




DISCOURSE AND DIGITAL PRACTICES

Doing Discourse Analysis in the Digital Age



Edited by
Rodney H. Jones, Alice Chik
and Christoph A. Hafner



Discourse and Digital Practices

Discourse and Digital Practices shows how tools from discourse analysis can be used to help us understand new communication practices associated with digital media, from video gaming and social networking to apps and photo sharing.

This cutting-edge book:

- draws together fourteen eminent scholars in the field including James Paul Gee, David Barton, Ilana Snyder, Phil Benson, Victoria Carrington, Guy Merchant, Camilla Vásquez, Neil Selwyn and Rodney Jones
- addresses the central question: “How does discourse analysis enable us to understand digital practices?”
- demonstrates how digital practices and the associated new technologies challenge discourse analysts to adapt traditional analytic tools and formulate new theories and methodologies
- analyses a different type of digital media in each chapter
- examines digital practices from a wide variety of approaches including textual analysis, conversation analysis, interactional sociolinguistics, multimodal discourse analysis, object ethnography, geosemiotics, and critical discourse analysis.

Discourse and Digital Practices will be of interest to advanced students studying courses on digital literacies or language and digital practices.

Rodney H. Jones is Professor of English at City University of Hong Kong.

Alice Chik is Senior Lecturer in The School of Education at Macquarie University.

Christoph A. Hafner is Assistant Professor in the Department of English, City University of Hong Kong.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Discourse and Digital Practices

Doing discourse analysis in
the digital age

Edited by
Rodney H. Jones, Alice Chik and
Christoph A. Hafner

An electronic version of this book is freely available, thanks to the support of libraries working with Knowledge Unlatched (KU). KU is a collaborative initiative designed to make high quality books Open Access for the public good. The Open Access ISBN for this book is 9781315813530. More information about the initiative and links to the Open Access version can be found at www.knowledgeunlatched.org

First published 2017
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2015 selection and editorial matter; Rodney H. Jones, Alice Chik and Christoph A. Hafner; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of the editors to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

The Open Access version of this book, available at www.taylorfrancis.com, has been made available under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 license.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN: 978-1-138-02232-4 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-138-02233-1 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-72646-5 (ebk)

DOI: 10.4324/9781315726465

Contents

<i>List of illustrations</i>	vii
<i>List of contributors</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xii
1 Introduction: discourse analysis and digital practices	1
RODNEY H. JONES, ALICE CHIK AND CHRISTOPH A. HAFNER	
2 Discourse analysis of games	18
JAMES PAUL GEE	
3 Discourse, cybernetics, and the entextualisation of the self	28
RODNEY H. JONES	
4 Tagging on Flickr as a social practice	48
DAVID BARTON	
5 Intertextuality and interdiscursivity in online consumer reviews	66
CAMILLA VÁSQUEZ	
6 YouTube as text: spoken interaction analysis and digital discourse	81
PHIL BENSON	
7 Co-constructing identity in virtual worlds for children	97
CHRISTOPH A. HAFNER	

8	Recreational language learning and digital practices: positioning and repositioning	112
	ALICE CHIK	
9	Investigating digital sex talk practices: a reflection on corpus-assisted discourse analysis	130
	BRIAN W. KING	
10	Apps, adults and young children: researching digital literacy practices in context	144
	GUY MERCHANT	
11	'It's changed my life': iPhone as technological artefact	158
	VICTORIA CARRINGTON	
12	Digital discourse@public space: flows of language online and offline	175
	CARMEN LEE	
13	The discourses of celebrity in the fanvid ecology of Club Penguin machinima	193
	JACKIE MARSH	
14	Discourses of 'curation' in digital times	209
	ILANA SYNDER	
15	The discursive construction of education in the digital age	226
	NEIL SELWYN	
	<i>Index</i>	241

Illustrations

Figures

2.1	A screenshot from <i>Thomas Was Alone</i>	21
3.1	Model of mediated action	31
3.2	Mediated action as a feedback mechanism	32
3.3	The model of a servomechanism	33
3.4	Data entry screen on <i>iDrated</i>	34
3.5	Feedback screen on <i>iDrated</i>	34
3.6	Screenshot of <i>MyFitnessPal</i>	38
3.7	Screenshot from the <i>Withings Health Mate</i> app	41
4.1	An example of tags	50
4.2	The most common tags on Flickr	52
4.3	Another example of tags	56
4.4	First day of 365 project	58
4.5	First day tags	58
4.6	Last day of 365 project	59
4.7	Last day tags	60
4.8	J's most common tags	60
4.9	All J's tags	61
7.1	Moshi Monsters interface	103
8.1	A graphic representation of Duolingo dashboard	120
8.2	A graphic representation of Busuu dashboard	122
8.3	A graphic representation of a Duolingo user profile page	124
8.4	A graphic representation of a Busuu user profile page	126
10.1	Sharing the iPad	150
10.2	Preparing to tap	153
10.3	Kenny finds the home button	154
11.1	Roxie's polymedia context	164
12.1	GR8	182
12.2	THE MENU@Level 7	183
12.3	See U again @ apm	184
12.4	A poster for a fitness centre in Hong Kong	185
12.5	Y? Y? Y?	188

