

Discourse in Web 2.0: Familiar, Reconfigured, and Emergent

SUSAN C. HERRING

Indiana University Bloomington

Introduction

FROM CONTROVERSIAL BEGINNINGS, the term Web 2.0 has become associated with a fairly well-defined set of popular web-based platforms characterized by social interaction and user-generated content. Most of the content on such sites is human discourse, via text, audio, video, and static images. It is therefore, in principle, of theoretical and practical interest to scholars of computer-mediated discourse. Yet although discourse-focused studies of individual Web 2.0 environments such as Facebook, Flickr, Twitter, and YouTube are starting to appear (see, for example—the chapters in Thurlow and Mroczek 2011), systematic consideration of the implications of Web 2.0 for computer-mediated discourse analysis (CMDA) as a whole is lacking. Does discourse in these new environments call for new methods of analysis? New classificatory apparatuses? New theoretical understandings? In this chapter I attempt to address these questions.

After defining Web 2.0 and reviewing its development over the past decade, the CMDA paradigm developed by the author (Herring 2004) is briefly reviewed, with the ultimate goal of determining whether—and if so, in what ways—it needs to be revised in light of Web 2.0. As a heuristic to address this goal, I introduce a three-part classification of Web 2.0 discourse phenomena: phenomena *familiar* from older computer-mediated discourse (CMD) modes such as email, chat, and discussion forums that appear to carry over into Web 2.0 environments with minimal differences; CMD phenomena that adapt to and are *reconfigured* by Web 2.0 environments; and new or emergent phenomena that did not exist—or if they did exist, did not rise to the level of public awareness—prior to the era of Web 2.0. This classification is loosely inspired by Crowston and Williams's (2000) broad classification of web pages into "reproduced" versus "emergent" genres, but with a focus on discourse, rather than genre.

I suggest that this three-way classification can provide insight into why particular discourse phenomena persist, adapt, or arise anew in technologically mediated environments over time. In so doing, I invoke technological factors such as multimodality and media convergence, social factors at both the situational and cultural levels, and inherent differences among linguistic phenomena that make them

"A fascinating collection of papers that takes the study of computer-mediated communication in some new directions while reminding us of the value of close attention to the details of discourse. This volume will be required reading for students of language in new media."

—BARBARA JOHNSTONE, professor of rhetoric and linguistics, Carnegie Mellon University

Our everyday lives are increasingly being lived through electronic media, which are changing our interactions and our communications in ways that we are only beginning to understand. In *Discourse 2.0: Language and New Media*, editors Deborah Tannen and Anna Marie Trester team up with top scholars in the field to shed light on the ways language is being used in, and shaped by, new media contexts such as Web 2.0, social media, electronic assessment and discourse in education, and other participatory technologies.

Students, professionals, and individuals will discover that *Discourse 2.0* offers a rich source of insight into these new forms of discourse that are pervasive in our lives.

DEBORAH TANNEN is university professor and professor of linguistics at Georgetown University and author of many books on discourse analysis.

ANNA MARIE TRESTER is a professorial lecturer and director of the master's program in language and communication in the Department of Linguistics at Georgetown University.

Contributors: Gillian Andrews, Jannis Androutsopoulos, Naomi S. Baron, Jeffrey Boase, Aaron Chia-Yuan Hung, Stephen M. DiDomenico, Cynthia Gordon, Susan C. Herring, Jens Kugele, Carmen Lee, Melissa Luke, Jenna Mahay, Marianna Ryshina-Pankova, Deborah Tannen, Anna Marie Trester, Crispin Thurlow, Hervé Varenne, Tuija Virtanen, Sarah Wessler, Laura West

Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics series

Cover design: Bruce Gore | Gore Studio, Inc.



ISBN 978-1-58901-954-6



Tannen
and
Trester

discourse 2.0

Language and New Media

401.41
D24

discourse 2.0



Language and New Media

Deborah Tannen
AND
Anna Marie Trester

EDITORS

青山学院大学図書館



001303145



variably sensitive to technological and social effects. Suggestions are also made of practical ways in which the classification might guide researchers to frame their studies and select certain methods of analysis. While the reconfigured and emergent categories are especially attractive in that they present new phenomena and raise special challenges for analysts of CMD, I argue that researchers should not neglect what appears familiar in favor of pursuing newness or novelty: all three categories merit research attention, for different reasons.

Background

The World Wide Web itself is not new. It was pitched as a concept by physicist Tim Berners-Lee to his employers at the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN) in 1990, implemented by 1991, and attracted widespread attention after the first graphical browser, Mosaic, was launched in 1993.¹ The early websites of the mid-1990s tended to be single-authored, fairly static documents; they included personal homepages, lists of frequently asked questions (FAQs), and ecommerce sites. The late 1990s saw a shift toward more dynamic, interactive websites, however: notably blogs (Herring et al. 2004) and online newssites (Kutz and Herring 2005), the content of which could be—and often was—updated frequently and which allowed users to leave comments on the site. These sites foreshadowed what later came to be called Web 2.0.

