

Superdiversity of Digital Discourse through the Lens of Linguistic Anthropology

Ondřej Procházka

University of Ostrava

Abstract

In his seminal 2003 essay 'Language as Culture in U.S. Anthropology: Three Paradigms', Alessandro Duranti assesses the development of the American anthropological tradition, which he divides into three historically related paradigms spanning the period from Boasian anthropology to recent studies connecting anthropology with other disciplines. Following these integrative tendencies, this paper employs Duranti's paradigmatic lenses to examine the increasing complexity and diversity of (not only) the Internet-mediated communication subsumed under the term 'superdiversity'; previous paradigms are revisited in the context of current research across related disciplines in order to investigate to what extent and in what ways superdiversity constitutes a new challenge – theoretically and methodologically – to the study of language in society and culture with a particular focus on digital discourse and social media.

Keywords: superdiversity, linguistic anthropology, sociolinguistics, multimodality, interaction, paradigm shift, social networking sites, virtual communities

1. Introduction

Following a protracted process of paradigm shift, sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology are well placed to engage with the contemporary social changes associated with superdiversity (Blommaert and Rampton 1)

Coined by Stephen Vertovec (2007), the term 'superdiversity' emerged in the light of the growing migration of people and the process of globalization that followed the events of

1989, further supported by the emergence of mobile communication technologies, which has resulted in the precipitation of demographic diversity on one hand and a new diversity of (online) communicative environments on the other. The combination of these two forces brings about increasing levels of complexity and mobility – a challenge encompassed in the term ‘superdiversity’ as an “emerging perspective on change and unpredictability in ever more intensively encroaching social and cultural worlds” (Arnaut & Spotti 2). In fact, superdiversity has been recently brought under the spotlight by a considerable number of contemporary scholars collaborating as part of *The International Consortium for Language and Superdiversity* (InCoLaS), which brings together 13 research centers whose collective effort has made inroads in several domains, including social work, institutional policy, urban and national politics, and (social) media (see Arnaut et al. 2016, 2017 for an overview; Blommaert and Rampton 2011).

In this line of thought, social media are defined broadly: “as digital applications that build on the ideological and technological premises and foundations of Web 2.0 (e.g. Herring, Stein and Virtanen 2013) that allow the creation, exchange and circulation of user-generated content (Kaplan and Haenlein 2010) and enable interaction between users (Leppänen et al. 2015, 3). Social media thus engage with superdiversity in three main ways. First, given the lack of predictability stemming from the new patterns of migration flows combined with augmented means of communication facilitated by technological developments, there is an increasing degree of unpredictability in users’ linguistic, social, cultural, religious, ethnic, familial backgrounds and country of origin. This also means that groups, communities, and other social constellations that bring these users together can be superdiverse in their own right (Leppänen and Häkkinen, 2012). Second, social media grounded in digital discourse¹ provide their users not only with a site and affordances for performing communicative practices, but also virtually unlimited sets of semiotic and linguistic resources for meaning-making as well as evaluation which is constitutive of the ‘post-panoptical’ sociality of social media manifested in a lack of centralized mechanisms of control by the authorities in power. Instead, there is “a shift to forms of grassroots, ‘bottom-up’ and peer surveillance. These are often polycentric in that participants can orient to, and shift between, several competing and complementary orders of normativity” (Leppänen et al. 2014, 114; cf. Blommaert 2010, 37–39). Social media thus represent loosely regulated communicative spaces divorced from strict adherence to ‘standard’ linguistic norms; their social and normative structures are jointly negotiated and enforced by the participants themselves in hardly predictable ways – a symptom of late modernity (Coupland 2010; Leppänen 2009). It follows that the third facet of superdiversity in social media illustrates the lack of predictability in the deployment of linguistic and other semiotic resources that are, in fact, circulated and recycled “in various ways in countless rhizomatic digital media practices mushrooming on the internet” (Leppänen et al. 2015, 4). It comes as no surprise that the metaphors associated with superdiversity build on the notions of flow, fluidity and movement so as to deconstruct the understanding of language and society as something stable and fixed – “whereas bilingual talk used to be analyzed in terms of juxtapositions between grammatical systems (i.e. code-switching), it is now being reconceptualized as bilingual practice that transverses language” (Androutsopoulos

and Juffermans 2). According to Blommaert (2013), these changes render the traditional vocabulary of linguistic analysis insufficient:

In superdiverse environments (both online and offline), people appear to take any linguistic and communicative resource available to them – a broad range, typically, in superdiverse contexts – and blend them into hugely complex linguistic and semiotic forms. Old and established terms such as ‘code-switching’, and indeed even ‘multilingualism’, appear to rapidly exhaust the limits of their descriptive and explanatory power in the face of such highly complex ‘blends’ [...]. And not only that: the question where the ‘stuff’ that goes into the blend comes from, how it has been acquired, and what kind of ‘competence’ it represents, is equally difficult to answer. Contemporary repertoires are tremendously complex, dynamic and unstable, and not predicated on the forms of knowledge-of-language one customarily assumes, since Chomsky, with regard to language. (8)

Although the term *code-switching* has not been entirely discarded (e.g. Leppänen 2012), such ‘multilingual’ encounters have been approached in various contexts associated with superdiversity as *polylingualism* (Møller 2008), *metrolingualism* (Otsuji and Pennycook 2009), *translanguaging* (Creese and Blackledge 2010), or *transidiomatic language practices* (Jacquemet 2005). For example, in their analysis of young adolescents in superdiverse urban societies, Jørgensen et al. (2011) claim that “[t]he notions of ‘varieties’, ‘sociolects’, ‘dialects’, ‘registers’, etc. may appear to be useful categories for linguists. They may indeed be strategic, ideological constructs for power holders, educators, and other gatekeepers [...]. However, what speakers actually use are linguistic features as semiotic resources, not languages, varieties, or lects.” (29). In addition, these semiotic resources involve complex indexicality – they are associated with particular sociocultural values, so, for instance, “values associated with ‘English’, ‘Turkish’, and ‘Danish’ by the local majorities in London, Lefcosia, Ankara, and Copenhagen, are probably different [and] susceptible to challenges, re-valuation, or even opposition” (29). Zooming in on their use of social media, Stæhr (2014) argues that Copenhagen adolescents negotiate and align to these values and normativities through metapragmatic activities such as *crossing* (Rampton 2005), *self- and other-initiated corrections* (Schegloff et al. 1977), *stylizations* (Rampton 2006), and *metapragmatic commentary* (Agha 2007).

Against this backdrop, Blommaert (2005, 2010) champions an ethnographic approach to superdiversity, in which signs are seen as *traces of multimodal communicative practices within a sociopolitically structured field which is historically configured*, with three main points:

- *Ethnography is intrinsically historicizing*, because any form of effectively performed (and ethnographically monitored) communicative practice can only be made meaningful because of its (Bakhtinian) histories of production and uptake by nonrandomly positioned actors. Contrary to what is widely assumed, ethnographic research is the exact opposite of synchronic, snapshot-based inquiry [...].
- The theoretical backbone for the first point can be found in the neo-Whorfian, Hymesian and Silversteinian tradition of linguistic anthropology – not elsewhere, for its

roots (like those of any intellectual enterprise) are not accidental nor freely exchangeable. What was said above about the meaningfulness of the sign is an exact empirical reformulation of that central concept in this tradition: *indexicality*. [...].

- In addition, the effort is driven by an *ethnographic understanding of social 'structure' as dynamic, fragmented and essentially stochastic*, i.e. 'chaotic': while the general vector of change can be determined, the actual outcomes of processes of change are relatively unpredictable, even if they appear 'logical' post factum. Random aggregates of processes generate nonrandom outcomes, and *change is the 'system' we observe*. Note that this is a departure from established Durkheimian-Parsonian understandings of 'structure' as that which dominates the 'large' ('macro') processes in social life. Practically speaking: 'structure' can reside in the exceptional, the near-invisible, rather than in the dominant. The politics of a place is not readable in a self-evident way from the volumes of particular signs displayed in that place [...]. (Blommaert 2016, n. pag., original emphasis)

This paper locates the point of departure for approaching superdiversity in the American tradition of linguistic anthropology mainly for two reasons. First, this tradition builds on a strong connection between ethnography and language analysis which provides fertile ground for the investigation of linguistic practices in the context of superdiversity; and second, "linguistic anthropology has very little institutional presence outside the US, and it is hard to find any graduate programmes in linguistic anthropology in Europe. Intellectually, this potentially increases the need for non-US linguists interested in society and culture to talk to other kinds of social scientist, while at the same time, it also means that there is less oversight of the reproduction or revision of canonical frameworks and procedures, leaving quite a lot of room for innovation (even though this may be quirky and short-lived)" (Rampton et al. 7). This paper can be seen as a small contribution to this transatlantic dialogue; however, before discussing the place and contributions of the superdiversity of digital discourse in the contemporary vocabulary of linguistic analysis, it is necessary to provide at least a brief overview of the notion of diversity in this perspective and its historical paradigmatic developments. Duranti's seminal distinction (2003) will serve as a main point of reference in this effort.

2. (Super)diversity and linguistic anthropology

Undoubtedly, diversity has been a central concern in sociolinguistics as well as linguistic anthropology for most of the 20th century; Dell Hymes (1972) argued that "[d]iversity of speech has been singled out as the main focus of sociolinguistics" (38) particularly with respect to language choice and language change, while Duranti (1997) claims that "[l]inguistic anthropologists have been concerned with similar issues, but they have also faced the complex question of the relation between language and thought [...]" (51); thus, "the notion of diversity ties together the earlier discussions of linguistic relativity and the more recent discussions of language contact and language mixing" (83). Despite the differences, both programs converge in the assumption that variation is a norm rather an exception; something that is largely ignored by formal grammarians who assume that speech

communities are homogenous, and by structural linguistics treating formal properties of language independently. Indeed it was thought that social and linguistic features pertain to separate categories around which a theoretical scaffolding could be built on stable and linear correlations (e.g. Labov's 1963 study of Martha's Vineyard).

However, Hymes (1969 [1999]) eventually contested the ideas of fixedness and stability, saying that "the relationship of cultures and communities in the world today is dominantly one of *reintegration* within complex units" (32). Later, Gumperz and Hymes (1972) defined social and linguistic features "not as separated-but-connected, but as *dialectic*, i.e. co-constructive and, hence *dynamic* (qtd. in Blommaert 2013, 7, original emphasis), which corresponds with Silverstein's (1985) formulation of the 'total linguistic fact': "the total linguistic fact, the datum for a science of language is irreducibly dialectic in nature. It is unstable mutual interaction of meaningful sign forms, contextualized to situations of interested human use and mediated by the fact of cultural ideology" (220). These are symptoms of an epistemological turn towards more context-sensitive, situation-based, and activity-oriented empirical approaches to groups of social actors and the ways they operate with linguistic, semiotic, and discursive resources in achieving their communicative goals: "named languages have now been denaturalized, the linguistic is treated as just one semiotic among many, inequality and innovation are positioned together in a dynamics of pervasive normativity, and the contexts in which people orient their interactions reach far beyond the communicative event itself" (Blommaert and Rampton 1). This has marked a fundamental shift defying the correlational orthodoxies and rethinking the oeuvre of social and cultural theorists such as Bakhtin, Bourdieu, or Foucault – as will be shown in the following chapters.