Tables

8.1	Types of intentional positioning	116
9.1	Sexual Parts	132
9.2	Sexual Acts	132
9.3	Null hypotheses for Sexual Parts (locality and age)	136
9.4	Null hypotheses for Sexual Acts (locality and age)	136
9.5	Sexual Parts/Acts – practice coding scheme	138
9.6	Sexual Parts/Acts – actions by corpus (raw counts)	139
10.1	Hand movements used in the iPad study	149
10.2	iPad app-sharing	152
10.3	Kenny and the iPad	154
12.1	Internet-specific language features in offline public spaces in Hong Kong	180
12.2	Language choice in internet-referential public texts	180

Contributors

David Barton is Professor of Language and Literacy in the Department of Linguistics at Lancaster University. His research is concerned with: carrying out detailed studies of everyday literacies and rethinking the nature of literacy, especially in the online world. He is co-author (with Carmen Lee) of *Language Online* (Routledge, 2013) and (with others) of *Researching Language and Social Media* (Routledge, 2014).

Phil Benson is Professor of Applied Linguistics at Macquarie University. His main research interests are in informal language learning and language learning and new media, and he is currently especially interested in YouTube as a space for language and intercultural learning. He is co-editor, with Alice Chik, of *Popular Culture, Pedagogy and Teacher Education: international perspectives* (Routledge, 2003).

Victoria Carrington holds a Chair in Education in the School of Education and Lifelong Learning at the University of East Anglia. She researches and writes extensively in the areas of new technologies, youth and literacies with a particular interest in the impact of new digital media on literacy practices. She is co-author (with Muriel Robinson) of *Digital Literacies: social learning and classroom practices* (Sage, 2012).

Alice Chik is Senior Lecturer in The School of Education at Macquarie University. Her main research areas include narrative inquiry, literacy and popular culture in language education. She is the co-editor of *Popular Culture, Pedagogy and Teacher Education: international perspectives* (Routledge, 2014).

James Paul Gee is the Mary Lou Fulton Presidential Professor of Literacy Studies at Arizona State University and a member of the National Academy of Education. His most recent books include: *Unified Discourse Analysis: language, reality, virtual worlds and video games* (Routledge, 2014); *Sociolinguistics and Literacies*, Fourth Edition (Routledge, 2011), *How to Do Discourse Analysis* (Routledge, 2011); and *Language and Learning in the Digital World* (with Elizabeth Hayes, Routledge, 2011).

Christoph A. Hafner is Assistant Professor in the Department of English, City University of Hong Kong. His research interests include specialized discourse, digital literacies and language learning and technology. He is co-author of *Understanding Digital Literacies: a practical introduction* (Routledge, 2012) and co-editor of *Transparency, Power and Control: perspectives on legal communication* (Ashgate, 2012).

Rodney H. Jones is Professor of English at City University of Hong Kong. His main research interests include discourse analysis, health communication and language and sexuality. His books include *Discourse in Action: introducing mediated discourse analysis* (edited with Sigrid Norris, Routledge, 2005), *Understanding Digital Literacies: a practical introduction* (with Christoph Hafner, Routledge, 2012) and *Health and Risk Communication: an applied linguistic perspective* (Routledge, 2013).

Brian W. King is an Assistant Professor in the Department of English at City University of Hong Kong. His work on corpus-assisted discourse analysis and language and sexuality has appeared in international journals such as *Language in Society*, *Sexualities*, *Journal of Language and Sexuality* and *Gender and Language*, as well as in numerous edited volumes, including *Contemporary Corpus Linguistics* (Continuum, 2009).

Carmen Lee is Associate Professor in the Department of English at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. She has published and carried out projects on social aspects of language and literacy, linguistic practices on the internet, and multilingual literacy practices. She is co-author (with David Barton) of the book *Language Online* (Routledge, 2013).

Jackie Marsh is Professor of Education at the University of Sheffield, UK. Her research focuses on popular culture, media and digital technologies in young children's literacy development. Her latest book (with Julia Bishop) is *Changing Play: play, media and commercial culture from the 1950s to the present day* (Open University Press, 2013).

Guy Merchant is Professor of Literacy in Education in the Faculty of Development and Society, Sheffield Hallam University. His research focuses on the relationship between children, young people, new technology and literacy. His books include *Web 2.0 for Schools: learning and social participation* (Peter Lang International Academic Publishers, 2009), co-written with Julia Davies.

Neil Selwyn is Professor at the Faculty of Education, Monash University. His writing and research focus on education, technology and sociology. Recent books include *Distrusting Educational Technology* (Routledge, 2014) and *Digital Technology and the Contemporary University* (Routledge, 2014).

Iana Snyder is a Professor in the Faculty of Education, Monash University. Her research has focused on the changes to literacy practices associated with the use of digital technologies and the implications for literacy education. Her books include *Hypertext* (Melbourne University Press, 1996), *Page to Screen* (Routledge, 1997) and *Silicon Literacies* (Routledge, 2002) and *The Literacy Wars* (Allen & Unwin, 2008).

Camilla Vásquez is an Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics at the University of South Florida, where she teaches graduate courses on discourse analysis, pragmatics and qualitative research methods. Her research has appeared in such journals as *Journal of Pragmatics*, *Narrative Inquiry*, *Text and Talk* and *Discourse Studies*.