What Is Web 2.0?

The term “Web 2.0” was first used in 2004 when Tim O’Reilly, a web entrepreneur in California, decided to call a conference he was organizing for “leaders of the Internet Economy [to] gather to debate and determine business strategy” the “Web 2.0 Conference” (Battelle and O’Reilly 2010; O’Reilly 2005). At the time, the meaning of the term was vague—more aspirational and inspirational than descriptive. As a business strategy, Web 2.0 was supposed to involve viral marketing rather than advertising and a focus on services over products. One of O’Reilly’s mantras is “Applications get better the more people use them” (Linden 2006). Today the term refers, according to Wikipedia (2011b) and other online sources, to *changing trends in, and new uses of, web technology and web design, especially involving participatory information sharing; user-generated content; an ethic of collaboration; and use of the web as a social platform*. The term may also refer to the *types of sites* that manifest these uses, such as blogs, wikis, social network sites, and media-sharing sites.

From the outset, the notion of Web 2.0 was controversial. Critics claimed that it was just a marketing buzzword, or perhaps a meme—an idea that is passed electronically from one internet user to another—rather than a true revolution in web content and use as its proponents claimed. They questioned whether the web was qualitatively different in recent years than it had been before, and whether the applications grouped under the label Web 2.0—including such diverse phenomena as online auction sites, photosharing sites, collaboratively authored encyclopedias, social bookmarking sites, news aggregators, and microblogs—formed a coherent set. Tim Berners-Lee’s answer to these questions was no—for the inventor of the web, the term suffered from excessive hype and lack of definition (Anderson 2006).

Table 1.1
Web 2.0 vs. Web 1.0 phenomena (adapted from O’Reilly 2005)

Web 1.0	Web 2.0
Personal websites	Blogging
Publishing	Participation
Britannica Online	Wikipedia
Content-management systems	Wikis
Stickiness	Syndication
Directories (taxonomies)	Tagging (folksonomies)

In response to such criticisms, O’Reilly (2005) provided a chart to illustrate the differences between Web 2.0 and what he retroactively labeled “Web 1.0.” This is shown in modified and simplified form in table 1.1. The phenomena in the second column are intended to be the Web 2.0 analogs of the phenomena in the first column.

This is no more than a list, however; it does not provide a principled way to determine what should or should not be included as “Web 2.0.” An alternative approach to conceptualizing Web 2.0 is from a temporal perspective. Most Web 2.0 phenomena emerged over the last decade; indeed, one criticism of the concept is that it seems to mean nothing more than “recent websites”—paving the way for “Web 3.0,” “Web 4.0,” etc., to describe ever-newer web-based phenomena in the future. Figure 1.1 situates phenomena that exhibit characteristics of “Web 2.0” along a timeline for roughly the first decade of the twenty-first century. The phenomena included in the figure are not intended to be exhaustive in any sense; however, an attempt has been made to include important exemplars of a range of phenomena. In the figure, applications that run on a platform other than the web but otherwise have characteristics of Web 2.0 are indicated in lighter text; Web 2.0 sites that were launched before O’Reilly coined the term in 2004 are indicated in black type; and Web 2.0 sites launched since 2004 are in bold type.²




Figure 1.1 Web 2.0 timeline (selective).

The most recent decade of collaborative communicative technologies is not a perfect match with Web 2.0 in the strict sense. Not all of the applications mentioned in figure 1.1 are based in the web—for example, Second Life (a three-dimensional graphical world) and Skype (a form of internet telephony) are applications that run on the internet but not on the web, and Instagram, a recently introduced photosharing application, runs on mobile phones (although it can share with web-based social network sites). Moreover, a number of sites commonly considered to be Web 2.0 were launched before 2004, and some—such as eBay, blog-hosting sites (such as LiveJournal), and online dating sites—go back to the 1990s. Nonetheless, with these exceptions, and together with the characteristics of the sites themselves, the timeline suggests some conceptual coherence that can be attributed to these phenomena. Thus, for the purpose of this chapter, the following redefinition of Web 2.0 is proposed: web-based platforms that emerged as popular in the first decade of the twenty-first century, and that incorporate user-generated content and social interaction, often alongside or in response to structures or (multimedia) content provided by the sites themselves.

