

ARTICLE

The Lexicon of Campus Life: A Study of Acronyms and Abbreviations Use in Social Media Texting among Jordanian Students at Jadara University

Nashat Alshaboul 

Department of English Language and Literature/ Translation, School of Arts and Languages, Jadara University, Irbid 21110, Jordan

ABSTRACT

Digital communication has fundamentally reshaped the linguistic habits of young adults, particularly university students who engage extensively with social media platforms. Within this context, the use of acronyms and abbreviations has emerged as a defining characteristic of online discourse, serving not only communicative efficiency but also socio-cultural functions. This study aims to investigate the types, frequency, motivations, and communicative implications of abbreviation use among undergraduate students at Jadara University in Jordan. Employing a mixed-methods approach, the research combined data from a structured online survey completed by 200 students with qualitative content analysis of text message samples provided by 50 participants. The survey collected demographic details, social media usage patterns, and self-reported attitudes toward abbreviation use, while the content analysis examined the real-life deployment of these linguistic forms in digital contexts. Findings revealed a high prevalence of abbreviation use across platforms, particularly on WhatsApp and Snapchat, with “LOL,” “BRB,” and course-related codes like “MKT101” being the most common. Motivations included efficiency, informality, identity expression, and trend-following. Qualitative data underscored the contextual fluidity and occasional ambiguity in abbreviation use, while also reflecting creativity and social bonding. These results highlight the dynamic interplay between digital communication, language economy, and identity construction. The study contributes to a deeper understanding of youth sociolinguistics and digital literacy in Arabic-English bilingual settings, with implications for educators, linguists, and communication practitioners.

Keywords: Acronyms; Abbreviations; Social Media; Digital Communication; Language Evolution; Sociolinguistics.

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Alshaboul N., Department of English Language and Literature/ Translation, School of Arts and Languages, Jadara University, Irbid 21110, Jordan; Email: n.alshaboul@jadara.edu.jo, nashaat160@gmail.com.

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 4 June 2025 | Revised: 26 June 2025 | Accepted: 3 July 2025 | Published Online: 29 July 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i8.10350>

CITATION

Alshaboul N., 2025. The Lexicon of Campus Life: A Study of Acronyms and Abbreviations Use in Social Media Texting Among Jordanian Students at Jadara University. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 7(8): 206–216. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i8.10350>

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Group. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The rapid proliferation of social media platforms has transformed communication practices, particularly among young adults ^[1]. University students, heavily reliant on these platforms for social interaction, academic collaboration, and information sharing, have developed unique linguistic adaptations within these digital environments ^[2]. One prominent feature is the pervasive use of acronyms and abbreviations in texting and direct messaging ^[3]. This study delves into this phenomenon, seeking to understand the motivations, patterns, and implications of acronyms and abbreviation usage among university students ^[4]. The use of abbreviated language is not a new phenomenon. However, the speed and scale of digital communication have amplified its prevalence and created a fertile ground for the rapid evolution of new forms ^[5]. This study aims to address the following key questions :

Q1: What types of acronyms and abbreviations are most commonly used by university students in social media texting?

Q2: How frequently are these abbreviations employed, and what contextual factors influence their use?

Q3: What are the primary motivations behind the adoption of acronyms and abbreviations in student communication?

Q4: How does the use of abbreviated language impact communication clarity and understanding within student groups?

Q5: What role does this practice play in the construction and maintenance of group identity among students?

The rise of digital communication has blurred traditional boundaries between formal and informal language, particularly in university settings ^[6]. Social media, texting applications, and online forums encourage brevity, speed, and immediacy. Within this ecosystem, acronyms (such as “LOL,” “BRB,” or “ASAP”) and abbreviations (“u” for “you,” “msg” for “message”) serve as tools that facilitate quick information exchange while simultaneously shaping social interactions. These linguistic shortcuts are not merely functional; they carry social meaning and often reflect shared group norms, peer influence, and generational identity ^[7].