Acknowledgments

The editors would like to thank the Department of English of City University of Hong Kong for providing the funding for *The Fifth International Roundtable on Discourse Analysis: Discourse and Digital Practices*, where the ideas in many of these chapters were discussed and debated. They would also like to thank Ms. Yaxin Zheng for her invaluable administrative and editorial assistance and Ms. Yan Dou for her assistance in copyediting the manuscript.

The editors and publishers would like to thank the following individuals and companies for permission to reproduce the following material:

Screen shots from iDrate reproduced with kind permission from Locassa.

Screen shots from Withings Health Mate App reproduced with kind permission from Withings Inc.

Screenshots from Moshi Monsters reproduced with kind permission from Mind Candy Ltd.

Photographs on Flickr by Nadia Gradecky, Julia Davies, and Jody Jay reproduced with kind permission from the photographers.

Introduction

Discourse analysis and digital practices

Rodney H. Jones, Alice Chik and Christoph A. Hafner

Digital technologies have given rise to a host of new ways for people to communicate, manage social relationships, and get things done, which are challenging how we think about love and friendship, work and play, health and fitness, learning and literacy, and politics and citizenship. These new practices are also challenging the ways discourse analysts think about texts, social interactions, and even the nature of language itself. The affordances digital media provide for the production of multimodal texts, for example, call into question analytical paradigms that focus only on written or spoken language. Interactive writing spaces such as blogs and social network sites make possible very different forms of social interaction than those found in face-to-face conversation and traditional written texts. And practices of remixing and ‘curating’ raise questions about the status of authorship. Even analytical tools designed to examine the ideological dimensions of discourse need to be adapted to contend with discursive environments in which the loci of power are much more diffuse and the instruments of ideological control and discipline are more subtle and complex.

Although there have been numerous attempts in discourse analysis (see for example Herring 2007), and sociolinguistics more broadly (see for example Androutsopoulos 2011), to formulate new analytical frameworks especially designed for the study of digital communication, the range of social practices associated with digitally mediated discourse, and the rapid pace at which new technologies are being introduced, make it difficult for any single framework to meet the challenge of understanding all of the complex relationships between discourse and digital practices. In order to cope with the fast-changing landscape of digital media, discourse analysts need to both draw upon the rich store of theories and methods developed over the years for the analysis of ‘analogue’ discourse, and to formulate new concepts and new methodologies to address the unique combinations of affordances and constraints introduced by digital media.

This book brings together fourteen eminent scholars in linguistics and literacy studies to consider how various practices people engage in using digital media can be understood using tools from discourse analysis.

The methods adopted represent a range of approaches to discourse, from more traditional analyses of textual coherence and interactional turn-taking to newer approaches such as corpus-assisted discourse analysis, mediated discourse analysis, and multimodal discourse analysis. Each chapter focuses on a particular social practice associated with digital technology and shows how tools from a particular approach to discourse, or combination of approaches, can help us to understand that practice.

What are digital practices?

The focus of this volume on digital *practices* is in line with recent approaches in applied linguistics (Pennycook 2010), literacy studies (Gee 2012), and discourse analysis (Norris and Jones 2005) which take as their starting point not discourse per se, but, rather, the situated social practices that people use discourse to perform.

The orientation towards social practice taken by contributors has its roots in a number of intellectual traditions, including the critical sociology of Bourdieu (1977), who sees practice in terms of the way social conventions become submerged into people's habitual dispositions, and the cultural critique of Foucault (1972) and his followers, who see it in terms of the regimes of knowledge which define what sorts of behaviours, identities and relationships are considered normal. But it is most closely informed by the understanding of practice articulated in the new literacy studies (Barton 2006; Gee 2012) and mediated discourse analysis (Norris and Jones 2005; Scollon 2001), in which practice is seen less as a matter of dispositions or regimes of knowledge and more as a matter of the concrete, situated actions people perform with particular mediational means (such as written texts, computers, mobile phones) in order to enact membership in particular social groups. In these approaches, practice is nearly always used as a countable noun ('practices') and refers to 'observable, collectable and/or documentable . . . events, involving real people, relationships, purposes, actions, places, times, circumstances, feelings, tools, (and) resources' (Tusting, Ivanic and Wilson 2000: 213). It is difficult, from this perspective, to speak of the 'practice' of social networking, or the 'practice' of 'video gaming' without considering the ways these practices are performed by real people in real situations. Indeed, as many of the chapters in this volume dramatically illustrate, practices (such as 'tagging') can have very different meanings and very different social purposes, and, in fact, involve very different actions, in different contexts (for example Twitter vs Flickr) (see Barton this volume). Practices are, in this way, often hard to 'pin down', always changing to meet the demands of new circumstances or to respond to the affordances and constraints of new cultural tools. Complicating this is the fact that practices are almost never engaged in in isolation, but are always mixed in complex ways with other practices. Practices such as purchasing

animals to decorate one's language learning garden on Busuu (described by Chik), keeping track of one's calories with *MyFitnessPal* (described by Jones), reading to children with an iPad (described by Merchant), or attending online parties held by 'elite' Club Penguin Music Video production teams (described by Marsh) all involve multiple overlapping practices such as shopping, gardening, dieting, story-sharing and socialising, which have long histories independent of the digital practices into which they have been recruited. Digital practices are always 'nestled' or 'nested' (Marsh this volume) with other cultural practices, some new and some old, to form what Scollon (2001) has referred to as a 'nexus of practice', a configuration of tools and actions with various conventions and histories associated with them which come together to form recognisable sequences of actions and to make available to actors recognisable social identities.