Computer-Mediated Discourse Analysis, Media Convergence, and "Discourse 2.0"

The second key background component of this chapter is discourse analysis and, specifically, the approach to analyzing online discourse that I have developed over the past seventeen years, CMDA. CMDA is an approach to the analysis of computer-mediated communication (CMC) focused on language and language use; it is also a set of methods (a toolkit) grounded in linguistic discourse analysis for mining networked communication for patterns of structure and meaning, broadly construed (Herring 2004).³

The term "computer-mediated discourse analysis" was first used as the name of a GURT workshop I organized in 1994. Since then it has evolved into a model organized around four levels of CMDA: structure, meaning, interaction management, and social phenomena (Herring 2004). The organizational principle of the CMDA toolkit is fairly simple: The basic idea is to adapt existing methods, primarily from linguistics (but in principle from any relevant discipline that analyzes discourse), to the properties of digital communication media. The methods and the phenomena, along with broader issues they address, are then loosely mapped onto four levels of hierarchy, from the microlinguistic, more context-independent level of structure to the macrolevel of contextualized social phenomena, as summarized in table 1.2. (A nonlinguistic level—participation—is sometimes included as well.)

However, in the time since the CMDA approach was originally conceptualized, CMC itself has been undergoing a shift, from occurrence in stand-alone clients such as emailers and instant messaging programs to juxtaposition with other content, often of an information or entertainment nature, in converged media platforms, where it is typically secondary, by design, to other information or entertainment-related activities (Herring 2009; Zelenkauskaitė and Herring 2008). This phenomenon, which I refer to as convergent media computer-mediated communication (CMCMC), is especially common on Web 2.0 sites. Examples include text comments on photo-sharing sites; text (and video) responses to YouTube videos; text (and voice) chat dur-

Table 1.2
Four levels of CMDA (adapted from Herring 2004)

Levels	Issues	Phenomena	Methods
Structure	Orality, formality, complexity, efficiency, expressivity, genre characteristics, etc.	Typography, orthography, morphology, syntax, discourse schemata, formatting conventions, etc.	Structural/descriptive linguistics, text analysis, stylistics
Meaning	What is intended, what is communicated, what is accomplished	Meaning of words, utterances (speech acts), exchanges, etc.	Semantics, pragmatics
Interaction management	Interactivity, timing, coherence, repair, interaction as co-constructed, etc.	Turns, sequences, exchanges, threads, etc.	Conversation analysis, ethnomethodology
Social phenomena	Social dynamics, power, influence, identity, community, cultural differences, etc.	Linguistic expressions of status, conflict, negotiation, face-management, play, discourse styles/lects, etc.	Interactional sociolinguistics, critical discourse analysis, ethnography of communication

ing multiplayer online games; and text messages from mobile phones posted to interactive TV programs. Less prototypically (because it involves the convergence of text with text rather than the convergence of text with another mode), CMCMC is also illustrated by reader comments on news stories; "talk" pages associated with Wikipedia articles; status updates and comments (and for that matter, chat and inbox exchanges) on Facebook profiles; and interpersonal and group exchanges on Twitter.⁴

In fact, the overlap between CMCMC and Web 2.0 is considerable. Almost all so-called Web 2.0 sites feature CMCMC, and almost all CMCMC applications are on the web. An exception to the former is social bookmarking sites such as del.icio.us, which do not contain CMC; an exception to the latter is text chat in multiplayer online games such as World of Warcraft, which are not hosted on the web. However, the trend is for increasing convergence, and it would not be surprising if these distinctions disappeared in the future. In what follows, it is assumed that Web 2.0 generally involves CMCMC.

The discourse in these new environments—what we might call convergent media computer-mediated discourse (CMCMD) or Discourse 2.0—raises many issues for CMDA. There are new types of *content* to be analyzed: status updates, text annotations on video, tags on social bookmarking sites, and edits on wikis. New *contexts* must also be considered—for example, social network sites based on geographic location—as well as new (mass media) audiences, including in other languages and cultures. (Facebook, for example, now exists in localized versions in well over one hundred languages [Lenihan 2011].) Discourse 2.0 manifests new *usage patterns*, as well, such as media coactivity, or near-simultaneous multiple activities on a single platform (Herring et al. 2009) and multiauthorship, or joint discourse production (Androutsopoulos 2011; Nishimura 2011). The above reflect, in part, new *affordances*

made available by new communication technologies: text chat in multiplayer online games (MOGs); collaboratively editable environments such as wikis; friending and friend circles on social network sites; social tagging and recommender systems; and so forth. Last but not least, Discourse 2.0 includes *user adaptations* to circumvent the constraints of Web 2.0 environments, such as interactive uses of @ and #, as well as retweeting, on Twitter (boyd, Golder, and Lotan 2010; Honeycutt and Herring 2009) and performed interactivity on what are, in essence, monologic blogs (Peterson 2011; Puschmann 2013). Each of these issues deserves attention, and some are starting to be addressed, but on a case-by-case, rather than a systemic, basis.