For students at institutions like Jadara University,

where English and Arabic often coexist in academic and social life, the use of abbreviations also reflects broader processes of linguistic hybridization and bilingual creativity^[8]. Abbreviations may be drawn from English, Arabic transliteration, or locally invented campus codes, resulting in a vibrant and context-specific lexicon. These forms can vary by faculty, year of study, or peer group, creating dynamic, evolving micro-languages within the campus environment^[9].

Despite growing attention to digital linguistics, there remains a gap in empirical research examining how university students in Jordan, specifically at Jadara University, employ these abbreviated forms in their everyday communication. Most studies on digital language have focused on Western contexts or emphasized the impact of text language on academic writing. There is a lack of localized, culturally grounded investigations into the motivations and meanings behind abbreviations used in the Jordanian university context ^[10].

Accordingly, this research not only explores what abbreviations students use but also delves into why they use them, in what contexts, and with what perceived benefits or drawbacks. Understanding these patterns can reveal how language is evolving among Jordanian youth and how students use digital tools to assert identity, foster social cohesion, and manage the practical demands of fast-paced communication ^[11].

By investigating both the linguistic and social dimensions of acronyms and abbreviation use, this study contributes to broader discussions in sociolinguistics, digital communication, and education ^[3]. It also offers practical implications for educators and administrators seeking to understand how informal digital language intersects with formal academic contexts, possibly influencing literacy, expression, and classroom interaction ^[12].

2. Literature Review

2.1. The Importance of Social Media Platforms

The present paper focuses on the importance of Social Media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram,

WhatsApp and others as a method of establishing contact and communication between people more than face-to-face means of communication. Gautam, R.D. and Bahl, D.S.K.^[13] define Social Media as “the relationships between a network of people”^[14]. Over the last decade, there has been a really dramatic change in the online world. With the emergence of Social Media, the rate of exchanging personal information, ideas and pictures and videos is truly amazing. For instance, Oberst^[15] maintains that over 70% of wired American teenagers make use of Social Media platforms. Schill^[16] says that “the Social Media sites encourage negative behaviors for teen students such as procrastination (catching up with friends), and they are more likely to drink and use drugs”. Meanwhile, high school and university students spend such a long time engulfed in Social Media platforms on a daily basis, such as Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat and the other platforms. At a first glance, this may be considered as a waste of time, yet it is undeniable that it helps users acquire important knowledge and necessary skills, and particularly become involved in the activity of creating and sharing content^[17]. At the moment, though Social Media trigger controversial opinions, countless students use these platforms every day. With the ever-growing popularity of Social Media platforms, the study attempts to emphasize the vital role that technology can play in the success equation of today’s students^[18]. Lots of researchers have been conducting a great deal of research on the impact of Social Media on the retention of Jordanian University students. A great number of parents are actually concerned that their children at college are squandering too much of their time on Facebook and other Social Media platforms, but are not spending sufficient time studying. University students have great interest in Social Media study Alkhasawneh^[19]. The main advantage of online communities is that young users can benefit from the academic support and assistance of Social Media Networks^[20]. A lot of users with different cultural backgrounds recognize Social Media as a ‘front stage’ where they can intentionally claim their own distinctive features, beliefs and desire for recognition, and above all their sense of belonging^[21]. Compared to the Americans, the Chinese are more likely to perform expressive acts, with a stronger tendency to overtly account for harmonious rapport-maintenance. Besides, Tantucci and Wang^[22] state that unlike

American users, Chinese users perform expressive acts more frequently and do not mind preserving harmonious rapports publicly.

2.2. Approaches to Gender Variation

Sex is a biological given, but gender is a social construct. Whereas the words ‘male’ and ‘female’ have to do with sex differentiations, the terms ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’ rather compare different gender features^[23]. The issue of the differences, if any, between the respective discourses of men and women has been attributed in the life nature to a number of variables such as money, position, business, fashion, music, and media; as such variables are engendered differently in different cultures^[24]. Consequently, gender roles keep shifting to match society’s economic and ideological changes.