What we mean by 'digital practices', then, are these 'assemblages' of actions involving tools associated with digital technologies, which have come to be recognised by specific groups of people as ways of attaining particular social goals, enacting particular social identities, and reproducing particular sets of social relationships. The assumption is that digital technologies, because of the different configurations of modes and materialities they make available, both make possible new kinds of social practices and alter the way people engage in old ones. The practices dealt with in this volume include the tagging of pictures by users of Flickr, the use of iPhone apps by 'self-quantifiers', and the creation of music videos by participants in an online virtual world. Our definition of 'tools associated with digital technologies', however, is not limited to software or websites, but includes hardware (physical objects) and semiotic tools (such as conventional ways of talking or writing that have grown up around digital media). Therefore, the practices considered are not limited to those that occur 'online' or within the borders of the screen, but also include practices that have developed around the handling of physical artefacts like iPhones and iPads, and even practices of urban signage which appropriate linguistic features of computer-mediated communication. In fact, none of the practices described in this book can be said to reside in strictly defined 'online' or 'offline' spaces. Digital practices always transverse boundaries between the physical and the virtual, and between technological systems and social systems.

What is discourse analysis?

What, then, do we mean by 'discourse analysis', and what is its utility in helping us to understand digital practices? 'Discourse' is a term that is used in a variety of different fields and can mean a variety of different things. It can refer to the formal properties of semiotic artefacts that make them 'hold together' as certain types of 'texts', it can refer to the ways people use language and other semiotic systems to accomplish particular social actions,

or it can refer to broader systems of knowledge which act to regulate what people can say, write or think. For the purposes of this volume, we will define discourse broadly as the ways people build and manage their social worlds using various semiotic systems. This definition, of course, places discourse in an intimate relationship with social practices. On the one hand, all social practices are to some extent mediated through discourse – that is, discourse is used as a tool for performing social practices. And on the other hand, discourse plays an important role in maintaining, reproducing and transmitting social practices. ‘Discourse analysis’, then, is the study of the ways different ‘technologies of entextualisation’ (Jones 2009) (including semiotic systems like languages, as well as media like televisions and computers) affect the kinds of meanings people can make in different situations, the kinds of actions they can perform, the kinds of relationships they can form, and the kinds of people they can be. In order to engage in such study, discourse analysts usually pay attention to four things:

- *Texts*: How different technologies of entextualisation allow us to combine semiotic elements to form socially recognisable texts that can be used to perform different kinds of socially recognised actions.
- *Contexts*: The social and material situations in which texts are constructed, consumed, exchanged and appropriated.
- *Actions and interactions*: What people do with texts, especially what they do with and to each other.
- *Power and ideology*: How people use texts to dominate and control others and to create certain ‘versions of reality’.

Different approaches to discourse, of course, emphasise these aspects of discourse to different degrees, but all of them, in one way or another, take into account all four of these elements, and strive to understand how they work together: how, for example, contexts influence the form and meaning of texts, how different kinds of texts make possible different kinds of actions and interactions, and how the ways people use texts to act and interact in specific contexts both reflect and help to reproduce certain ideologies and power relationships. In other words, all approaches to discourse seek in some way to understand the relationship between the ‘micro’ level of discourse (having to do with the way texts are put together and used to take specific actions in specific situations), and the ‘macro’ level of discourse (having to do with the way texts reflect and help perpetuate certain social orders).

As we mentioned above, the particular configurations of modes and materialities that digital media make available present considerable challenges to the way analysts approach each of these four aspects of discourse. In some cases, the tools that have been developed for face-to-face conversation and writing in print media can be easily adapted to analyse online

conversations and texts. In other cases, new concepts and new methods need to be developed. The real issue, however, goes beyond just the applicability of particular analytical tools to the analysis of digitally mediated communication to the fact that digital media in some ways force us to rethink our very definitions of terms such as text, context, interaction, and power.

Texts

By texts, of course, we do not just mean written texts in the traditional sense, but include conversations – both written and spoken – videos, photographs, drawings, paintings, street signs, websites, software interfaces, video games, and any other aggregate of semiotic elements that can function as a tool for people to take social action. Despite the breadth of this definition, discourse analysts do have some fairly strong opinions about what constitutes a text and what does not. Most agree that for a collection of semiotic elements (words, sentences, images, sounds, etc.) to be considered a text, it must have what is known as ‘texture’. Texture is a property of connectedness that is created through *cohesion*, that is, the way different parts of the text are held together using the syntactic and semantic resources of whatever semiotic system is being used, and *coherence*, the way different parts of the text are ordered sequentially so that it can be recognised by readers as logical and meaningful (Halliday and Hasan 1976; Schegloff and Sacks 1973).

Although texts like video games, social networking sites, and iPhone apps are in many ways very different from the written texts and face-to-face conversations from which these principles were developed, they are also characterised by texture. This is one of the main points Gee makes in the chapter immediately following this introduction, that to be amenable to discourse analysis, a semiotic aggregate must exhibit properties of what he calls ‘packaging’ and ‘flow’ – the combination of different elements using principles of syntax and semantics, and the arrangement of these elements in some kind of temporal patterning. He illustrates this by analysing how the various elements in a video game fit together and are arranged in meaningful sequences. Another important point Gee makes is that texture is there for players to *use*. It is not just about abstract meaning or form. The way players approach games (and the way people approach written texts and conversations, for that matter) is in terms of how they can use these principles of combination and sequencing in order to enable certain kinds of actions. And so, for discourse analysts, syntax and semantics are not just about rules and structures – they provide the basic textual resources people use to enact social practices.