However, this is not a first paradigm shift in the history of linguistic anthropology; Duranti (2003) presents a critical review of linguistic anthropology in the U.S. tradition as a trajectory of its historical reassessment, seeing the "lack of internal debate among linguistic anthropologists conducting very different kinds of research" (335). For this ambitious endeavor he employs Kuhn's influential notion of 'paradigm' (1962) in order to highlight the quintessential characteristics of each approach, or more specifically, the areas of incompatibility or lack of agreement across paradigms):

The first paradigm, initiated by Boas, was mostly devoted to documentation, grammatical description and classification (especially North American indigenous languages) and focused on linguistic relativity, the second paradigm, developed in the 1960s, took advantage of new recording technology and new theoretical insights to examine language use in context, introducing new units of analysis such as speech event. [...] The third paradigm, with its focus on identity formation, narrativity, and ideology, constitutes a new attempt to connect with the rest of anthropology by extending linguistic methods to the study of issues previously identified in other (sub) fields. (Duranti 2003, 323)

Duranti acknowledges that the relationship between paradigms is complex and problematic in two ways: between the theoretical and methodological foundations of each paradigm, and between the individuals or groups of researchers who are not always willing to fully commit to one paradigm over another. Consequently, he proposes a six-dimensional

definition of ‘paradigm’; that is, “a research enterprise with a set of recognizable and often explicitly stated (a) general goals, (b) view of the key concept (e.g. language), (c) preferred units of analysis, (d) theoretical issues, and (e) preferred methods for data collection” (324):

	First paradigm	Second paradigm	Third paradigm
General goals	The documentation, description, and classification of indigenous languages, especially those of North America (originally part of ‘salvage anthropology’).	The study of language use across speakers and activities.	The use of linguistic practices to analyze the reproduction and transformation of persons, institutions, and communities across space and time.
View of language	As lexicon and grammar, that is, rule-governed structures, which represent unconscious and arbitrary relations between language as an arbitrary system and reality.	As a culturally organized and culturally organizing domain.	As an interactional achievement filled with indexical values (including ideological ones).
Preferred units of analysis	Sentence, word, morpheme, and from the 1920s, phoneme; also texts (e.g., myths, traditional tales).	Speech community, communicative competence, repertoire, language variety, style, speech event, speech act, genre.	Language practice, participation framework, self/person/identity.
Theoretical issues	Appropriate units of analysis for comparative studies (e.g., to document genetic classification or diffusion), linguistic relativity.	Language variation, the relationship between language and context.	Micro-macro links, heteroglossia, integration of different semiotic resources, entextualization, embodiment, formation and negotiation of identity/self, narrativity, language ideology.
Preferred methods for data collection	Elicitation of word lists, grammatical patterns, and traditional texts from native speakers.	Participant observation, informal interview, audio recording of spontaneous language use.	Socio-historical analysis, audiovisual documentation of temporally unfolding human encounters, with special attention to the inherently fluid and movement-by-movement negotiated nature of identities, institutions, and communities.

Table 1. A simplified overview of Duranti’s three paradigms (2003).

The table shows that the object of inquiry has increased in scope as well as complexity (from grammar to language in context and later to various social constructs and processes). Whereas early-days research studied language solely in physical and territorialized environments (e.g. family, tribe, nation, state), today the research foci have been expanded to mobile modes and transnational spaces of communication in order to understand the changing context of local and translocal language practices. In this respect, superdiversity coincides mainly with Duranti's third paradigm, as it offers fresh perspectives on old issues (cf. Blommaert 2015a; Silverstein 2015; Arnaut 2016) but also "an 'umbrella' notion under which it seems possible to tackle the interaction, thereby also emphasizing the importance of the communication technologies that enable and intensify the present-day global flows of people, discourses, and signs" (Androutsopoulos and Juffermans 2).

Unlike in Kuhn's original concept of the incommensurability between concurrent paradigms, Duranti (2003) holds that earlier paradigms are not entirely replaced by new paradigms; in fact, new and old paradigms can co-exist and complement one another, which results in what Peter Galison (1999) calls 'trading zones' – the convergence of different scientific beliefs and approaches based on coordination and the exchange of goods (e.g. information). Galison's trading zones bear a significant value today, especially in the wake of superdiversity pointing to an integrated view of digital language and literacy practices in our theorizing of language, discourse, and communication.

In fact, there have been multiple attempts at transferring the traditional principles and concepts from the domains of linguistics, anthropology, and ethnography to the settings of computer-mediated communication (CMC) in order to explore the new forms of social interaction and civic engagement marked by 'prosumption' – the conflux of consumption and production practices that characterize participation in the milieu of Web 2.0 (O'Reilly 2007; Leppänen and Häkkinen 2012). The general framework for research on the superdiversity of digital discourse (particularly the investigation social media activities and interactions) has been mostly associated with 'discourse-centered online ethnography' (Androutsopoulos 2008) because it typically zeroes in on the emergence of particular linguistic and discourse practices with attention to their communal aspects, their local and situated character, as well as the norms governing the deployment of semiotic resources across various genres and the holistic description of the communities in question (Kytölä and Androutsopoulos 2012). However other approaches also include *virtual ethnography* (Hine 2000), *network ethnography* (Howard 2002), *netnography* (Kozinets 2002), *webnography* (Puri 2007), *digital ethnography* (Murthy 2008), *cyberethnography* (Robinson & Schulz 2009), *internet ethnography* (boyd 2008), *digital anthropology* (Horst and Miller 2012), *cyberanthropology* (Knorr 2011), or *anthropology of the internet* (Hart 2004). Diversity in these approaches signals the necessity of adopting new comprehensive methodologies for anthropological research that will better interpret changing and emergent sociocultural worlds in the superdiversity of digital discourse. The following chapter aims to explain these efforts in greater detail through the paradigmatic prism suggested by Duranti.

3.1 Expanding the third paradigm

Researchers interested in the third paradigm focus on utilizing the study of language as a bridge to other disciplines in order to expand our understating of particular social and cultural phenomena, for example globalization or identity construction and negotiation. Unlike in previous paradigms, language is conceived of as a tool in gaining access to complex social processes contributing to the transmission and reproduction of culture and society which takes human agency in everyday encounters into consideration. However, seeing that language is just one semiotic conduit among many in the multimodal expanse of superdiversity of digital discourse, the current developments expand the agenda and principles of the third paradigm beyond the linguistic as its point of departure. Following Duranti's paradigmatic classification (2003), the current developments are described in terms of (a) general goals, (b) view of the key concept, (c) preferred units of analysis, (d) theoretical issues, (e) preferred methods for data collection.

3.1.1 General goals

The general goal is to use multidisciplinary frameworks to examine the reproduction and transformation of digital discourse and the role of social actors in such processes.

Historically, the research on language of digital discourse has paralleled the development of linguistic anthropology as outlined by Duranti. According to Androutsopoulos (2006, 2008, 2011; cf. Eckert 2012 and Leppänen & Kytölä 2017), there are three waves of studies which largely mirror Duranti's three paradigms.

The first wave of studies was concerned with features and communication strategies pertaining to the new media and the Internet, particularly new communication technologies and their effect on language, *but without taking the contextual factors into consideration* as in the first – *descriptivist* – paradigm, “[t]he data were often randomly collected and detached from their discursive and social contexts, and generalisations were organised around media-related distinctions such as language of emails, newsgroups, etc.” (Androutsopoulos 2008, 1). Nevertheless, this descriptive approach bore fruits in terms of establishing a fairly good understanding of the ‘language of CMC’ and its unique features such as the use of emoticons and acronyms, mechanics of conflating written and spoken features, and principal differences between synchronous (e.g. chat, instant messaging) and asynchronous (mailing, discussion boards) modes of communication (Herring 1996; Crystal 2001). Given the rapid development of communication technologies, the critique of this approach rightfully addressed the long neglected “interplay of technological, social, and contextual factors in the shaping of computer-mediated language practices, and the role of linguistic variability in the formation of social interaction and social identities on the Internet (Androutsopoulos 2006, 421).

The newly sparked interest in these overlooked aspects gave rise to a second wave of language-focused CMC studies that correspond with the concepts and practices of Duranti's second paradigm. Focus has shifted from medium-related to user-related patterns of language use; in other words, from ‘language of CMC’ to ‘computer-mediated discourse’ (Herring 2004). Data collection involved mainly direct contact with Internet

users by virtue of surveys, interviews, and participant observation. This has brought about one interesting corollary which will be further elaborated in the following chapters: “the same questions that linguists had to address in the 1960s, in the early days of corpus construction – such as the distinction between public and private language – have risen again in electronic form“ (Crystal 2011, 14).

Data interpretation started to draw from pragmatics, sociolinguistics and discourse studies in terms of contextualized actions, i.e. situated language use and linguistic diversity. In fact, upon seeing the growing linguistic diversity propelled by the new technologies, David Crystal has distanced himself from the term “Netspeak” as a unified form of language use on the Internet (i.e. ‘language of CMC’) that he coined in his 2001 publication:

The stylistic range has to recognize not only web pages, but also the vast amount of material found in email, chatrooms, virtual worlds, blogging, instant messaging, texting, tweeting and other outputs, as well as the increasing amount of linguistic communication in social networking forums (over 170 in 2011) such as Facebook, MySpace, Hi5, and Bebo. Each of these outputs presents different communicative perspectives, properties, strategies, and expectations. It is difficult to find linguistic generalizations that apply comfortably to Internet language as a whole. (Crystal 2011, 10).

It is necessary to bear in mind, given the growing linguistic variability provided by the Web 2.0 interface, that language is grounded in specific and visually organized environments, while verbal exchanges become more fragmented since they are more dependent on multimodal context. Typical Web 2.0 environments such as content-sharing and social networking websites are characterized not only by multimodality, but also by multiauthorship – their content is produced by virtually unlimited numbers of participants who, simultaneously and independently of each other, weave together intricate combinations of various semiotic modes; hence the need for an incorporation of the analysis of multimodality in the CMC research toolkit (Thurlow and Mroczek 2011, ix–xxv). Indeed, Androutsopoulos (2011) argues that clear-cut independent variables such as gender, region, and age are reflecting mere “scholarly conventions rather than the categories that are relevant to participants in online communication” (280), besides the fact that variables such as age and gender are scarcely accessible due to various degrees of anonymity. Instead, he holds that, in the light of the semiotic complexity and multidimensionality of the current web environments, the potential of variation analysis has been exhausted, and he proposes a new approach that is consistent with what can be called a third wave of studies on digital discourse.

The third wave stems mainly from the second as it attempts to reconcile the elusive “role of linguistic variability in the formation of social interaction and social identities on the Internet” (Androutsopoulos 2006, 421). Moreover, the third wave has been predominantly “interested in connections between online and offline social activities, by default defining (and accepting) diversity, heteroglossia, and complexity as research targets” (Leppänen & Kytölä 2017, 157; cf. Herring 2013). The Internet provides an immensely large repository of potential data about contemporary social practices across ethnical and national

boundaries, yet this rich source has been largely addressed with only more or less established verbally oriented methods, while the very nature of the Web remains multimodal:

Most notably, this applies to the exploration of the visual and multimedia features of the Web (as opposed to mainly verbal utterances and practices), both as a very significant source of cultural information and as an opportunity for improving the nature and depth of scholarly communications. So there is still a need for a more adapted and sophisticated tool or methodology to disclose this cultural data source in all of its apparent and less apparent modalities and to adequately address the interplay between these different expressive aspects as the prime generators of meaning. (Pauwels 2015, 65)

It is no surprise that there has been a growing demand for an integrated tool, a multimodal framework, for analyzing digital discourse beyond the linguistic, which, as previously argued, is just one semiotic among many. For this reason, all forms of communication and interactions (not just verbal) need to be taken into account, as they are constitutive of identity construction, impression management, self-presentation, etc. It is true that the multimodal nature of the Internet is largely limited to only two (super) modes, the visual and the auditory; modes appertaining to the tactile, gustatory, and olfactory senses are dismissed. However, the visual mode contains a plethora of expressive systems not frequently associated with ‘visual’, such as the textual elements (which have to be viewed or heard), typography, layout, and design features. At the same time, the auditory mode (spoken or sung texts, music, noises) also exhibits an increasing number of important aspects related to online communication. It is also necessary to pay attention to co-occurrences and arrangements of different modes such as music, soundtrack, spoken and written language, movement, gesture, set, material object, personal appearance, shot and framing, etc. (Bell and Gibson 566–567).