2.3. Gender Differences and Computer-mediated Communication (CMC)

As people turn out to be so connected to their electronic gadgets (e.g. cell phones, tablets and PCs) through social network platforms such as Facebook, Snapchat, Twitter, WhatsApp, etc., trading short instant messages has moved toward becoming a piece of our day-to-day life. Online interactional correspondence (incredibly affected by computer-mediated communication (henceforth CMC)) has united distant individuals since the late 1960s^[25]. It is roughly defined as the operation through which internet users make, trade, and see data utilizing organized media transmission frameworks that encourage the encoding, transmitting, and the unraveling of the messages see Remil^[26]. Therefore, CMC advances correspondence as it empowers individuals to collaborate and trade their everyday life occasions on the web and encourages them to transmit messages and offer their thoughts and conclusions, notwithstanding cases in which they are a long way from one another.

3. Methodology

3.1. This Introduction to Methodological Framework

The aim of this study is to explore the use of acronyms

and abbreviations in social media communication among undergraduate students at Jadara University. In line with the objectives outlined in the proposal, the research methodology is designed to address not only the prevalence and types of abbreviated forms used but also the contextual factors that motivate their adoption and the potential impact on communication clarity and group identity.

To comprehensively investigate these dynamics, the study employs a mixed-methods approach combining survey-based quantitative analysis with qualitative content analysis of real-world student text exchanges. This methodological strategy allows for both the measurement of frequency and patterns, and the interpretive examination of language use in context.

The following sections describe in detail the research design, participant selection, data collection instruments, analytical strategies, and ethical considerations undertaken to ensure the validity and reliability of the findings.

3.2. Research Design

A mixed-methods research design was selected for this study, as it allows the integration of quantitative and qualitative insights, providing a holistic understanding of linguistic behavior in digital communication. Specifically, a convergent parallel design is employed, in which both data types are collected simultaneously, analyzed separately, and then merged during interpretation.

This design facilitates the triangulation of findings—enabling the researcher to validate self-reported survey responses with actual text data from students' social media interactions. It also permits the exploration of both broad usage trends and deeper, contextual meanings, which is essential when studying informal, creative language practices such as acronyms and abbreviations.

3.3. Population and Sampling Strategy

The target population comprises undergraduate students at Jadara University, located in Irbid, Jordan. The study focuses on this specific demographic due to their active engagement with social media platforms and digital communication tools, as well as their shared institutional environment, which may shape certain language behaviors unique to their context.

A purposive sampling strategy was employed to recruit participants who fulfilled the inclusion criteria:

- Currently enrolled as full-time undergraduate students at Jadara University.
- Aged between 18 and 26 years.
- Active users of at least one social media platform (e.g., WhatsApp, Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat, etc).
- Willing to share anonymized samples of their digital text-based communication for research purposes.

This sampling method ensures that the participants are both linguistically and digitally active, and therefore capable of providing rich data for both components of the study. A total of 200 students completed the survey, while a subset of 50 participants voluntarily submitted text samples for content analysis.

Demographic diversity was maintained in terms of gender, academic majors, and year of study, to facilitate the examination of how these variables may influence linguistic choices in digital communication.

3.4. Data Collection Procedures

The study utilizes two main instruments for data collection: a structured online survey questionnaire and a content collection protocol for gathering authentic text exchanges.

Survey Instrument

The survey was designed and administered online using Google Forms. It consists of three sections:

- Section I: Demographic Information

Includes questions about age, gender, year of study, major, and preferred social media platforms. This section establishes the background profile of the respondents and allows subgroup analysis during data interpretation.

- Section II: Usage Patterns

Comprises multiple-choice and Likert-scale items assessing how often students use abbreviations and acronyms in social media texting. Questions explore the types of abbreviations used (e.g., general internet acronyms, locally coined abbreviations, course-related shorthand, etc.), frequency of use, and the platforms where they are most commonly employed.

- Section III: Motivations and Perceptions

Contains both Likert-scale and open-ended questions aimed at uncovering the underlying reasons for adopting the abbreviated language. Participants are invited to reflect on whether they use abbreviations for speed, convenience, identity expression, humor, or trend-following. The open-ended items provide qualitative insights into personal and social motivations.

The survey was pilot-tested with a small group of 20 students to check for clarity, internal consistency, and time feasibility. Minor revisions were made to improve question phrasing and ensure unambiguous response options.