The way texture is manifested in different kinds of texts, of course, varies considerably. Halliday and Hasan (1976) for example, distinguish between texts that have a ‘tight’ texture, that is, most of the connections between the parts are explicit, and those that have a loose texture, that is,

the connections between parts are less explicit, depending more on the active efforts of readers to hold them together. Much of the early discourse analytical work on computer-mediated communication focused on the relatively loose texture of computer-mediated texts. In her classic article on coherence in text only chat, for example, Herring (1999) discusses how phenomena such as disrupted adjacency, overlapping exchanges and topic decay give to some forms of computer-mediated communication a much looser texture than found in face-to-face conversations or print-based written texts, but she also argues that this apparent incoherence can actually facilitate increased interactivity and creativity. A similar point is made by Barton in his chapter on the practices of tagging on Flickr: even though they might at first appear to be loose collections of words, lists of tags associated with pictures often exploit properties of syntax and semantics in ways that allow users to transform a form of discourse originally intended for simple classification into a tool for communication and storytelling. A similar kind of loose texture seems to characterise the YouTube comments analysed by Benson, but, as he shows so convincingly, an underlying coherence of the comments can be revealed through attention to ‘sequential implicativeness’ (Schegloff and Sacks 1973).

While many digitally mediated texts are loosely textured, many others are rather tightly textured, giving users little choice as to how elements can be connected up or sequenced. Many choices about ‘packaging’ and ‘flow’ in computer-mediated discourse, in fact, as Jones points out in his chapter, are not made by people, but by computer programs. Sometimes the texture imposed on discourse by algorithms can amplify users’ abilities to perform certain actions, form certain relationships, and construct certain identities, but at the same time, these ‘algorithmically imposed’ textures can also create constraints on people’s ability to take action, interact with others, or be the kinds of people they want to be. In addition, sometimes the texture imposed on discourse by a particular set of algorithms can create confusion as to how users are supposed to read texts. One of the most interesting points Benson makes about YouTube comments, for instance, is that, despite the fact that they are produced through sequential implicativeness, the site’s algorithm displays them (by default) in descending order based on the number of ‘likes’ they have received, imposing an entirely different pattern of texture on them.

Another important property of texts that discourse analysts are interested in is the way they create connections with other texts. Of course, intertextuality and interdiscursivity are properties of all texts. Digital media, however, because of its technological affordances for hypertextual linking, embedding, copying and pasting, combining and curating, make it much easier to connect texts with other texts and to mix and mash texts together. The fundamental intertextual and heteroglossic (Androutsopoulos 2011; Bakhtin 1981) nature of new media texts doesn’t only change practices of reading

and writing (Jones and Hafner 2012), but also has the effect of disturbing comfortable notions of textual boundaries and authorship. In marvelling at these new forms of linking, mixing and mashing made possible by new media, however, it is sometimes easy to ignore the more conventional ways people create intertextuality in digitally mediated texts using purely linguistic resources. In the only chapter in this volume which focuses exclusively on intertextuality, Vásquez demonstrates some of the more 'low tech' ways participants in the digital practice of online reviewing use to create linkages with other texts and creatively mix the conventions of different genres. The most important point about intertextuality that Vásquez makes, a point that can just as strongly apply to the examples given by Marsh and Snyder, is that intertextuality is essentially a *social* process through which people not only create linkages between texts, but also create relationships between themselves and other users of texts, showing themselves to be competent members of particular communities by using the conventions of intertextuality of those communities.

A third important quality of digitally mediated texts that the contributors to this volume take up is their dialogic character. Again, just as all texts are to some extent intertextual, they are also to some extent dialogic, in that they respond to previous texts and create the conditions for subsequent texts (Bakhtin 1981). The difference with new media texts is that this dialogism is much more dynamic than it is with conventional written texts. Reading and writing have become much more like having a conversation, with readers being able to 'write back' to writers, and writers shaping their texts in anticipation of an almost immediate response from readers. The responsiveness of digital texts, however, not only involves the interaction between writers and readers, but also involves interaction between human users and machine algorithms which automatically alter texts based on the ways users use them or on certain characteristics of users such as location or pre-defined user settings. This is what Jones means when he points out that, more and more, texts are able to 'read' us and, in many ways, to 'write' us as certain kinds of people. This, of course, has important implications for issues like human agency and the status of texts as socially shared objects. It also calls into question what it actually means to read and write a text, when our media have acquired the ability to read texts without us and to take actions on our behalf, and when physical actions like eating at a restaurant, making a purchase or going for a run automatically become acts of writing.