In order to address the need for a complex model for analyzing online environments, Pauwels (2011) conceived an analytical framework with a structured overview of multiple aspects of websites potentially containing sociocultural meanings in a broad sense. The framework is fully customizable: “new features or options of existing parameters may be added (paradigmatic aspect), while on the other hand the combination of choices that can be made within each of the parameters is virtually limitless (syntagmatic aspect)” (86). In this way, the framework can be easily adapted for a study of particular aspects of social media as well as social networking sites. It transpires from the model that meaning in digital discourse is indeed multilayered, since it is crafted from the rich multimodal and multisemiotic reservoirs of online environments. Interestingly, Duranti’s third paradigm mentions three theoretical concepts pertinent to the third wave of studies which are instrumental in unveiling the processes behind meaning-making on a multimodal basis. The concepts are *heteroglossia*, *entextualization*, and indirectly also *resemiotization*.

The notion of heteroglossia was originally introduced by Mikhail Bakhtin (1981) as “the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past, between differing epochs of the past, between different socio-ideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles and so forth” (291). Since Bakhtin’s original definition, the term has been modified and utilized in various disciplines, including not

only literary theory, but also sociolinguistics (Lähteenmäki 2010) and linguistic anthropology (Duranti 1992; Smith 2004). What remains important here is that “heteroglossia addresses (a) the simultaneous use of different kinds of forms or signs, and (b) the tension and conflicts among those signs, based on the sociohistorical associations they carry with them.” (Bailey 2007, 257). Therefore, as Androutsopoulos (2011) contends, “heteroglossia does not *occur*, as one might say with regard to language variation, but is *made*: it is fabricated by social actors who have woven voices of society into their discourses, contrasting these voices and the social viewpoints they stand for. [...] Heteroglossia invites us to examine contemporary new media environments as sites of tension and contrast between linguistic resources, social identities, and ideologies” (282–283). In his analysis of the stylized usage of linguistic heterogeneity by a bilingual German musician on her *MySpace* profile, Androutsopoulos (2011) concludes that heteroglossia is particularly useful in (1) analyzing multilayered composition of webpages on multiple layers ranging from single semiotic forms to larger textual units (e.g. posts, videos, etc.); (2) unearthing the ways of juxtaposing linguistic resources to index social, historical, and ideological tensions and conflicts either by a single author or by contributions from multiple participants; (3) revealing the role of institutional and situational contexts that are at play; (4) exploring the global/national and global/local relations as new domains of heteroglossic tension (295).

Similarly to Androutsopoulos, Leppänen et al. (2014) argue that “[c]ommunication in social media involves not only resources provided by language(s), but also other semiotic resources – textual forms and patterns, still and moving images, sounds and cultural discourses – as well as the mobilization of these in processes of decontextualization and recontextualization. The language of social media is thus woven from multiple and intertwined semiotic materials” (113). Assuming that social media represent important platforms for interaction and cultural activities for many individuals as well as social or cultural groups, these platforms offer a plentitude of diverse formats for social interaction and identity performance. However, as has been argued above, identities are scarcely simplistic, transparent or even accessible in a digital environment in the traditional sense as fixed or stable categories such as gender, ethnicity, or age; instead, they are dynamically constructed, negotiated, and performed in communicative activities and interactions – identity is in fact “a situated outcome of a rhetorical and interpretive process in which interactants make situationally motivated selections from socially constituted repertoires of identificational and affiliational resources and craft these semiotic resources into identity claims for presentation to others (Bauman 2000 1). The processes of self-identification and self-perception are thus determined by the linguistic, semiotic, and discursive choices that (dis)associate the social actor with the notions of commonality, connectedness and groupness (Leppänen, Westinen, and Kytölä 2017; cf. Brubaker and Cooper 2000). By investigating five social media discourses (i.e. linguistic material on Facebook, visual material on YouTube and its discussion threads, visual material on web forum discussions, textual interventions on fan fiction sites, and multimodal resources in YouTube rap videos), they examined the processes of resemiotization and entextualization of various semiotic resources as crucial resources for ‘(dis)identification’ and the meaning-making performance of identity in social media in terms of affiliation with commonality, connectedness, and groupness, or, importantly, also disaffiliation from it, if the social actors perceive a communal digression

from their own values: “[t]he kind of semiotic resources that are available to participants in social media activities can be empowering as well as delimiting: they can both provide new opportunities for identification, agency and social action, in which the capacity to use a range of semiotic resources can play a key role, and also impose new divisions, hierarchies and exclusions” (Leppänen et al. 2014, 133).

Additionally, their analysis shows “the ways in which micro-level discourse practices are linked and contribute to global social and cultural processes of change, and have considerable relevance to new kinds of identifications and communality which do not always have a national, ethnic or local basis” (134). This is an interesting insight which testifies against the “widespread determinist fallacy, also prevalent in sociolinguistics, that [the ‘variables’ such as] gender, race, age or status influence the way we speak: *There is no such direct influence, simply because social properties of the situation are not directly involved in the cognitive processes of discourse production and understanding* (van Dijk 4, original emphasis).

In his response to Duranti’s (2003) essay, van Dijk is indeed particularly concerned with injustice done to cognition not only in anthropology, but also in discourse studies: “a study of language and discourse without explicit cognitive basis is empirically and theoretically reductionist and hence inadequate” (qtd. in Duranti 2003, 340). Put differently, without the sociocognitive interface, the gap between societal structures, social situations and interactions on one hand and the structures and strategies of text and talk on the other hand will never be bridged. Van Dijk welcomes the integrative tendencies of the third paradigm, that is, “the integration of the ‘macro’ categories previously banned from interactional studies in sociology and anthropology, such as the role of institutions, groups, power, and domination” (qtd. in Duranti 2003, 340–341). This of course includes not only the linguistic phenomena pertinent to digital discourse – including the specific linguistic forms (first paradigm), the use of language in concrete and culturally significant social encounters (second paradigm) and the role of language in understanding these encounters (third paradigm) – but also other semiotic phenomena constituting the multimodality of digital discourse – because, as Kress & Van Leeuwen (1996) contend, “the semiotic effects are cognizable in many domains and at various levels: at the level of *media* and the *dissemination* of messages – most markedly in the shift from the book and the page to the screen; at the level of *semiotic production* in the shift from the older technologies of print to digital, electronic means; and in *representation*, in the shift from the dominance of the mode of *writing* of the mode of *image*, as well as others” (6, original emphasis). Even Duranti acknowledges that “[I]anguage is no longer the primary object of inquiry but [...] an instrument for gaining access to complex social processes” (Duranti 2003, 332).

Current developments have been thus marked by a reliance on largely multi- and interdisciplinary approaches, including disciplines concerned with the socially situated use of language – such as interactional sociolinguistics, semiotics, discourse analysis, pragmatics, literary and literacy studies, ethnography, and culture studies. However, what needs to be stressed is also the ‘cognitively informed linguistic anthropology’ which, as heralded by van Dijk, is also suggested as an important contour of a next paradigm by Salzmann, Stanlaw, and Adachi: “This is not much a radical departure because [...] an interest in the relationships among language, thought, culture, and mind goes back to the earliest work

of Boas [...]. In short, cognitive linguistic anthropology uses language as the doorway to enter the study of cognition and the study of language-in-use: how people perceive the real physical world, the constructed social world, and the imagined conceptual world” (28–29). In the same vein, the study of cognition can also be extended to the study of the online – digital – world, and it can thus supply sufficient means to examine linguistic behavior in connection with sociocultural and sociocognitive discursive practices in digital discourse – particularly, but not exclusively, in social media networks and online communities.

3.1.2 View of language

Language is viewed as a multimodal social practice in heteroglossic and polycentric participatory culture.

As has already been indicated, language has recently been approached in linguistic anthropology as a social practice through which individuals communicate (i.e. Saussure’s parole rather than langue); that is, in the sense of Bourdieu (1982, 31): “A language is itself a set of practices that imply not only a particular system of words and grammatical rules, but also an often forgotten or hidden struggle over the symbolic power of a particular way of communicating, with particular systems of classification, address and reference forms, specialized lexicons, and metaphors (for politics, medicine, ethics)” (qtd. in Duranti 1997, 45). Bourdieu’s definition of language is convenient because it also converges with the two central tenets of cognitive linguistics, namely that language is an integral part of cognition (Lakoff & Johnson 1980) and symbolic in nature (Talmy 2000). If we accept Lakoff’s (1990) ‘cognitive commitment’ – if we embrace the link between language and other cognitive faculties – then any linguistic analysis must be carried out not only in respect to different levels of linguistic analysis, but also with respect to other mental faculties (40). This leads directly to the second tenet, which is here understood not in terms of Langacker’s cognitive grammar, i.e. “language is an open-ended set of linguistic signs of expressions, each of which associates a semantic representation of some kind with a phonological representation” (11), but in terms of *cognitive semiotics*², i.e. “language is investigated as a coordinative activity, where symbolic patterns are aligned and negotiated to facilitate and constrain social coordination” (Zlatev 4; cf. Tylén et al. 2010). Considering the fact that digital discourse is replete with multimodal symbolic patterns aligned according to various (usually communal) conventions and (usually technical) affordances, it is necessary to view internet users as social actors with varying degrees of competence in understanding and producing digital discourse with respect to these constraints. It may be argued that this competence actually corresponds to the *new literacies*, which can be briefly characterized as follows: “(a) new skills, strategies, dispositions, and social practices are required by new technologies for information and communication; (b) new literacies are central to full participation in a global community; (c) new literacies regularly change as their defining technologies change; and (d) new literacies are multifaceted and benefit from multiple points of view” (Leu et al. 3). Thus, in this theoretical framework, what is new about the term *practice* in cognitively informed digital anthropology is that the practices in digital discourse require certain background knowledge related to the mechanics of the discourse,

in order to co-create its participatory culture with a range of multimodal means provided by the respective technological affordances (cf. Procházka 2014, 2016).

What is interesting from the viewpoint of language is that the technological affordances that support the platforms for participatory culture have opened multimodal corridors of expression which has redefined the view of language use, as Kress insists (2003): “Other modes are there as well, and in many environments where writing occurs these other modes may be more prominent and more significant. As a consequence, a linguistic theory cannot provide a full account of what literacy does or is; language alone cannot give us access to the meaning of the multimodally constituted message; language and literacy now have to be seen as partial bearers of meaning only” (35). Therefore, the view of language as a social practice in digital participatory culture has to account for *heteroglossia* as outlined in the previous chapter, hence the notion of a *heteroglossic participatory culture*.

The term *participatory culture* involves an “ecological approach, thinking about the interrelationships among different communication technologies, the cultural communities that grow up around them, and the activities they support” (Jenkins 7). In an interview with Patricia Lange, Jenkins describes participatory culture as

a term that’s used to describe spaces that are very open for individual contributions, where there is a supportive environment where people can learn and grow and share what they produce. So [it is] everything from video blogging and YouTube, the gaming world to fan fiction. [...] [T]hese are sites where people learn together, create together, grow together, communicate together outside of some of the rigid formal structures that shape school in its current form. [...] [W]e throw ideas out into the world and we bring them back in an improved way because of our engagement with communities. (n. pag.)