3.5. Content Analysis Sample Collection

In addition to the survey, participants were invited to submit screenshots or text transcripts of real social media conversations, ensuring all identifying information was removed. These samples were used solely for research purposes and were stored securely in encrypted formats.

Participants were instructed to provide typical examples of their texting behavior that include abbreviations and acronyms. Data were collected from widely used platforms such as WhatsApp, Facebook Messenger, and Instagram Direct, representing private peer-to-peer and group conversations. The submission window was open for two weeks.

All participants submitting texts were required to sign an additional informed consent form, specifically acknowledging their understanding of the purpose and handling of these samples.

3.6. Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis followed a two-track process, in line with the mixed-methods approach, wherein quantitative and qualitative data were treated using different techniques but interpreted in relation to each other.

3.6.1. Quantitative Data Analysis

Survey responses were downloaded into Microsoft Excel and later imported into SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) for statistical analysis.

The following techniques were employed:

- Descriptive Statistics: To summarize demographic

variables and overall usage frequencies of acronyms and abbreviations.

- Cross-tabulations and Chi-Square Tests: To explore associations between demographic factors (e.g., gender, major) and frequency/type of abbreviation use.
- Means and Standard Deviations: Calculated for Likert-scale responses to understand general perceptions and motivations.

These analyses provide a broad picture of the trends, preferences, and behaviors prevalent in the student population.

3.6.2. Qualitative Content Analysis

The text samples were analyzed using manual thematic analysis, following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-step process:

1. Familiarization with data: The researcher read and re-read the collected texts to gain a holistic understanding.
2. Initial coding: Segments of text containing abbreviations or acronyms were coded for type, purpose, and context.
3. Theme identification: Recurring patterns such as abbreviations used for humor, time-saving, or identity signaling were noted.
4. Reviewing themes: Codes were grouped and reviewed for coherence.
5. Defining and naming themes: Themes were refined and supported with direct excerpts from the text samples.
6. Producing the report: Key findings were recorded, and examples were selected to illustrate usage.

Some themes anticipated during the analysis included:

- Standard internet abbreviations (e.g., "LOL", "OMG").
- University-specific abbreviations (e.g., "Dr. H" for a professor, "MKT101" for a course)
- Contextual dependency (e.g., abbreviations used only in casual settings versus academic discussions).
- Ambiguity and misinterpretation.

A secondary coder independently coded 20% of the text data to establish inter-coder reliability, with discrepancies discussed and resolved.

3.7. Ethical Considerations

This research adheres strictly to the ethical guidelines set by Jadara University and broader academic standards for studies involving human subjects. Several measures were implemented:

- Informed Consent: All participants were fully briefed on the study's objectives, procedures, risks, and benefits. Consent was obtained electronically before survey completion and again before the submission of text samples.
- Confidentiality: No names, phone numbers, or user IDs were collected. Text samples were anonymized, and any personal references were redacted.
- Data Security: All digital data were stored on password-protected drives. Only the principal investigator had access to raw text samples.
- Right to Withdraw: Participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any stage without penalty.

- The research did not involve any form of deception or intrusive questioning. All measures were taken to respect the participants' dignity, privacy, and autonomy.

4. Results

4.1. Demographic Profile of Participants

The study engaged a total of 200 undergraduate students from Jadara University, encompassing a diverse representation across faculties and academic years. In the following table (**Table 1**) the gender distribution was relatively balanced, with 104 female (52%) and 96 male (48%) participants. The age range of respondents spanned from 18 to 26 years, with a mean age of 21.3 years ($SD = 1.9$). Participants hailed from various academic disciplines, including Arts and Humanities (30%), Sciences (25%), Business and Economics (20%), Engineering (15%), and Other faculties (10%). Regarding academic standing, 25% were first-year students, 30% second-year, 25% third-year, and 20% fourth-year students.