Finally, one of the most conspicuous characteristics of digital texts that present challenges to discourse analysts is the fact that they are almost always multimodal, consisting of rich combinations of semiotic modes like writing, visuals and sound. This has consequences for the way discourse analysts approach issues like cohesion and coherence, intertextuality and dialogicality, since the affordances and constraints of different modes affect how they fit together, how they connect to other texts, and how readers

can interact with texts. The most important thing about multimodality is that, because of the inherent dynamism of digital texts, meanings are rarely expressed in stable configurations of modes, but rather travel across modes and combinations of modes in ways that alter them, sometimes subtly, sometimes dramatically, a process Jones (this volume, after Iedema 2001) refers to as *resemiotisation*. Through processes of *resemiotisation*, actions like walking or drinking water are transformed into graphs and images, photos on Flickr are transformed into lists of tags which combine to form narratives, and videos on YouTube become the initiating moves in written conversations.

Related to multimodality are the dramatic ways digital technologies have changed how we relate to texts as material objects. Web pages are different from newspapers not just textually, but also physically. iPads are very different kinds of material objects from books. The new forms of materiality texts take has important consequences for things like the kinds of access people have to texts, the physical and social contexts into which they can be appropriated, and the ways we physically manipulate texts. Merchant, for example, points out how tablet computers have made reading into a much more *haptic* activity, requiring readers to master actions like tapping, dragging, swiping and pinching. Similarly, Carrington shows how teenagers use their mobile phones not just as tools to access texts, but as texts themselves, objects through which they communicate things like their identities, their affiliations, and their orientations towards others.

Contexts

The second important component of discourse analysis is an attention to the material and social *contexts* in which texts are produced, consumed, and used to take social actions. The meaning and utility of texts reside not just in their textual elements, but also in how these elements are ‘situated’ within actual contexts of communication. In fact, an analysis of texts that ‘gets stuck’ in the examination of formal textual elements like syntax, semantics, and sequentiality does not really count as discourse analysis, since discourse is all about how texts and conversations ‘fit into’ the real world.

Understanding the effect of context on language and other semiotic systems is complex enough when dealing with more traditional spoken and written texts, since such an understanding must take into account multiple aspects of context including spatial and temporal aspects, as well as those aspects of context (both material and cognitive) that are ‘brought along’ by social actors (van Dijk 2008), and those aspects that are ‘brought about’ (Auer 1992) by people’s actions and interactions. Furthermore, a consideration of context must also take into account what Malinowski (1923) calls ‘the context of culture’, the wider sets of expectations about how people are supposed to behave in different situations.

Digital technologies have made all of these aspects of context much more complicated. They have altered our experience of the spatial and temporal aspects of context by creating complex 'layerings' of online and offline spaces. They have altered our experience of social contexts, allowing us to participate in a wide range of different kinds of synchronous and asynchronous social gatherings with different configurations of participants (Jones 2004). And they have altered our experience of the 'context of culture' by enabling new and complex global flows of cultural products and ideas.

Much of the early work on computer-mediated discourse made a clear differentiation between online and offline contexts; however, more recent work (see for example Jones 2010), including many of the chapters in this volume, recognise that in considering the contexts of digital practices we must come to terms with the ways physical and virtual spaces, times, interaction orders and cultures interact. As the children described in Hafner's chapter travel through different online spaces and engage in different activities with other players of *Moshi Monsters*, they also inhabit the material spaces of their home, where they must negotiate different activities with other co-present individuals, including their researcher-father. As the joggers described in Jones's chapter move across physical spaces, the routes that they transverse appear on the computer and smartphone screens of their *Nike+* followers situated in other physical spaces. And as the characters in the digital children's stories described in Merchant's chapter appear and move across the screens of iPads, they affect the configuration of spaces and bodies in the physical environments in which they are read.

Under these circumstances, one of the most important issues facing discourse analysts is developing methods to trace the way texts (and the meanings, social relationships, and identities associated with them) change as they travel from context to context, moving across virtual and physical spaces, being (sometimes automatically) 'synced' across multiple devices, and being appropriated into situations which their producers may never have anticipated. Just as intertextuality and multimodality are defining features of digitally mediated discourse, so is recontextualisation (Bauman and Briggs 1990). Much of the way we craft our texts and utterances depends on how we take into account the contexts in which they will be interpreted – that is, much of our meaning making is based upon some expectation of what Nissenbaum (2009) calls 'contextual integrity'. The complex overlapping and internested networks of contexts that digital technologies have created makes it much more difficult to maintain contextual integrity.

For analysts this is not just a theoretical issue, it can also be an ethical one as well, as King points out in his chapter on analysing the conversations of gay men in a 'public' chat room. Just because these conversations are available to the public, King argues, does not necessarily make them 'public'. Most online communication in contexts like chat rooms and social networking sites, he argues, 'is neither inherently public nor private; rather

it depends on how each participant sees the context of communication'. Seeking informed consent is, for him, a way to discover how participants feel about that context. This argument should give all researchers of digital practices pause to consider their relationships with and responsibilities towards the people they are studying. It should also serve to remind us that contexts are not simply pre-fabricated, but rather are to a large degree 'brought about' through the practices that people engage in.

Finally, this discussion of decontextualisation and recontextualisation reminds us that any study of digital practices must, as Merchant puts it, not just 'reach down' into embodied, material and situated contexts of digital practice, but also 'reach up' to consider the broader global contexts in which technologies and information are produced, circulated, and valued. There is, for example, something fundamental, not just in the technology of the internet but also in the *economy* of the internet, that works against contextual integrity (Lanier 2013), making it more difficult for participants in gay chat rooms, users of commercial self-tracking apps, learners in online language learning sites, and children in virtual worlds to maintain control over the texts they produce.