In digital discourse, participatory culture, as the name suggests, involves collaborative participation in terms of sharing, commenting, liking, subscribing, uploading, checking in, embedding, remixing, re-appropriating, etc. – consumers become also producers, that is, *prosumers* (Miller 2011). Nevertheless, in order to participate in the digital participatory culture – to use language or any other semiotic vehicle – an individual is limited by not only by the technological constraints afforded by the ‘sites’, but also by his or her background knowledge, which can be further defined through another important term – *intertextuality*.

Since Ruth Wodak accentuated historicity in discourse studies (Wodak et al. 1990; cf. Wodak & Meyer 2001), it may be assumed that every text in every discourse has a certain history – every text may imbued with social, cultural, racial, emotional, and other tensions which are interpreted with all the knowledge the reader possesses, although not necessarily in consonance with the author’s intention. When entering and/or participating in digital discourse (and its participatory culture for that matter), several assumptions should be considered: (1) texts are not structures of presence but traces and tracing of otherness (Frow 45); consequently, (2) these other texts (intertexts) inform and limit new texts in specific ways which are pertinent to the new environment in which they are grounded; and finally, (3) recognizing intertextuality is also an act of interpretation (i.e. reconstruction of meaning). In Bakhtin’s idea of intertextuality (the polyphony of social and discursive forces),

heteroglossia is born because a social actor is “surrounded by the myriad responses he or she might make at any particular point, but any one of which must be framed in a specific discourse selected from the teeming thousands available” (Holquist 69).

Following Kress, this paper argues that the same assumptions should be extended beyond intertextuality to *multimodality*, that is, from textual elements to other constellations of interrelated semiotic elements and their complex combinations (multiplex, multilayered, and nonlinear objects) planted in different environments. It may be argued that specific words and other semiotic resources “come with social and historical associations from prior usage” and their meanings are constantly being shaped in new interactive situations (Bailey 2012, 502). Thus:

[w]e are confronted, in every actual example of discourse, by a complex construction of multiple historicities compressed into one synchronized act of performance, projecting different forms of factuality and truth, all of them ideologically configured and thus indexically deployed and all of them determined by the concrete sociolinguistic conditions of their production and uptake, endowing them with a scaled communicability at each moment of enactment. These dense and complex objects are the stuff of the study of language in society (Blommaert 2015b, 113–114).

Given their historicity, specific bits of discourse are subject to the scalar effect of recognizability – different audiences recognize different indexical values and meanings entailed by the same discourse, which, in fact, discloses the something about the author as well as the audience – “their positions in the stratified sociolinguistic economy that produced the discourse, enabling access to the resources required to create meanings that communicate with different people” (Blommaert 2015b, 113). Echoing Foucault’s ‘orders of discourse’ (1984), it follows that available resources for meaning-making are not accessible to all; those with a lack of access have limited options in participation in the production and transmission of particular discourses because their ability to recognize the historical trajectories of discursive material is restricted and their participative contributions may eventually result in an unintentional meaning effect, such as being misunderstood or disqualified as transgressive, irrelevant, or simply not true (cf. Procházka 2016; Oboler 2012).

The whole situation is further complicated by the *polycentric normativities* in the post-panoptical sociality regulating the use of particular resources for meaning-making in social media; instead of one normative center regulating participants’ activities, they can or are required to orient to several centers in their production and reception of digital discourse (Arnaut 2016, cf. Leppänen & Piirainen-Marsh 2009). The shift from centrally controlled norms to polycentric normativities is sometimes referred to as the ‘practice turn’ (Pennycook 2010; cf. Rampton 2006): “normativities are now also seen as the outcome of various communities of practice and as such they are more fluid and situational than norms which were linked to fairly well-established and territorially bounded speech communities” (Pietikainen and Holmes 9). Revisiting the Bourdieuan idea that “practices are actions with history, suggesting that when we think in terms of language practices, we need to account for both time and space, history and location” (Bourdieu 1977, 2), Pennycook adds that “practices are not just things we do, but rather bundles of activities that

are central organization of social life that is *acted out* in specific places” (2, my emphasis). Here, he departs from the notion of language ‘use’ accentuated by the third paradigm (seeing language as a ‘tool’ for accomplishing interactional achievements) because the word ‘use’ presupposes the pre-existence of language. Instead, Pennycook emphasizes the notion of ‘activity’: “what we do with language in a particular place is a result of our interpretation of that place; and the language practices we engage in reinforce our interpretation of that place” (2); in other words, language is a product of repeated stylizations and sedimentations rather than a predetermined object of analysis.

However, repetition in this way does not necessarily entail sameness or fixity; on the contrary, for Pennycook, it is creativity – “what if we suggest that the rules are not in fact rules but convergent effects of rule-breaking?” (41). Blommaert (2013) develops the argument further in the context of superdiversity: “what has become a ‘rule’ or a ‘norm’ [also] becomes an ideologically saturated behavioral expectation; but such ‘rules’ or ‘norms’ have no abstract existence, they only have an existence in iterative communicative enactment. People need to perform such ideologically saturated forms of behavior – their behavior must be iterative in that sense – but small deviations from that ‘rule’ have the capacity to overrule the whole of norm-governed behavior” (7). For example, in digital discourse, deviations from the ‘standard’ varieties of different languages and their combinations have resulted in more or less homogenous varieties, registers, and styles forming a coherent semiotic habitat pertinent to a specific part of participatory culture and its technological affordances and constraints (e.g. Thurlow and Mroczek 2011; Seargeant and Tagg 2014).

3.2.3 Preferred units of analysis

The preferred unit of analysis consists of communicative practices and multimodal artifacts.

Having outlined the insufficiency of monomodal analysis in the light of the prevailing multimodal superdiversity of digital discourse, it is more preferable to investigate *communicative practices* rather than solely linguistic practices pertinent to the third paradigm. As has previously been suggested, communicative practices are understood here in the linguistic-anthropological tradition (Agha 2007), which puts situated action first; linguistic conventions/structures are “just one (albeit important) semiotic resource among a number that are available to participants in the process of local language production and interpretation, and it treats meaning as an active process of here-and-now projection and inferencing, ranging across all kinds of percept, sign and knowledge” (Blommaert & Rampton 13). Consequently, it is more preferable to investigate the heteroglossic interplay manifested in communicative practices that give rise to multimodal ensembles (Kress and van Leeuwen 2001), referred to here as *multimodal artifacts* – artificially created aggregates of two or more modes forming a unitary whole with a sociocultural significance (e.g. user profiles, Facebook wall, mash-up videos, internet memes, comments on social networking sites, etc.).

Linguistic anthropology has always been interested in the sociolinguistic dimension of human communication and interaction, but the co-occurrence and arrangement of different modes and modalities stood on the periphery of interest until the emergence of the third

paradigm. Recent developments stemming from the third paradigm devote considerable attention to the processes of forging multimodal representations of persons, institutions, and communities in the heteroglossic mosaic of digital discourse. To decipher the heteroglossic mosaic constituted by the multimodal artifacts supported by rapidly developing technologies, the concepts of entextualization and resemiotization are useful because they unearth the principles of recirculation and appropriation of complex multisemiotic material which shapes participatory culture. Entextualization emerged from the domain of anthropology and discourse studies (Bauman & Briggs 1990; Silverstein & Urban 1996; Blommaert 2005), and resemiotization from the study of multimodality (Iedema 2003; Scollon & Scollon 2004). The former follows the trajectories of language (re)use and textual material as resources in meaning-making by decontextualization (extracting the material out of its context) and recontextualization (transplanting and adjusting the extracted material to a new context), while the latter follows trajectories of meaning-making processes across modes and modalities as well as across social and cultural boundaries, emphasizing the need for socio-historical insights into the complex processes behind meaning-making. Moreover, both entextualization and resemiotization provide an analyst with a toolkit for identifying the trajectory of reutilizing textual and other semiotic resources in meaning-making, and, by the same token, in reconstructing particular multimodal artifacts (Leppänen et al. 2014).

An analyst is thus able to examine how social actors co-create participatory culture by mobilizing and deploying linguistic and other semiotic materials not only in identity work, but also in making sense of relations and realities in ways that may complement and intertwine with their activities in physical, offline contexts. According to Leppänen & Kytölä, any ethnographically informed analysis related to the superdiversity of digital discourse (and particularly social media) needs careful consideration and close, long-term observation of the sites, actors, and discourses that are subject of investigation, which should include:

- ensuring that the investigation of complex social media practices is ‘multi-sited enough’ so that salient aspects of the discourses and phenomena in focus are convincingly covered;
- identification of meaningful nexuses of practice and sites of engagement (Scollon & Scollon 2004) in which particular multilingual or multisemiotic practices and styles emerge, thrive, circulate, are transformed, and possibly wither away;
- the delimitation and focusing of investigations to determine where to stop tracing the trajectories in qualitative research with the aim of holistic yet detailed description;
- treating digital practices as grassroots cultural production in which the borderline between producers and consumers of digital discourse is a blurred one, in a world where anyone with an internet connection and a digital device can copy, imitate, edit and circulate different discourses. (148–149)

Further, considering that social actors mobilize various resources in socio-cultural niches regulated by polycentric normativities, some degree of agency is always involved, as they also exert a certain degree of social power manifested (1) in their access and

competence in such activities, (2) in the legitimacy of their claims to reuse the semiotic material, and finally, (3) in the differential values attached to various types of semiotic material (Bauman and Briggs 74–76). This also broaches new ethical challenges which will be discussed in the next subchapter along with other theoretical issues.

3.1.4 Theoretical issues

Theoretical issues include mainly, but not only: the gap between the offline and the online, speed of change, and new ethical challenges.

3.1.4.1 The gap between the offline and the online

Online-offline dynamics pose an important challenge for ethnographically-informed digital anthropology because the Internet may be accessed from virtually anywhere and at virtually any time, making our understanding of spatial and temporal dimensions rather blurred in the light of its superdiversity – and, at the same time, it also blurs our understanding of what constitutes an ethnographic ‘field’ in this regard. For this reason, Varis maintains that “context and contextualization are a critical issue in digital ethnography [due to an increasing number of] polycentric environments in which little, if anything, can be taken for granted” (57). It follows that there is hardly any ‘one-size-fits-all’ or universal approach to digital ethnography, as the contexts vary enormously; rather, flexible and adaptive ethnographically informed approaches should be explored.

Technological affordances and constraints are, for example, one of the main problems for the contextualization of digital communication. In their study about Twitter users, Marwick and boyd introduce the notion of ‘context collapse’. Twitter, like Facebook and other similar social network sites, builds on a *networked audience* rather than a *broadcast audience*, meaning that the latter assumes one-to-many communication where a single broadcaster distributes content to a largely static, geographically bounded anonymous audience, while the former consists of a many-to-many model where audience members take turns in creating and producing content: “managing the networked audience requires monitoring and responding to feedback, watching what others are doing on the network, and interpreting followers’ interests” (Marwick and boyd 17; cf. Drotner 2005); furthermore, in such networked digital environments, people’s networks potentially include people from different social circles (e.g. not only family members, friends, co-workers, but also people they have never met offline). Thus, social media technologies “collapse multiple audiences into single contexts, making it difficult for people to use the same techniques online that they do to handle multiplicity in face-to-face conversations” (Marwick and boyd 1). This brings about significant changes to interpersonal interactions – social actors have to manage tensions between public/private, insider/outsider, and frontstage/backstage performances (Goffman 1959).