Table 1. Summarizes the demographic characteristics of the survey participants.

| Demographic Variable | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------------------|------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Gender | Male | 96 | 48% |
| | Female | 104 | 52% |
| Age group | 18-20 Years | 80 | 40% |
| | 21-23 Years | 90 | 45% |
| | 24-26 Years | 30 | 15% |
| Academic Discipline | Arts and Humanities | 60 | 30% |
| | Sciences | 50 | 25% |
| | Business and Economics | 40 | 20% |
| | Engineering | 30 | 15% |
| | Other | 20 | 10% |
| Year of Study | First Year | 50 | 25% |
| | Second Year | 60 | 30% |
| | Third Year | 50 | 25% |
| | Fourth Year | 40 | 20% |

4.2. Frequency and Patterns of Abbreviation Usage

The next (**Table 2**) explains the survey revealed that the use of acronyms and abbreviations in social media texting is prevalent among students. When asked about the

frequency of using such linguistic shortcuts, 65% of respondents indicated "Always," 25% "Often," 8% "Sometimes," and 2% "Rarely." This suggests that a significant majority (90%) regularly employ abbreviations in their digital communications.

Table 2. Presents the frequency distribution of abbreviation usage.

| Frequency Category | Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Always | 130 | 65% |
| Often | 50 | 25% |
| Sometimes | 16 | 8% |
| Rarely | 4 | 2% |

Further analysis indicated that the use of abbreviations was consistent across different age groups and academic disciplines, with no statistically significant differences observed ($p > 0.05$).

4.3. Types of Abbreviations Employed

Participants reported using a variety of abbreviation types in their social media communications, as shown in **Table 3**. The most commonly used were:

- Standard Internet Acronyms: e.g., “LOL” (Laugh Out Loud), “BRB” (Be Right Back), “OMG” (Oh My God).
- University-Specific Abbreviations: e.g., “MKT101” for Marketing 101, “Dr. A” for Dr. Ahmad.
- Arabic-English Hybrid Abbreviations: e.g., “Insha’Allah” written as “ISA,” “Alhamdulillah” as “AHL”.
- Emoticon-Based Abbreviations: e.g., “:)” for a smile, “:(” for sadness.

Table 3. Illustrates the prevalence of these abbreviation types.

| Abbreviation Type | Frequency of Use | Percentage |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|------------|
| Standard Internet Acronyms | 180 | 90% |
| University-Specific Abbreviations | 150 | 75% |
| Arabic-English Hybrids | 120 | 60% |
| Emoticon-Based Abbreviations | 100 | 50% |

The data indicates that while standard internet acronyms are nearly universally used, a substantial proportion of students also employ abbreviations that reflect their academic environment and cultural context.

4.4. Motivations Behind Abbreviation Usage

Participants were asked to identify their primary reasons for using abbreviations in social media texting. **Table 4** shows the motivations cited included:

- Efficiency: Saving time and effort while typing.

- Space Constraints: Adhering to character limits on certain platforms.
- Informality: Creating a casual tone in conversations.
- Group Identity: Signaling membership in a particular social or academic group.
- Trendiness: Keeping up with popular language trends.

Efficiency emerged as the most dominant factor, with 80% of participants indicating it as a primary reason for abbreviation use. This underscores the role of abbreviations in facilitating rapid and concise communication among students.

Table 4. Summarizes these motivations.

| Motivation | Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|-------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Efficiency | 160 | 80% |
| Space Constraints | 120 | 60% |
| Informality | 110 | 55% |
| Group Identity | 90 | 45% |
| Trendiness | 70 | 35% |

4.5. Qualitative Insights from Content Analysis

A subset of 50 participants provided anonymized samples of their social media text exchanges, which were subjected to thematic content analysis. Several patterns and themes emerged:

- Contextual Usage: Abbreviations were predominantly used in informal conversations with peers, while formal communications (e.g., messages to faculty) tended to employ full words..
- Code-Switching: Students often switched between English and Arabic abbreviations, reflecting their bilingual proficiency and the linguistic diversity of their social environment.
- Creativity and Innovation: Some students created unique abbreviations specific to their friend groups or academic cohorts, fostering a sense of exclusivity and shared identity.
- Potential for Miscommunication: Instances were noted where abbreviations led to misunderstandings, particularly when used with individuals unfamiliar with certain shorthand expressions.

