доцент
Національний університет біоресурсів та природокористування України
03041, вул. Героїв Оборони, 15, м. Київ, Україна
https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0119-7673
Олена Лаута
Кадидат філософських наук, доцент
Національний університет біоресурсів та природокористування України
03041, вул. Героїв Оборони, 15, м. Київ, Україна
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6118-0258

Анотація. У статті проаналізовані особливості комунікації в соціальних мережах, а також сутнісні характеристики та існуючі класифікації мови ворожнечі та мови підтримки. Необхідність глибшого розуміння цих явищ зумовлена їхнім впливом на суспільство, комунікаційні норми та необхідністю розробки ефективних механізмів протидії агресії в мережі. Мета дослідження полягала в виявленні, аналізі та систематизації комунікативних стратегій для вираження мови ворожнечі та підтримки в соціальних мережах. Методологія включала контент-аналіз текстів, структурно-семантичне моделювання та соціолінгвістичне спостереження. Результати дослідження показали, що мова соціальних мереж є гібридом, для якого характерні неформальність та стислість, такі як прості речення, аграматизми, скорочення; мультимодальність, тобто використання емодзі, мемів, зображень; гіпертекстуальність та компресія, а саме використання гештегів, лінків; вплив технічних обмежень, таких як обмеження кількості символів стимулює креативність; адаптація до цензури, а саме модифікація слів для обходу алгоритмів модерації. Мова ворожнечі реалізується через стратегії сарказму, маніпуляції, опозиції «свій-чужий» та використання модифікованої лексики для обходу цензури. Мова підтримки переважно виражається через стратегії емоційної підтримки, інформаційної допомоги та використання вербальних і невербальних маркерів (вподобайки, ретвіти, гештеги). Взаємодія полярних дискурсів ворожнечі та підтримки у цифровому середовищі відображає адаптацію комунікативних практик до умов онлайн-спілкування та алгоритмів модерації. Дослідження виявило, що ці дискурси часто існують у паралельних просторах (наприклад, у відповідях на один і той же твіт). Спільною стратегією для обох є використання опозиції «свій-чужий». Мова підтримки часто виникає як реакція на мову ворожнечі, формуючи механізм колективного опору

Ключові слова: мова ворожнечі; мова підтримки; інтернет-комунікація; соціальні мережі; комунікативні стратегії