The ethnographic approach seems especially helpful in disentangling these contextual complexities shaping people’s communicative practices in digital discourse. In her ethnographic study, boyd (2008) distinguishes four technological properties that shape interaction in digital discourse: (1) persistence (online semiotic material is automatically

recorded and archived), (2) searchability (semiotic material can be accessed through searches), (3) replicability (digital content, made of bits, can be duplicated) and (4) scalability (the potential spread and visibility of semiotic material is great). It is especially searchability and scalability that facilitate the recontextualization and resemiotization of available resources, yet these factors also make the processes highly complex and unpredictable (cf. Rymes 2012). An ‘online corpus’ usually consists of ‘finished’ communicative products which are not only shaped by the immediately observable *online context*, but also by the *offline context* of the physical input. The physical, offline context in which digital activity takes place thus introduces a new layer(s) of normativity for communicative events, and, consequently opening a variety of self-, peer-, and state-imposed dimensions of ‘acceptability’, in a wide array of activities ranging from taking ‘selfies’ at funerals to fomenting political unrest through social media (e.g. during the Arab Spring) (cf. Varis & Wang 2011). It should be borne in mind that online contexts cannot be studied as a singularity; the context of digital communication cannot be reduced to seeming graspable concepts such as ‘Facebook’ or ‘Twitter’, since they are “by no means a consistent or static thing, but an ideological construct shaped by, among other things, the way in which users view this medium in relation to other media, [including offline media]. Hence, the online environments studied cannot be taken as self-explanatory contexts, but need to be investigated for locally specific meanings and appropriations” (Varis 58). However, activities in social media are not organized solely on the basis of local categories and precepts, but are increasingly *translocal* – “participants are orienting not only to their local affiliations but also to groups and cultures which can be distant but with which they share interests, causes or projects” (Leppänen and Häkkinen 18). The heterogeneity of digital discourse outlined in the previous chapters in fact articulates diverse and distinct nuances in how translocality manifests itself in different, situated, and context-bound instances of digital communication.

Turning back to boyd’s (2008) technological properties, persistence and replicability are also crucial for the ethnography of digital communication. The fact that online materials can be easily traced and located holds important implications for digital ethnographers; while the data might be anonymized with nicknames or avatars, it might be still retraced by virtue of its ‘googlability’. Difficult compromises in sacrificing ethnographic detail and accuracy in favor of safety have to be made: “It is the responsibility of ethnographers to see that they do not, for instance, jeopardize political activists in contexts where revealing their actions – or making it easier to establish their offline identities – might put them in danger, or that they are not inadvertently ‘outing’ people with stigmatized sexualities” (Varis 59). This also opens up a related issue about different understandings of what is ‘public’ and ‘private’; semiotic material might be publically available, yet its further use and reuse might be problematic, including for research purposes. In a similar vein, Crystal (2011) raises the issue of inaccessibility; when it comes to such outputs as email, chat, and text-messages, “people are notoriously reluctant to allow their private e-communications to be accessed by passing linguists. [...] The research literature is characterized by a great deal of theoretical speculation but relatively few empirical studies“ (13).

3.1.4.2 Speed of Change

Besides the ‘rapidly growing language corpus’ and the ‘diversity of language encountered on the Internet’, Crystal (2011) identifies ‘speed of change’ as one of the current challenges in research on digital discourses (10–15). It might be argued that the ‘speed of change’ is actually a cause of ‘the rapidly growing language corpus’ – Crystal (2011) in fact claims that digital language corpus now contains “more written language than all the libraries in the world combined” (10). The rapidity of change in digital discourse renders any linguistic generalizations rather dangerous, since they might be out of date as soon as they are written. This is because digital discourse remains grounded in an electronic medium – semiotic vehicles change not only on the basis of new technologies introducing new communicative practices (e.g. blogging, tweeting, etc.), but also according to the design of these technologies, that is, their user interface. Each interface is composed of what van Dijck (2013) calls ‘defaults’ – settings automatically assigned to a software application to channel user behavior in a certain way; however,

defaults in digital environments are not just technical but also ideological maneuverings; if changing a default takes effort, users are more likely to conform to the site’s decision architecture. A notorious default is Facebook’s setting to distribute a message to everyone, rather than to friends only [...]. Algorithms, protocols, and defaults profoundly shape the cultural experiences of people active on social media platforms, [including] the nature of our connections, creations, and interaction. Buttons that impose ‘sharing’ and ‘following’ as social values have effects in cultural practices. (32)

Thus, we may establish a fairly descriptive account of each social network site, but as soon as its architecture changes (e.g. Facebook introducing ‘Timeline’ in 2011, Twitter adding the URL shortener in 2010, etc.), the communicative practices are affected and possibly changed as well. Moreover, even smaller changes, for example in the layout, may bring about significant consequences. In his approach to multimodality, Kress (2009) ascribes layout the status of a mode, even though it does not ‘name’, ‘depict’, ‘enact’ or ‘indicate’ anything; “it does however ‘dispose’, organize and indicate aspects of the social/ontological ‘status’ of representations, as ‘known’ and ‘given’ or as ‘new’ and ‘unknown’”. In doing that, layout ‘orients’ viewers/interactants socially as ‘part of my group or not’ (92). An apt example is the Facebook-inspired redesign of the beleaguered Myspace layout in 2010, in an effort to stop its users from straying to its younger and much more successful competitor (Barnett 2010).

Indeed, social networking sites cannot be studied in isolation; individuals as well as organizations often coordinate multiple profiles grounded in different, yet heavily interconnected, platforms. An individual may, for example, present himself or herself on a personal website with all the information for supporters, partners, funders, etc. However, at the same time, he or she may use Facebook to communicate with family, friends, coworkers, etc.; Youtube, Pinterest, or Instagram to share visual content; LinkedIn to create and maintain professional connections, Twitter to contribute or just keep updated on

matters of interest; and a blog platform to convey more well-formed and sustained, albeit often informal, thoughts.

In other words, a change in one social networking site might also affect other sites, such as when hashtags became popular practice on Twitter during the 2007 California wildfires as a convenient means to distribute news about #sandiegofire; and subsequently, “the use of the hashtag was officially put into effect in July 2009 by the Twitter platform, to be followed in 2011 by Google+ and Instagram, whilst Facebook began to make use of this idea in June 2013” (van den Berg 4). The change might be also extremely abrupt, often due to external (offline) impulses. For example, in the wake of 2015 Paris attacks, a wave of mass compassion and support spread over social media – Facebook prompted its users to veil their profile pictures with a transparent French flag filter, Twitter became awash with hashtags such as #PrayForParis, #PrayForFrance, and for Parisians #PorteOuverte (“#OpenDoor”) to offer their homes as shelter for strangers stranded by the attacks (Buncombe 2015), and Instagram was reported to have 70 million people sharing their prayers for Paris within the first week after the attacks (Laurent 2015). As abrupt as it may be, Lee claims that “[u]nexpected design (or affordance) changes such as these pose real challenges for internet researchers [...] but they are also a perfect opportunity for tracing creative adaptations in people’s new media textual practices” (111). This claim might be of course extended beyond linguistic practices, as has been indicated in the previous chapters.

3.1.4.3. New ethical challenges

Given the rapid speed of change, new ethical problems and challenges emerge in an unprecedented manner (e.g. Buchanan 2004; cf. Markham & Buchanan 2012). Most of the ethnographical and anthropological challenges related to ethical considerations about the superdiversity of digital discourse stem from the elusive, often contested borderline between ‘public’ and ‘private’ in virtual space and its impact on informants, communities, and digital practices (e.g. Androutsopoulos 2013; cf. Kytölä 69–76; Stæhr 25–34). Of course, this has far-reaching ramifications for data collection, analysis, interpretation, and publication. Leppänen et al. (2015) identify three broad strands of ethical questions related to ethnographically informed social-scientific research on digital practices and discourses:

- Access to, observation of and collection of online (and offline) data; the self-positioning of the researcher(s); ethnographic approaches to the (online) communities in focus
- The researcher’s sensitivity towards controversial issues (when selecting appropriate data and rejecting inappropriate data for closer discussion)
- Granting the informants and authors of online data sufficient anonymity (or, alternatively, sufficient credit for their writings). (4)

The limitations of this paper allow only a brief discussion of the new ethical conundrums; therefore, attention is paid specifically to the cornerstone of anthropological and ethnographical enterprise – participant observation. Boellstorff et al. distinguish several fundamental areas in which ethnographers should consider the ethics of the impacts of

their research on informants: informed consent, mitigation of institutional risk, anonymity, deception, sex and intimacy, compensation, and accurate portrayal. First, informed consent in ethnographic research is handled differently than in, for example, biomedical or psychological research because there is virtually no risk of bodily harm or psychological distress; instead, ethnography carries what is sometimes called ‘informational risk’ – leaking private information. What is new for digital ethnography and research in online environments is the situation similar to that “in public areas, where it is not necessary to have every person in an interaction sign an informed consent form – just as there is nothing inherently unethical about taking a picture of a tourist in an open, general area at an amusement park, which is a public place although an admission fee is charged” (Boellstorff et al. 134–135).

Second, if there is a possibility of legal or contractual breach, “ethnographers should assess how to mitigate risks to informants when studying legally sensitive areas that might eventuate in a subpoena” (Boellstorff et al. 136); this applies especially to collected data with potentially incriminating content due to violation of Terms of Service (ToS) and/or End User Licensing Agreements (EULAs).

Third, as a matter of course, ethnographers should avoid an inappropriate disclosure of informant identities or confidential information, including potentially questionable or even illicit conduct. In order to avoid revealing an informant’s identity in published work, it is sometimes recommended to anonymize collective identities “since being able to identify a group often makes it easy to identify individuals in the group” due to the interconnectedness of social networks (Boellstorff et al. 137). However, in some online environments, identities are strongly bound to pseudonyms, so concealing or altering pseudonyms could potentially lead to the loss of significantly important data, even if anonymity is maintained. Case-to-case considerations have to be made.

Fourth, ethnographers should avoid deceptive practices such as assuming a false identity to obtain valuable data; participant observation implies “a certain level of intimacy with informants, in the sense of closeness and deep rapport (Boellstorff et al. 144); thus, it not only unethical to pose as, say, a member of the opposite sex, but also corruptive; such a subterfuge will often lead to inaccurate and dubious representations of both oneself and the subject of the research, rendering the collected data useless. Further, participant observation, by definition, also entails a certain degree of participation in the community – Boellstorff et al. 2012 concur with the traditional conception and disregard the ‘fly on the wall’ approach whereby the observer is hidden and not participating. Contrary to this view, a number of researchers advocate that in the socio-technical milieu of online environments, partial or zero participation (i.e. observation only) is permissible in some cases: “if used as supplementary method not dealing with individuals or sensitive data, but as a way to confirm insights about ways of conduct in a general sense (i.e. practices), a hidden approach could be defended” (Skågeby 416).

Fifth, it has been informally acknowledged that closeness between researchers and informants may result in sexual activity, but until recently this has scarcely received any attention (cf. Kulick and Willson, 1995) along with its unpredictable and frequently unforeseen consequences. Although it is relatively easy to avoid sex, especially in an online community that does not necessarily meet offline, issues of intimacy remain close to the very

core of ethnographic practices; ethnographers might be invited to participate in special events not generally shared with the uninitiated, and their subsequent course of action should uphold ethical standards (Kendall 2009). Another issue with intimacy arises again due to the interconnectedness of social networks; activities in social network sites might be easily tracked, hence the danger of unwittingly exposing sensitive data or negatively affecting further responses within the group or community (e.g. as a result of ‘friending’ some people while ignoring others). Priorities and relevant policies should be established at the outset of ethnographic research.