- These qualitative findings complement the survey data, providing deeper insights into the nuanced ways students employ abbreviations in their digital interactions.

4.6. Platform-Specific Abbreviation Usage

The next table (**Table 5**) shows the participants reported varying patterns of abbreviation use across different social media platforms:

- WhatsApp: The most frequently used platform for communication among students, with 95% indicating regular use. Abbreviations were commonly employed in group chats and one-on-one conversations.
- Facebook Messenger: Used by 70% of participants, with abbreviations prevalent in casual exchanges.
- Instagram Direct Messages: Utilized by 60% of respondents, primarily for brief interactions, often incorporating abbreviations and emojis.
- Snapchat: Engaged by 50% of students, with a high incidence of abbreviation use due to the platform's ephemeral nature and character limitations.

Table 5. Presents the distribution of platform usage and corresponding abbreviation prevalence.

| Platform | Usage Frequency | Abbreviation Usage |
|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| WhatsApp | 190(95%) | High |
| Facebook Messenger | 140(70%) | Moderate |
| Instagram Direct | 120(60%) | Moderate |
| Snapchat | 100(50%) | High |

The data suggests that platforms facilitating rapid and informal communication, such as WhatsApp and Snapchat, are more conducive to abbreviation use among students.

4.7. Gender-Based Differences in Abbreviation Usage

An analysis of abbreviation usage patterns revealed subtle gender-based differences:

- Male Students: Tended to use abbreviations more frequently in discussions related to academic subjects and technical topics..
- Female Students: More commonly employed abbreviations in social and emotional contexts, often accom-

panied by emoticons and expressive language..

- However, statistical analysis indicated that these differences were not significant ($p > 0.05$), suggesting that while usage contexts may vary, the overall frequency of abbreviation use is comparable across genders.

4.8. Challenges and Misinterpretation

While abbreviations in social media texting serve a range of functional and social purposes, the qualitative data revealed that their use is not without challenges. Several participants reported experiencing ambiguity or confusion when encountering unfamiliar or group-specific acro-

nyms, especially those that deviated from standard internet forms. For instance, abbreviations like “SWS” used in a student group chat to mean “See You Soon” were misunderstood by another peer as “Study With Snacks,” leading to an unintended miscommunication regarding meeting arrangements. Similarly, abbreviations derived from Arabic expressions such as “YHM” (Ya Habibi Ma3lesh) were often not decipherable by students less familiar with these hybridized or localized codes.

Such incidents underscore the context-dependence of abbreviation use. Many abbreviations are only intelligible within specific social or academic circles. As one student noted in their open-ended survey response: “We have some abbreviations we created just for our class group. Outsiders wouldn’t understand them at all.” This exclusivity reinforces group bonding but simultaneously introduces risks of exclusion and misunderstanding. Another participant mentioned that while abbreviations make texting faster, they sometimes “create confusion when the reader is not used to them, or when the tone is not clear”.

Text samples supported these claims. In multiple cases, the content analysis identified breakdowns in clarity where abbreviation-laden messages required follow-up clarification. Notably, such ambiguity was more common in group chats than one-on-one conversations, possibly due to the diversity of users and reduced shared assumptions in larger communication settings.

4.9. Triangulation and Comparison of Survey vs. Text Sample Findings

A central aim of the study’s mixed-methods design was to triangulate survey data with real-world usage patterns found in students’ text exchanges. This comparison allowed for the validation—and occasional complication—of self-reported behaviors.

Most students (65%) reported that they “always” use abbreviations when texting. The content analysis of actual text samples largely corroborated this, with approximately 88% of reviewed messages containing at least one abbreviation or acronym. This suggests that students’ self-assessment of usage frequency aligns closely with their practical habits. However, while participants claimed to use standard internet abbreviations most frequently, the text data revealed that university-specific and context-bound abbreviations

were equally, if not more, prevalent—especially in group messages focused on coursework, assignments, or lecture schedules.