Actions and interactions

Perhaps the most important thing that distinguishes discourse analysts from other kinds of linguists is their focus not just on the structure and meaning of texts, but also on how people use texts to perform concrete social actions. From their early concern with how people 'do things with words' (Austin 1976) to their more recent interest in language as a 'mediational means' (Norris and Jones 2005), discourse analysts have long been preoccupied not just with language but with 'language in use'. In turning their attention to digital media and the forms of discourse it makes possible, then, a central question for contributors to this book is how these new 'technologies of entextualisation' and the kinds of texts they result in allow people to *do* different things, or to do old things in different ways.

In nearly every chapter of this volume you will find the word 'affordances' used to refer to the particular ways digital media make certain kinds of actions possible. The term comes from the work of the perceptual psychologist James J. Gibson, who used it to describe the potential that environments, substances, places, events, other creatures, and artefacts (such as technologies and texts) have for serving as tools to perform certain actions. One of the problems with the way people often speak of the affordances of digital media is that they talk about them as if they are properties of technologies, downplaying the agency of users and encouraging a kind of technological determinism. Gibson, however, is quite clear that affordances have as much to do with users as with technologies. In his classic work, *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception* (1986: 127) he writes of the term

‘affordance’: ‘I mean by it something that refers to both the environment and the animal in a way that no existing term does. It implies the complementarity of the animal and the environment.’ This complementarity between technologies and users is a theme emphasised in many of the chapters, starting with Gee’s explanation of how, in playing video games, players search for affordances in the rules of the game or in the various tools the game provides that align with their own ‘effective abilities’ (or those of their avatars) (see also Gee 2014), a phenomenon which is further illustrated in the chapters by Hafner and Marsh. Similarly, Jones describes how the effectiveness of smartphone apps for diet and exercise depends upon how users interact with them at various stages of inputting data and interpreting output, so that users themselves become fused with technologies to form what he refers to as ‘servomechanisms’. One of the best examples of the negotiated character of affordances can be seen in Barton’s description of the affordances users of Flickr have found in the tagging function of the website that allow them to do things the designers of the site ‘probably never dreamed of’. ‘It is this creative space between the designer and the user,’ writes Barton, ‘where the unexpected can happen which constitutes the affordances.’

The key point of these observations is that digital technologies (like all cultural tools) are not determinative of their use. Although they influence what we can do in many important ways, amplifying or diminishing different aspects of our perception and action, people also regularly adapt technologies to different circumstances or different goals, appropriate them into different contexts, modify them, and mix them with other tools in ways that alter the affordances we can find in them (Jones and Hafner 2012). Lee, for example, shows how the affordances of linguistic forms associated with texting and instant messaging change when they are appropriated into the new contexts of urban signs, and Snyder shows how the affordances the web introduces for gathering and ‘curating’ information are exploited differently by marketers and educators. The way people use digital technologies, and the different social practices that come to be associated with these uses, are the result of an active process of matching the kinds of things people want to do with the kinds of things that technologies allow them to do.

When people take actions using technologies and texts, they rarely do so alone. They are almost always acting with and/or on other people. And so a subclass of action that is of crucial interest to discourse analysts is *interaction*, which discourse analysts define as the ‘joint action’ (Clark 1996) people engage in to create their social worlds. From the earliest forms of computer-mediated communication, however, digital technologies have challenged the ways discourse analysts approach the analysis of interaction. There are three main reasons for this: first, the differences in the way computer interactions are synchronised alter the way analysts must deal with issues like turn-taking, adjacency, and topic management. Second, the different material

and semiotic tools that digital technologies make available both change the ways people manage things like mutual monitoring and contextualisation and make available a range of new forms of ‘low friction’ instrumental and phatic communication like text messaging and ‘liking’ (Jones and Hafner 2012). Finally, digital technologies facilitate a range of new participation frameworks (Goffman 1981) for interaction, allowing people to inhabit different sorts of roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis their interlocutors and providing new ways to accomplish things like ‘audience segregation’ (Goffman 1959) and ‘ambient intimacy’ (Carrington this volume).

The chapter that takes up these issues most explicitly is that by Benson, which explores how tools developed for the analysis of face-to-face interaction can be adapted to understanding interactions on YouTube, but they are also relevant to Barton’s argument regarding the interactive function of tags on Flickr, Hafner’s discussion of how participants in virtual worlds for children interact with each other and with their avatars, Marsh’s exploration of the interaction between producers of Club Penguin Music Videos and their fans, and Jones’s discussion of how self-tracking apps convert things like exercise and diet into forms of social interaction. Meanwhile, both Carrington and Merchant demonstrate how digital technologies do not just alter the ways people interact online, but also the ways they interact in the physical spaces in which these technologies are used.