Sixth, ethnographic endeavors should be always carried out with minimal impact on the communities under study, but Boellstorff et al. (2012) hold that “we should go beyond neutral effect to strive for positive impact. ‘Doing good’ creates a favorable impression of researchers in general and ethnographers in particular, paving the way for future research” (146), yet informants or even the whole community should not become dependent on the researcher, and information about the finitude of the research should be communicated.

Finally, although it is often held to be an imperative of ethnography that it should present the most accurate and faithful portrayal of an informant’s lifeworld, i.e. “*his* native point of view, relation to life, *his* vision of his world” (Malinowski 25) – the feasibility of this endeavor has been recently disputed in the light of the postmodern turn in qualitative enquiry, resulting in what Clifford and Marcus (1986) call ‘a crisis of representation in the human sciences’, which “challenged classic ethnographic norms based on objectivist representation of culture. The postmodern turn unveiled the complicity of conventional social science methods in reinscribing historical oppression” (Jason and Glenwick 72). In response to these criticisms, the traditional ethnographic ontological and epistemological perspectives have been reassessed mainly with respect to recognizing researcher bias and subjectivity, giving rise to a critical approach to ethnography (cf. Brookfield 1987). To reconcile the dissonance, Duranti (1997) states that ethnography is, in fact, characterized by the ability to perform two apparently contradictory functions: “ethnographers must have the ability to achieve a reasonable degree of objectivity by ‘stepping back’ from one’s own cultural experiences in order to achieve an ‘etic’ perspective [as well as] the ability to identify with the community sufficiently so as to achieve an ‘emic’ perspective” (85–86). Further, some ethnographers go as far as asserting that

competence as insider does not make one an accurate observer. In fact, ethnography usually works best when concluded by *an outsider with considerable inside experience*. The reason is that the ethnographer’s job is not to replicate the insider’s perspective but rather to elicit and *analyze* it through systematic comparison between inside and outside views of particular events and processes. This task includes detecting tacit knowledge, something by definition is generally invisible to insiders. (Forsythe 2001, 149, original emphasis)

Considering that digital ethnography has been generally described as traditional ethnography adapted to the study of virtual/online communities (Hine 2000; Kozinets 2002), it should be borne in mind that it does not matter whether one opts for more traditional,

realist, ethnography or critical ethnography (Creswell 93–94) because ethnography is “not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretative one in search of meaning” (Geertz 5), and, as Boellstorff et al. argue, “this does not cast us into a postmodern morass in which all interpretations are equal. Like field sciences from astronomy to zoology, the fact that the value of ethnographic research is not predicated on replication does not mean there are no standards for assessment” (149). Of course, this brief overview only scratches the surface of the digital quicksand; the ethics of the digital social fabrics are constantly shifting as new methodologies emerge together with new technological affordances; therefore, “it is up to us, ethically, as scholars to create, seek out, propagate, and defend adequate standards” (149).

3.1.5 Preferred methods for data collection

Preferred methods for data collection in digital discourse adopt traditional procedures possibly with help of electronic techniques and tools.

Methods of data collection in research on the superdiversity of digital discourse draw on and combine procedures employed in previous paradigms with ethnographically sensitive techniques, approaches, and tools provided by computing services and technologies. Considering the length and breadth of superdiversity, it is virtually impossible to give a full account of the preferred methods due to the emergent character of the phenomenon in question; nevertheless, Androutsopoulos (2013) holds that regardless of framework, general issues related to the collection of online data include:

- The online data of interest to linguists is overwhelmingly written language data. CMC research is therefore confronted with the hitherto marginal status of written language in sociolinguistics [and linguistic anthropology], and at the same time contributes to raising the interest in written language data.
- Written language online is closely related to various semiotic resources, including typography, still and moving images, and screen layout; the media-richness of contemporary digital environments increases the impact of multimodality on meaning-making.
- Modes of digital communication introduce new base-level units in online discourse. Categories such as ‘message’ or ‘post’ must be taken into account when collecting and analyzing online data, and their relation to familiar syntactic and discourse-level units (sentence, clause, utterance, turn, adjacency pair) must be analytically examined.
- In CMC, social contexts can be invisible or only partially retrievable from digital exchanges themselves. Information on participants and their social relationships is often limited for both analysts and participants. New conventions of anonymous public exchange emerge, and traditional operationalization of socio-demographic may be of little use.
- Despite homogeneity at the level of hardware (‘it’s all bits and bytes’), digital language data can be strikingly heterogeneous, especially if researchers do not restrict to

data from a single mode but sample across the range of digital modes, each with their respective semiotic resources, that people use in their online practices.

- Finally, digital data is available in overwhelming amounts, making it difficult to select and focus on one specific sample or site of discourse. (237–238)

The situation is further complicated by the degree of involvement on the part of researcher. On one hand, data can be collected automatically even without visiting the web sites in question (a ‘screen-based’ approach); on the other hand, researchers may choose to elicit data in close contact and collaboration with social actors (a ‘user-based’ approach). Researchers are thus presented with insider (participative) or outsider (non-participative, ‘lurker’) perspective options, or the combination thereof (outsider with inside experience). Even though the insider perspective is generally encouraged in contrast with the outsider perspective, the benefits of their combination enable a greater degree of reflective observation as well as greater analytical scope corresponding with the degree of insider knowledge about the interactional and technical precepts of the communicative space in question, which is also helpful in recruiting key informants who might be instrumental in other methods of data collection traditionally accompanying observation – document collection and interviews. The former was historically limited mostly to textual material in the sense of the first paradigm, but audio and later audiovisual recording possibilities paved the way for documenting and analyzing social interactions on a multimodal basis. Thus, for instance, screenshots or snapshots may present a convenient rich container of structural and contextual information complementing textual material (e.g. log files) in both a synchronic and diachronic manner (i.e. taking screenshots or snapshots over a period of time). In digital discourse, document collection might be narrowed down to a specific online site (SNS, blog, forum, etc.) or multiple sites by virtue of refined search options and techniques by both general (e.g. Google) or specialized (e.g. Boardreader, Omigli, Blogpulse) search engines (Skågeby 415). The latter, online interviews, might be conducted synchronously (via e.g. instant messaging) or asynchronously (via e.g. email), yet both types carry several benefits as well as drawbacks in comparison with traditional face-to-face interviews (see e.g. Crichton & Kinash 2003)

As far as virtual communities are concerned, participant observation remains one of the most common qualitative methods for obtaining data. Besides SNSs, participant observation has also proved to be a highly useful method in anthropological explorations of a variety of virtual communities grounded in Massive Multiplayer Online Games (MMOGs) such as *World of Warcraft* (Nardi 2010) or *Second Life* (Boellstorff 2008). Additionally, Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) and other virtual learning social environments have also received significant attention from anthropologists (e.g. Flamenbaum et al. 2014). Nevertheless, each approach has to grapple with a number of challenges associated with superdiversity, namely: mobility, complexness, and unpredictability (Blommaert 2013). First, the fluidity of (virtual) communities – people might join the communities only for a short period of time, making it difficult to identify and track interactions constituting social practices, identity construction, relationships, and behavior patterns – all of which are motivated by internal as well as external forces driven by constant change, generating complex yet coherent systems. This creates a degree of unpredictability in what

may be observed, hence the need for closer ethnographic inspection preferably combined with other methods. Further, there is the inconsistent and fleeting of nature of social interactions – not all interactions are thematically relevant, coherent, or acceptable within the purview of a community (e.g. trolling, flaming, phishing, etc.); moreover, some interactions are not archived or easily accessible (e.g. private chat exchanges). Finally, the overall shortage of information about the mechanics of community dynamics – there are “very little critical insights on what constitutes practice in these communities, how networked media facilitate existing or new practices and how online media practice intertwines with offline practice” (Akoumianakis 2011, 36).

Alternatively, advances in computational capacities offer some novel quantitative ways of collecting data, namely via data mining techniques. Countless Internet users are generating digital traces of their identity and activities on a daily basis, making ‘user-generated’ content as one of the defining characteristics of participatory culture. In the study of SNSs, social media mining is a useful method for collecting, analyzing and extracting meaningful patterns from these traces (Zafarani et al. 2014). Several tools and approaches have been systematically employed in this respect; for example, *content analysis* that reduces rich data sets into counts serving as a basis for the identification of overall trends and linguistic norms (Herring et al. 2006), *social network analysis* for delimiting the bounds of a community and delineating its participants’ relationships so as to operationalize social context in detail (e.g. Carrington, Scott, and Wasserman 2005), and *crawling agents* or *devices*³ for automatized collection of larger amounts of quantifiable data in a relatively time-efficient and cost-effective manner (e.g. Krishnamurthy, Gill, and Arlitt 2008). The combination of these approaches and tools enables cross-validation of information, facilitates the enrichment of data, and allows comparison of data from a variety of sources (for a full overview see Daniel 2011).

The latest methodological innovations frequently rely on conflating qualitative and quantitative methods in an effort to establish a comprehensive and non-reductive account of interactions in digital discourse. Although they are not frequently associated with the line of research followed in this paper, these multi-method models combine several approaches in concert with each other, and thus dispelling or mitigating the limitations of each approach, which might be helpful in addressing some of the challenges posed by superdiversity.

4. Conclusion

Interestingly, nearly all contributors to the mounting literature on superdiversity received their initial training in applied linguistics (in Europe) while only a small minority are trained anthropologists, yet much of the work done on superdiversity (not only of digital discourse) has been both directly and indirectly inspired by the American tradition and developments in linguistic anthropology and ethnography, especially the tradition established by Hymes, Gumperz, and Silverstein. In fact, both European-based sociolinguistics and US-based linguistic anthropology helped to dismantle the nation-state imagination (i.e. languages are separate entities delimited by national boundaries which define the criteria of belonging and membership of a national community; a view that identifies

the ‘transnational’ and ‘global’ flows as deviant patterns) (Blommaert 2015a, 82–83; cf. Arnaut 2016). Contemporary scholars interested in critical and ethnographic approaches to the social changes brought about by globalization (particularly in terms of social networks) have been loosely organized under the term *new sociolinguistics* (Heller 2007; Blommaert 2010), but its roots can be found in anthropology as its followers seek to provide a more holistic understanding of the increasing diversity of linguistic forms as well as the significance of space, culture, and social semiotics in multilingual environments, which highlights the convergence between linguistic ethnography and discourse studies (Leppänen & Kytölä 157). Indeed, superdiversity should be seen as a point of convergence or nexus of developments, and this paper focuses particularly on developments in research on communicative activities and interaction in digital discourse.

Mediated interaction has become available to people and communities around the world, leading to increased digital media communication that facilitates connectedness and enables collaborative content production via the affordances of computer and mobile devices. It is shown that the contemporary vocabulary in the study of language in society and culture is undergoing a considerable revision given the increasing granularity of diversity, both offline and online.

Digital communication is perceived as an interplay of various semiotic vehicles constrained by the respective communicative environment and its technological affordances. The focus is not so much on language systems as on languages as emergent forms from contexts of interaction, as well as on creative semiotic practices across the boundaries of culture, history, and politics. It is therefore necessary to accept a certain degree of unpredictability and uncertainty in the way that anything qualifiable as ‘deviant’, ‘aberrant’, or ‘unusual’ linguistic performance may, in fact, be quite normal in the given communicative space. In this endeavor, ethnographically informed approaches are favored, since the ethnographic enterprise avoids projecting *a priori* characteristics onto the object of inquiry and has the capacity to capture the perpetual changes in the superdiversity of digital discourse which are not entirely random, but are constitutive of the overall discourse coherence. Current approaches thus rely on their multi- and interdisciplinary nature, which helps researchers to unveil the complex concert of multiple modes and techno-social ideologies orchestrating meaning-making processes. Such integrative tendencies lend themselves to new methods of data collection since the traditional procedures might be complemented by exploiting computational capacities – particularly by data mining and its subsequent triangulation – to increase the volume of data and improve its validity and to address the pitfalls of (not necessarily linguistic) research in online environments, including the rapidity of change, the elusive border between ‘private’ and ‘public’ as well as between ‘online’ and ‘offline’, and new ethical challenges.