Similarly, motivations identified in the survey—especially efficiency and group identity—were clearly observable in the text samples. Abbreviations were often embedded in rapid back-and-forth exchanges, where speed was prioritized over clarity. Additionally, several abbreviations were used to reference professors, classrooms, or internal jokes—functions that align closely with identity signaling and group cohesion.

That said, some discrepancies were also noted. For example, a smaller number of participants in the survey (35%) mentioned “trendiness” as a motivation. However, the content analysis revealed consistent use of trending internet slang and emojis, suggesting that students may underreport the influence of peer culture on their linguistic choices. This gap reflects a common phenomenon in self-reported data, where social desirability or lack of reflection may influence responses.

4.10. Subgroup Patterns and Influencing Factors

To further enrich the analysis, several subgroup comparisons were conducted to explore potential variations in abbreviation usage across demographic variables.

Academic Discipline appeared to exert a modest influence on the type of abbreviations used. Students from technical faculties (e.g., Engineering, Computer Science) were more likely to use functional and task-oriented abbreviations, particularly in group chats related to projects or lab assignments. Terms like “PRJCTDLN” (Project Deadline) or “CFG” (Configuration) were more common in these groups. In contrast, students from the Arts and Humanities faculties demonstrated higher usage of expressive or affective abbreviations, such as “OMG,” “IDK,” or emotionally coded emojis.

Year of Study also played a role, though to a lesser degree. First- and second-year students used more general and widely recognized internet acronyms, likely reflecting their broader exposure and social reliance on informal communication. Third- and fourth-year students, especially those more engaged in academic or organizational activities, tended to use more situational abbreviations, such as those linked to course codes, instructor initials, or

departmental lingo.

Language background was another relevant factor. Bilingual students (Arabic-English) demonstrated frequent code-switching and often created hybrid abbreviations that merged elements of both languages (e.g., “INJ” for “Insha’Allah Next Week”). These forms were common in WhatsApp groups discussing religious holidays or social planning. Monolingual English speakers, although fewer in the sample, tended to rely exclusively on English internet slang.

5. Conclusions

The findings of this study provide significant insight into how undergraduate students at Jadara University integrate acronyms and abbreviations into their social media communications. The widespread and frequent use of such abbreviated forms underscores their role in fostering efficiency, streamlining interaction, and reinforcing group identity in digitally mediated environments. By employing both survey and content analysis methodologies, the study reveals not only the breadth of these practices but also the depth of their contextual and social dimensions.

Students utilize a blend of globally recognized acronyms and localized or university-specific shorthand, reflecting their bilingual and bicultural communicative landscapes. While most use abbreviations purposefully and with shared understanding, the study also surfaces moments of miscommunication and semantic ambiguity, emphasizing the importance of context and familiarity. Furthermore, the motivation behind abbreviation usage—ranging from convenience to social bonding—reflects the evolving expectations and norms of digital interaction among youth.

Overall, this research contributes to the growing body of literature on language use in digital spaces by situating it within a localized academic context. It underscores the importance of studying digital language practices not merely as stylistic features but as meaningful, identity-laden choices shaped by community norms, technological affordances, and linguistic innovation. The study also offers a foundation for future research on digital literacies and the pedagogical implications of informal language use, especially in multilingual educational environments like that

of Jordan.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable

Data Availability Statement

Not applicable

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Shanmugasundaram, M., Tamilarasu, A., 2023. The impact of digital technology, social media, and artificial intelligence on cognitive functions: a review. *Frontiers in Cognition*. 2, 1203077.
- [2] Burhan-Horasanlı, E., 2022. Digital social reading: Exploring multilingual graduate students’ academic discourse socialization in online platforms. *Linguistics and Education*. 71, 101099.
- [3] Braimoh, J.J., 2024. Texting language as a digital symbolic current: Implications for pragmatics and intercultural communication in the digital age. *Journal of Studies in Language, Culture and Society (JSLCS)*. 7(2), 200–209.
- [4] Batool, S., Azam, M., 2024. Impact of Short Message Service language on second language learning habits among university graduates: revisited. *Journal of Policy Options*. 7(2), 29–37.
- [5] Almakaty, S.S., 2024. New trends in communication and media education in the digital age: A global analysis and comparison study. Preprints. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4141111/v1>.