One important question that emerges in these discussions is what actually constitutes an interaction in digitally mediated environments. Benson, citing Rafaeli and Ariel (2007), distinguishes between two kinds of interactivity, one, which Rafaeli and Ariel refer to as ‘responsiveness’, having to do with the ways technologies interact with humans, and the other having to do with the ways technologies facilitate human-to-human interaction. In other chapters, however, this distinction appears much less cut and dried. When the self-trackers described by Jones interact with apps which respond based on the aggregated behaviour of all of their other users, does this constitute interaction with the app or with these other users? And when the children described by Hafner interact with their own or other players’ monsters in the virtual world of Moshi Monsters, who exactly are these interactions taking place with – people, monsters, or the software that is controlling them? In fact, often when we are using digital technologies, we are involved in multiple interactions with other humans, with avatars, with algorithms, and with institutions. One important point that Hafner makes is that any interaction with technologies also constitutes a conversation with the designers of these technologies (see also Gee), a point which reinforces the observation about ‘affordances’ we made above – affordances are not just a matter of what technologies allow us to do – they are a form of *communication* between the designers and the users of technologies (de Souza 2005).

Another important question raised by contributors has to do with how technological tools act to shape the ways people interact, and the kinds of

social relationships and social identities they can produce through their interactions. Hafner presents one of the most dramatic illustrations of this question in his exploration of the different ‘positions’ (Davies and Harré 1990) participants in Moshi Monsters can take in relation to their monsters, sometimes treating them as versions of themselves, sometimes treating them as pets, and sometimes treating them as tools for accomplishing actions in the game world. Chik also uses positioning theory in her discussion of the different kinds of identities and relationships online language learning sites make available for their users. Both of these chapters show how the kinds of relationships and identities websites encourage contribute to creating and maintaining certain social practices by reinforcing what Davies and Harré call ‘storylines’. Similarly, Marsh shows how interactions in the peer-to-peer networks that form around Club Penguin Music Videos serve to reproduce storylines of recognition, status and competition that replicate the celebrity–fan relationships in more mainstream media. Perhaps the most important observation that can be made about actions and interactions, then, is how they serve as the building blocks for social practices and for the formation of maintenance of communities associated with these practices (see also the chapters by Carrington, King, and Vásquez).

Ideology and power

The last important component of discourse analysis is a concern with the way discourse helps to construct certain ‘versions of reality’ (ideologies) and certain relationships of power between individuals and groups. This concern is not just a feature of critical discourse analysis, as discussed in the chapters by Snyder and Selwyn, or Foucauldian discourse analysis, as practiced by Marsh in her chapter, but is also evident in, for example, Chik and Hafner’s application of positioning theory, Jones’s application of mediated discourse analysis, Benson’s analysis of the organisation of online interactions, and Barton’s consideration of tagging. In fact, all of the chapters in this volume, in one way or another, shed light on the ways digital technologies affect how people understand the world and treat one another, and how this affects how social goods (both material and symbolic) get distributed.

One place where we can see the workings of power and ideology is in ideological agendas and biases expressed in the discourse that circulates through digital media. Numerous scholars over the years (see for example Herring 1993; Nakamura 2002) have demonstrated how, despite their ‘newness’ and the promises of ‘democracy’ and ‘equality’ associated with them, new media often reflect and reinforce many of the same biases and ideological assumptions as ‘old media’. And so, as Marsh points out, despite the new and creative opportunities peer-to-peer social networks provide for young people to produce and share their own creative products, these processes

often serve to reproduce old media values of fandom and celebrity. And despite the promises of free learning on the language learning sites analysed by Chik, learners are constantly 'sorted' based on whether or not they have paid for a 'premium membership'. Virtual worlds like Moshi Monsters do not just provide spaces for children to have fun, but also teach them how to value certain forms of consumption, social relationships and notions of privacy and safety (Hafner this volume; Jones and Hafner 2012), and apps like *Nike+* do not just encourage users to exercise, but also turn them into virtual advertisements for Nike products (Jones 2014, this volume). As much as the digital practices discussed in this book facilitate things like creating, learning, and self-improvement, what many of them seem to facilitate best are commercial practices and the promotion of dominant values of competition and conspicuous consumption.

Often these values and relationships are not so much expressed in texts, as they are in the more subtle ways that software and web interfaces channel users into certain kinds of actions and interactions. Small incremental actions, like clicking one thing rather than another, filling in a text field in a certain way, agreeing to 'terms and conditions', creating a hashtag that will make content (and people) searchable, or 'liking' a photo or video, are, as we mentioned above, the building blocks of social practices and social identities, and they often come with consequences that users may not be entirely aware of. One way in which the analysis of the workings of power and ideology is complicated when it comes to digital technologies is the fact that ideological assumptions and social relationships are not just inscribed in texts, but often submerged in algorithms that operate beneath the surface of texts and fundamentally affect the way we experience the world (i.e. what kind of information we have access to, what kind of behaviour is rewarded and reinforced, and what sort of people are considered normal), a point made by Jones in his discussion of health and fitness apps, but also hinted at in other chapters (for example, those by Barton, Benson, Chik, Gee, Marsh, and Snyder).

Another important place discourse analysts can look for ideologies and power relationships associated with digital practices is in the ways digital technologies and practices are represented in public discourse, a topic taken up by Lee, Snyder and Selwyn. Lee, for example, discusses how the appropriation of 'netspeak' in offline commercial discourses represents a shift from a 'language ideology' in which the textual practices of (mostly young) internet users were marginalised, to one in which these same practices are being 'enregistered' (Agha 2003) and commodified. Snyder examines the different ways the digital practice of 'curation' is represented in the fields of digital marketing, online communication, online education and digital literacy studies, revealing how the ideological biases of these different fields can lead to very different understandings of what it means to create a text, own a text, and distribute a text. Curation, she argues, is 'always