Generally speaking, the collaborative spirit of research on superdiversity maintains the inviting, explorative, unrestricted, and dialogical character of intellectual endeavor; “it is not a fight about ownership of terms and arguments, even less a quest for ‘European’ or ‘American’ genealogies of thoughts; it is the contrary: it is about sharing views in a joint process of construction” (Blommaert 2015a, 88).

Notes

¹ Although there are a number of competing terms that encapsulate Internet-mediated communication, such as ‘computer-mediated communication’ (CMC) or ‘computer-mediated discourse’ (CMD) (Herring 2004; see Crystal 2011 for a more comprehensive overview of terminology), this paper prefers the term ‘digital discourse’ (Thurlow and Mroczek 2011) due to the phenomenon of ‘de-computerization’, i.e. the emergence and increasing popularity of mobile technologies (smart-phones, tablets) with internet access.

² Cognitive semiotics is understood here in the sense propagated by the Centre for Semiotics (CfS) situated at the University of Aarhus, Denmark. The CfS has been interested in cognitive semiotics since the mid-1990s, and, according to Zlatev (2012, . 4), “CfS is the only academic institution so far offering an MA program in CS (both in name and content): ‘Cognitive Semiotics is first and foremost interdisciplinary program which draws on neuroscience, philosophy, logic, linguistics, anthropology, cognitive science and literary theory’” (4).

³ Crawlers are automated systems designed for large-scale downloading of web pages. Besides data mining (i.e. analyzing and/or statistically processing collected web pages), they are frequently used for web archiving and as components of web search engines which assemble and index a corpus of web pages, enabling a quick response to users’ queries.

Bibliography

- Akoumianakis, Demosthenes. “Recurrent Interactions, Acts of Communication and Emergent Social Practice in Virtual Community Settings.” *Handbook of Research on Methods and Techniques for Studying Virtual Communities*. Ed. B. K. Daniel. New York: Information Science Reference, 2011. 34–60.
- Androutsopoulos, Jannis, and Kasper Juffermans. “Digital Language Practices in Superdiversity: Introduction.” *Discourse, Context & Media* 4.5 (2014): 1–6.
- Androutsopoulos, Jannis. “Introduction: Sociolinguistics And Computer-Mediated Communication.” *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 10.4 (2006): 419–438.
- . “Potentials and Limitations of Discourse-Centred Online Ethnography.” *Language@Internet* 5.8 (2008): 1–20. Web. 13 May 2016. <http://www.languageatinternet.org/articles/2008/1610>
- . “From Variation to Heteroglossia in the Study of Computer-mediated Discourse.” *Digital Discourse: Language in the New Media*. Eds. C. Thurlow, and K. Mroczek. Oxford: OUP, 2011. 277–298.
- . “Online Data Collection.” *Data Collection in Sociolinguistics, Methods and Applications*. Eds. C. Mallinson, B. Childs, and G.V. Herk. New York: Routledge, 2013. 236–250.
- Arnaut, Karel, and Missimiliano Spotti. “Superdiversity discourse.” *Working Papers in Urban language and Literacies* paper 122 (2014): 1–11.
- Arnaut, Karel. “Superdiversity: Elements of an Emerging Perspective.” *Language and Superdiversity*. Eds. K. Arnaut, J. Blommaert, B. Rampton, and M. Spotti. New York: Routledge, 2016. 49–70.
- Arnaut, Karel, Jan Blommaert, Ben Rampton, and Massimiliano Spotti. *Language and Superdiversity*. London: Routledge, 2016.

- Arnaut, Karel, Jan Blommaert, Martha S. Karrebæk, and Massimiliano Spotti. *Engaging Superdiversity: recombining spaces, times and language practices*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2017.
- Bailey, Benjamin. "Heteroglossia and boundaries." *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. Ed. M. Heller. New York: Palgrave, 2007. 257–274.
- . "Heteroglossia." *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism*. Eds. M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge, and A. Creese. Abingdon: Routledge, 2012. 499–507.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Discourse in the novel." *The Dialogic Imagination*. Trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. 259–422.
- Barnett, Emma. "MySpace unveils 'Facebook-style' Homepage." *The Telegraph*. 12 August 2010. Web. 12 August 2010. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/myspace/7940564/MySpace-unveils-Facebook-style-homepage.html>
- Bauman, Richard, and Charles L. Briggs. "Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19 (1990): 59–88.
- Bauman, Richard. "Language, identity, performance." *Pragmatics* 10.1 (2000): 1–5.
- Bell, Allan, and Andy Gibson. "Staging Language: An Introduction to the Sociolinguistics of Performance." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15.5 (2011): 555–572.
- Blommaert, Jan. *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: CUP, 2005.
- . *Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: CUP, 2010.
- . *Ethnography, Superdiversity and Linguistic Landscapes: Chronicles of complexity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2013.
- . "Commentary: Superdiversity Old and New." *Language & Communication* 44 (2015a): 82–88.
- . "Chronotopes, Scales, and Complexity in the Study of Language in Society." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 44 (2015b): 105–116.
- . "The Conservative Turn In Linguistic Landscape Studies." *Ctrl+Alt+Dem*. 5 January 2016. Web. 12 May 2017. <https://alternative-democracy-research.org/2016/01/05the-conservative-turn-in-linguistic-landscape-studies/>
- Blommaert, Jan, and Ben Rampton. "Language and superdiversity." *Diversities* 13.2 (2011): 1–22.
- Boellstorff, Tom. *Coming of Age in Second Life: An Anthropologist Explores the Virtually Human*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- Boellstorff, Tom, et al. *Ethnography and Virtual World*. 1st ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- . *Ce que parler veut dire*. Paris: Fayard, 1982.
- boyd, dannah. "How can qualitative internet researchers define the boundaries of their projects: A response to Christine Hine." *Internet Inquiry: Conversations About Method*. Eds. Markham, N. Annette, and Nancy K. Baum. Los Angeles: Sage, 2008. 26–32.
- Brookfield, Stephen. *Developing Critical Thinkers: Challenging Adults to Explore Alternative Ways of Thinking and Acting*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.
- Brubaker, Rogers, and Frederick Cooper. "Beyond 'identity'." *Theory and Society* 29 (2000): 1–47.
- Buchanan, Elizabeth. *Readings in Virtual Research Ethics*. Hershey, PA: Information Science Publishing, 2004.
- Clifford, James, and George Marcus. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

- Coupland, Nicolas. *The Handbook of Language and Globalization*. Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Creese, Angela, and Adrian Blackledge. "Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching?" *The Modern Language Journal* 94.1 (2010): 103–115.
- Creswell, John W. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2012.
- Crichton, Susan, and Shelley Kinash. "Virtual Ethnography: Interactive Interviewing Online as Method." *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology* 29.2 (2003): n. pag. Web. 2 August 2016. <https://www.cjlt.ca/index.php/cjlt/article/view/26548/19730>
- Crystal, David. *Language and the Internet*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- . *Internet Linguistics*. London: Routledge, 2011.
- Daniel, Ben K. *Handbook of Research on Methods and Techniques for Studying Virtual Communities: Paradigms and Phenomena*. New York, NY: Information Science Reference, 2011.
- Drotner, Kirsten. "Media on the Move: Personalized Media and the Transformation Of Publicness." *Journal of Media Practice* 6.1 (2005): 53–64.
- Duranti, Alessandro. "Heteroglossia in Samoan Oratory." *Pacific Studies* 15.4 (1992): 155–175.
- . *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- . "Language as Culture in U.S. Anthropology: Three Paradigms." *Current Anthropology* 44.3 (2003): 323–347.
- Eckert, Penelope. "Three waves of variation study: The emergence of meaning in the study of Sociolinguistic variation." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41.1 (2012): 87–100.
- Flamenbaum, Rachel, et al. "Anthropology in and of MOOCs." *American Anthropologist* 116.4 (2014): 829–838.
- Forsythe, Diana E. *Studying Those Who Study Us: An Anthropologist in the World of Artificial Intelligence*. Boston, MA: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- Foucault, Michel. "The order of discourse." *Language and Politics*. Ed. M. Shapiro. London: Blackwell, 1982. 108–138.
- Frow, John. "Intertextuality and ontology." *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices*. Eds. M.orton, and J. Still. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1990. 45–55.
- Galison, Peter. "Trading zone: Corrdinating action and belief." *The Science Studies Reader*. Ed. M. Biagioli. New York and London: Routledge, 1999. 137–160.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1959.
- Gumperz, John, and Dell Hymes. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.
- Hart, Keith. "Notes towards an anthropology of the internet." *Horizontes Antropológicos* 10.21 (2004): 15–40.
- Haythornwaite, Caroline. "Social networks and Internet connectivity effects." *Information Communication and Society* 8.2 (2005): 125–147.
- Heller, Monica. *Bilingualism: a social approach*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Herring, Susan C. "Introduction." *Computer-Mediated Communication: Linguistic, Social and Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. Ed. Susan C. Herring. Pennsylvania: Benjamins, 1996. 1–10.
- . "Computer-mediated discourse analysis: An approach to researching online communities." *Designing for Virtual Communities in the Service of Learning*. Eds. Sasha A. Barab, Rob

- Kling, and James H. Gray. Cambridge, U.K. and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 338–376.
- . “Discourse in Web 2.0: Familiar, Reconfigured, and Emergent.” *Discourse 2.0. Language and New Media*. Eds. D. Tannen, and A. M. Trester. Washington, DC: GUP, 2013. 1–25.
- Herring, Susan C., et al. “A longitudinal content analysis of weblogs: 2003–2004.” *Blogging, Citizenship, and the Future of Media*. Ed. M. Tremayne. London: Routledge, 2006. 3–20.
- Herring, Susan C., Dieter Stein, and Tuija Virtanen. “Introduction to the Pragmatics of Computer-mediated Communication.” *Pragmatics of Computer-Mediated Communication*. Eds. S. C. Herring, D. Stein, and T. Virtanen. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2013. 3–32.
- Hine, Christine. *Virtual Ethnography*. London: Sage, 2000.
- Holquist, Michael. *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Horst, Heather, and Daniel Miller. *Digital Anthropology*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014.
- Howard, Philip. “Network Ethnography and the Hypermedia Organization: New Media, New Organizations, New Methods.” *New Media & Society* 4.4 (2002): 550–574.
- Hymes, Dell. “The uses of anthropology: critical, political, personal.” *Reinventing anthropology*. Ed. D. Hymes. Ann Arbor: the University of Michigan Press, 1969 [1999]. 3–82.
- . “Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Setting.” *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. Eds. D. Hymes, and J. Gumperz. London: Basil Blackwell, 1972. 35–72.
- Iedema, Rick. “Multimodality, resemiotization: extending the analysis of discourse as multi-semiotic practice.” *Visual Communication* 2.1 (2003): 29–57.
- Jacquemet, Marco. “Transidiomatic practices: Language and power in the age of globalization.” *Language & Communication* 25.3 (2005): 257–277.
- Jason, Leonard A., and David S. Glenwick. *Handbook of Methodological Approaches to Community-based Research: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Jenkins, Henry. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York, NY: New York University Press, 2006.
- Jørgensen, Norman J., et al. “Polylinguaging in superdiversity.” *Diversities* 13.2 (2011): 23–38.
- Kaplan, Andreas M., and Michael Haenlein. “Users Of The World, Unite! The Challenges And Opportunities Of Social Media.” *Business Horizons* 53.1 (2010): 59–68.
- Kendal, Lori. “Question Four: How Do Issues of Gender and Sexuality Influence the Structures and Processes of Qualitative Internet Research.” *Internet Inquiry: Conversations about Method*. Eds. A. N. Markham, and N. K. Baym. London: Sage Publications, 2009. 99–118.
- Klinger, Kristin. *Virtual Communities: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools and Applications* (vol 1). New York, NY: Information Science Publishing, 2011.
- Knorr, Alexander. *Cyberanthropology*. Wuppertal: P. Hammer, 2011.
- Kozinets, Robert V. “The Field Behind theScreen: Using Netnography for Marketing Research in Online Communities.” *Journal of Marketing Research* 39.1 (2002): 61–72.
- Kress, Gunther R. *Literacy in the New Media Age (Literacies)*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- . *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to communication*. London: RoutledgeFalmer, 2009.
- Kress, Gunther R., and T. van Leeuwen. *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- . *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication*. London: Hodder Arnold, 2001.