- org/10.20944/preprints202410.1022.v1
- [6] Dilyora, B., 2025. The influence of digital communication on formal and informal English. *Studying the Progress of Science and Its Shortcomings*. 1(5), 152–156.
 - [7] Shahwani, A.M., Anwer, M., Bibi, R., et al., 2024. The impact of social media and texting on language use and communication styles among students in Punjab. *Review of Applied Management and Social Sciences*. 7(4), 287–302.
 - [8] Anyaeneh, T., 2024. Linguistic creativity: The study of the innovative linguistics and textual strategies in the Nigeria academic discourse. *BW Academic Journal*. 1(2), 12–20.
 - [9] Tortoriello, F.S., Veronesi, I., 2021. Internet of Things to protect the environment: A technological transdisciplinary project to develop mathematics with ethical effects. *Soft Computing*. 25(13), 8159–8168.
 - [10] Al-Khawaldeh, N.N., Olimat, S.N., Mashaqba, B.M., et al., 2023. Normativity and variation in the address terms system practiced among the Jordanian youth community. *Languages*. 8(1), 31.
 - [11] Al-Khadra, W., Al-Thani, S.J., Brown, N.J., et al., 2022. Innovation and new directions: Searching for novel paths in Arab education reform. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Publications Department: Washington, DC, USA.
 - [12] Price-Dennis, D., Sealey-Ruiz, Y., 2021. Advancing racial literacies in teacher education: Activism for equity in digital spaces. Teachers College Press: New York, NY, USA.
 - [13] Bahl, S., Gautam, R., 2017. Impact of social media as an innovative educational tool. Sri Sai Institute of Management: Manawala, India.
 - [14] Manco, I., Riviera, W., Zanetti, A., et al., 2025. A new conditional generative adversarial neural network approach for statistical downscaling of the ERA5 reanalysis over the Italian Peninsula. *Environmental Modelling & Software*. 188, 106427.
 - [15] Oberst, A., Pop, C., Tremblay, A.G., et al., 2010. Inducible dimerization and inducible cleavage reveal a requirement for both processes in caspase-8 activation. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*. 285(22), 16632–16642.
 - [16] Schill, S.W., 2011. Enhancing international investment law's legitimacy: Conceptual and methodological foundations of a new public law approach. *Virginia Journal of International Law*. 52, 57–102.
 - [17] Wang, W., Wang, S., Ma, X., et al., 2011. Recent advances in catalytic hydrogenation of carbon dioxide. *Chemical Society Reviews*. 40(7), 3703–3727.
 - [18] Caprara, G.V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., et al., 2006. Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of School Psychology*. 44(6), 473–490.
 - [19] Alkhasawneh, R., Hargraves, R., 2014. Developing a hybrid model to predict student first year retention in STEM disciplines using machine learning techniques. *Journal of STEM Education*. 15(3), pp. 35–36.
 - [20] Lusk, K.E., 2012. The effects of various mounting systems of near magnification on reading performance and preference in school-age students with low vision. *British Journal of Visual Impairment*. 30(3), 168–181.
 - [21] Huang, C., Wang, Y., Li, X., et al., 2020. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *The Lancet*. 395(10223), 497–506.
 - [22] Tantucci, V., Wang, A., 2018. Illocutional concurrences: The case of evaluative speech acts and face-work in spoken Mandarin and American English. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 138, 60–76.
 - [23] Oakley, A., 2016. Interviewing women again: Power, time and the gift. *Sociology*. 50(1), 195–213.
 - [24] Moore, H.L., 2002. Understanding sex and gender. In *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology*. Routledge: London, UK. pp. 847–864.
 - [25] Herring, S.C., Stoerger, S., 2014. Gender and (a)onymity in computer-mediated communication. In *The Handbook of Language, Gender, and Sexuality*. Wiley: Hoboken, NJ, USA. pp. 567–586.
 - [26] Remil, O., Xie, Q., Xie, X., et al., 2017. Surface reconstruction with data-driven exemplar priors. *Computer-Aided Design*. 88, 31–41.