- Krishnamurthy, Balachander, Phillipa Gill, and Martin Arlitt. "A few chirps about twitter." *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Online Social Networks*. ACM Press, 2008. 19–24.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Kulick, Don, and Margaret Willson. *Taboo: Sex, Identity and Erotic Subjectivity in Anthropological Fieldwork*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Kytölä, Samu, and Janis Androutopoulos. "Ethnographic Perspectives on Multilingual Computer-Mediated Discourse." *Multilingualism, Discourse, and Ethnography*. Eds. M. Martin-Jones, and S. Gardner. London: Routledge, 2012. 179–196.
- Labov, William. "The social motivation of a sound change." *Word* 19 (1963): 273–309.
- Lähtenmäki, Maki. "Heteroglossia and voice: Conceptualising linguistic diversity from a Bakhtinian perspective." *Language Ideologies in Transition: Multilingualism in Russia and Finland*. Eds. M. Lähtenmäki, and M. Vanhala-Aniszewski. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang, 2010. 15–29.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live by*. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 1980.
- Lakoff, George. "The Invariance Hypothesis. Is Abstract Reason Based on Image-schemas?" *Cognitive Linguistics* 1.1 (1990): 39–74.
- Langacker, Ronald W. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1987.
- Lange, Patricia G. "Participatory Cultures." *AnthroVlog*. 11 November 2007. Youtube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2H3UzRtmX24&t>
- Laurent, Oliver. "70 Million people shared their prayers for Paris on Instagram." *Time*. 16 November 2015. Web. 14 August 2016. <http://time.com/4114288/paris-instagram/>
- Lee, Carmen. "Micro-Blogging and Status Updates on Facebook: Texts and Practice." *Digital Discourse: Language in the New Media*. Eds. C. Thurlow, and K. Mroczek. Oxford: OUP, 2011. 110–128.
- Leppänen, Sirpa, & Samu Kytölä. "Investigating multilingualism and multimediality as communicative resources in social media." *Researching Multilingualism: Critical and Ethnographic Approaches*. Eds. M. Martin-Jones, and M. Deirdre. New York: Routledge, 2017. 155–171.
- Leppänen, Sirpa, and Ari Häkkinen. "Buffalaxed Super-diversity: Representing the Other on YouTube." *Diversities, A Special Issue on Language and Superdiversity*, 15 (2012): 17–33.
- Leppänen, Sirpa, Elina Westinen and Samu Kytölä. *Social Media Discourse, (dis)identifications and diversities*. New York: Routledge, 2017.
- Leppänen, Sirpa, et al. "Authenticity, normativity and social media." *Discourse, Context & Media* 8 (2015): 1–5.
- Leppänen, Sirpa. "Linguistic and discursive heteroglossia on the translocal internet: the case of web writing." *Language Mixing and Code-switching in Writing: Approaches to Mixed-language Written Discourse*. Eds. M. Sebba, Sh. Mahootian, and C. Jonsson. London: Routledge, 2012. 233–254.
- . "Playing with and policing language use and textuality in fan fiction." *Internet Fictions*. Eds. Hotz-I. Davies, A. Kirchhofer, and S. Leppänen. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009. 71–89.
- Leppänen, Sirpa, and Arja Piirainen-Marsh. "Language policy in the making: an analysis of bilingual gaming activities." *Language Policy* 8.3 (2009): 261–284.

- Leppänen, Sirpa, et al. "Entextualization and resemiotization as resources for identification in social media." *The Language of Social Media: Identity and Community on the Internet*. Eds. P. Seargeant, and C. Tagg. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. 112–136.
- Leu, Donald J., et al. "Research on Instruction and Assessment in the New Literacies of Online Reading Comprehension." *Comprehension Instruction: Research-based Best Practices*. Eds. C. C. Block, Sh. Parris, and P. Afflerbach. New York: Guilford Press, 2008. 219–236.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1922.
- Marcus, George, and Michael Fischer. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Markham, Annette, and Elizabeth Buchanan. "Ethical Decision-Making and Internet Research Recommendations from the AoIR Ethics Working Committee." (Version 2.0). *Association of Internet Researchers*. 2012. Web. 24 August 2016. <https://aoir.org/reports/ethics2.pdf>
- Marwick, Alice E, and danah boyd. "I tweet honestly, I tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience." *New Media & Society* 13.1 (2010): 114–133.
- Miller, Vincent. *Understanding Digital Culture*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, 2011.
- Møller, Jannus S. "Polylingual performance among Turkish-Danes in late-modern Copenhagen." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5.3 (2008): 217–236.
- Murthy, Dhiraj. "Digital ethnography: An examination of the use of new technologies for social research." *Sociology* 42.5 (2008): 837–855.
- Nardi, Bonnie A. *My Life as a Night Elf Priest: An Anthropological Account of World of Warcraft*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2010.
- O'Reilly, Tim. "What Is Web 2.0: Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software." *COMMUNICATIONS & STRATEGIES* 1 (2007): 17–37.
- Oboler, Andre. *Aboriginal Memes and Online Hate*. Melbourne: Online Hate Prevention Institute, 2012. Web. 20 May 2016. <http://ohpi.org.au/aboriginal-memes-and-online-hate/>
- Otsuji, Emi, and Alastair Pennycook. "Metrolingualism: fixity, fluidity and language influx." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 7.3 (2009): 240–254.
- Pauwels, Luc. "Researching Websites as Social and Cultural Expressions: Methodological Predicaments and a Multimodal Model for Analysis." *SAGE Handbook of Visual Research Methods*. Eds. E. Margolis, and L. Pauwels. London/New Delhi: Sage, 2011. 571–590.
- . *Reframing Visual Social Science Towards a More Visual Sociology and Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Pennycook, Alastair. *Language as a Local Practice*. London: Taylor & Francis, 2010.
- Pietikäinen, Sari, and Helen Kelly-Holmes. *Multilingualism and the Periphery*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Procházka, Ondřej. "Internet Memes – New Literacies?" *Ostrava Journal of English Philology* 6.1 (2014): 53–76.
- . "Cohesive Aspects of Humor in Internet Memes on Facebook: a Multimodal Sociolinguistic Analysis." *Ostrava Journal of English Philology* 8.1 (2016) 7–38.
- Puri, Anjali. "The Web of insights the art and practice of webnography." *International Journal of Market Research* 49.3 (2007): 387–408.
- Rampton, Ben, et al. "Superdiversity and sociolinguistics." *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies* paper 152 (2015): 1–13.
- Rampton, Ben. *Crossing. Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2005.

- . *Language in Late Modernity: Interaction in an Urban School*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Robinson, Laura, and Jeremy Schulz. "New avenues for sociological inquiry: Evolving forms of ethnographic practice." *Sociology* 43 (2009): 685–698.
- Rymes, Betsy. "Recontextualizing YouTube: From macro-micro to mass-mediated communicative repertoires." *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 43.2 (2012): 214–227.
- Salzmann, Zdeněk, James Stanlaw & Nobuko Adachi. *Language, Culture, and Society: An Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2014.
- Scollon, Ronald, and Suzanne B.K. Scollon. *Nexus Analysis: Discourse and the Emerging Internet*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Seargeant, Philip, and Caroline Tagg. "Introduction: The language of social media." *Language of Social Media: Identity and Community on the Internet*. Eds. P. Seargeant, and C. Tagg. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. 1–20.
- Buncombe, Andrew. "Paris Attacks: Residents use #PorteOuvverte hashtag to offer shelter to the stranded." *The Independent*. 14 November 2015. Web. 14 August 2016. <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/paris-attacks-residents-use-porteouverte-hashtag-to-offer-shelter-to-the-stranded-a6734326.html>
- Carrington, Peter, John Scott, and Stanley Wasserman. *Models and Methods in Social Network Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Silverstein, Michael. "Language and the culture of gender." *Semiotic Mediation*. Eds. E. Mertz, and R. Parmentier. New York: Academic Press, 1985. 219–259.
- . "How Language Communities Intersect: Is 'Superdiversity' an Incremental or Transformative Condition?" *Language and Communication* 44 (2015): 7–18.
- Silverstein, Michael, and Greg Urban. *Natural Histories of Discourse*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Skågeby, Jörgen. "Online Ethnographic methods." *Handbook of Research on Methods and Techniques for Studying Virtual Communities: Paradigms and Phenomena*. Ed. B. K. Daniel. New York, NY: Information Science Reference, 2011. 410–428.
- Smith, Andrea L. "Heteroglossia, 'Common Sense,' and Social Memory." *American Ethnologist* 31.2 (2004): 251–269.
- Stæhr, Andreas. *Social Media and Everyday Language Use among Copenhagen Youth*. PhD Thesis. København: Københavns Universitet, Det Humanistiske Fakultet, 2014.
- Talmy, Leonard. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000.
- Thurlow, Crispin, and Kristine Mroczek. *Digital discourse: Language in the new media*. Oxford: OUP, 2011.
- Tylén, Kristia, et al. "Language as a tool for interacting minds." *Mind & Language* 25.1 (2010): 3–29.
- van den Berg, Jan A. "The story of the hashtag(#): A practical theological tracing of the hashtag(#) symbol on Twitter." *HTS Theologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 70.1(2014): 1–6.
- van Dijck, José. *The Culture of Connectivity. A Critical History of Social Media*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- van Dijk, Teun A. *Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Varis, Pia, and Xuan Wang. "Superdiversity on the internet: A case from China." *Diversities* 13.2 (2011): 71–83.

- Varis, Pia. "Digital ethnography." *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Digital Communication*. Eds. A. Georgakopoulou, and T. Spilioti. London: Routledge, 2016. 55–68.
- Vertovec, Stephen. "Super-diversity and its implications." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30.6 (2006): 1024–1054.
- Wodak, Ruth, and Michael Meyer. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE Publications, 2001.
- Wodak, Ruth, et al. *Wir sind alle unschuldige Täter! Diskurshistorische Studien zum Nachkriegsantisemitismus*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1990.
- Zafarani, Reza, et al. *Social Media Mining: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Zlatev, Jordan. "Cognitive Semiotics: An emerging field for the transdisciplinary study of meaning." *The Public Journal of Semiotics* 4.1 (2012): 2–24.

Address:

University of Ostrava

Faculty of Arts

Department of English and American Studies

Reální 5

701 03 Ostrava

Czech Republic

on.prochazka@gmail.com