In the face of so many apparently new phenomena, one might question whether Discourse 2.0 should continue to be called CMD. The term “computer-mediated” originally referenced the term “computer-mediated communication,” which is still preferred by communication scholars. But communication technologies are increasingly moving beyond computers. Mobile phones can be considered honorary computers, but voice calls, for example, challenge that characterization, as does television-mediated conversation via text messages (Zelenkauskaitė and Herring 2008). Some recent discourse-focused publications use such alternative terms as “digital media” and “new media” discourse. However, the term “new media” is lacking in historical perspective, and “digital media” is too broad, referring as it does to video games as well as communication devices, although “digital discourse” (Thurlow and Mroczek 2011) makes clear that discourse is in focus. Conversely, the term “keyboard-to-screen communication” proposed by Jucker and Dürscheid (2012) is too narrow, in that it excludes communication input via audio and video technologies. It well may be that in the coming years, the dust will settle and a descriptive term that is neither too narrow nor too broad will emerge as the obvious candidate. For now, CMD and CMDA still seem useful terms, in that they make the link to CMC transparent and are based on established tradition, so they will continue to be used in the remainder of this chapter.

Discourse in Web 2.0: An Organizational Lens

As a conceptual aid to making sense of Discourse 2.0 on a larger scale, I propose a three-part organizational lens, a broad categorization scheme according to which discourse in Web 2.0 environments can be classified. This scheme challenges the *prima facie* assumption that all phenomena that seem new actually are new, classifying them instead in relation to their antecedents (or lack of antecedents) as *familiar*, *re-configured*, or *emergent*. At first blush, the scheme may appear simply to reproduce chronology—older phenomena might be expected to be familiar, and new ones to be emergent—but in fact it does not. As the discussion below shows, the reverse pattern sometimes holds.

Web Genre Classification

The Discourse 2.0 classification scheme proposed here was inspired by Crowston and Williams (2000), who in the mid-1990s were among the first scholars to attempt to classify genres of web pages. They proposed a simple, two-way classification—reproduced versus emergent—but noted that some pages could be classified as adaptations of reproduced genres.

The following are examples of Crowston and Williams’s categories applied to traditional web content. Reproduced content (sometimes referred to as “shovelware”) includes course syllabi, scholarly articles, and meeting minutes, which in the early years of the web (and sometimes still) were often created with word processing software offline and simply uploaded to the web. Adapted genres include news sites, genealogy sites, and e-journals, which have tended to preserve the basic genre conventions of their offline precursors—but with adaptations, such as user commenting and hyperlinking, that leverage the affordances of the web. As examples of emergent genres, Crowston and Williams mention hotlists of links and personal homepages; blogs and wikis have also been claimed to be indigenous to the web (Blood 2002; Wagner 2004). In the case of blogs, however, several scholars (Herring et al. 2004; Miller and Shepherd 2004) have pointed out the continuities between paper diary writing, for example, and blogging—such that nowadays most blog researchers would consider blogs to be an adapted genre. As this last case illustrates, there is a general ahistoricity that characterizes much new media research and a tendency to claim newness when historical precedents in fact exist; this is a risk associated with applying Crowston and Williams’s classification. The scheme can also be somewhat subjective, depending on what facets of a web genre one chooses to focus on and the familiarity of the researcher with previous genres. Nonetheless, the classification can lead to interesting insights.

One such insight is that there appears to be a trend over time for web genres to shift along a continuum from reproduced to adapted to emergent, with the seemingly paradoxical effect that as genres age, they move along the continuum in the direction of “emergence.” An example is online news sites, which tended to be *reproduced* from print newspapers in the early days but have become increasingly *adapted* to the web with the inclusion of user comments, multimedia, hyperlinks, and other interactivity and navigation features (Eriksen and Ihlström 2000). Similarly, the social network site Facebook initially combined the format of “face books” from Harvard University dormitories with web-based features such as commenting (Wikipedia 2011c) and was thus *adapted*, but over time it has added and combined so many features (including embedded graphics, games, polls, and various modes of CMC) that it can now arguably be considered *emergent*. This is not just because of the number of features, but because the whole is qualitatively different from the sum of its parts, and it has no single offline or online precedent.

This trend is consistent with the observation in media studies that new information and communication technologies (ICTs) are first put mainly to old uses, and uses that take advantage of the full potential of the technologies emerge only later, if at all (Winston 1998). In the case of web genres, the mechanisms underlying this shift are, on the one hand, the incorporation of new media affordances into familiar text types, and on the other hand, increasing media convergence. When familiar media combine, they often do so in ways that result in qualitatively different phenomena that can be considered new or emergent.

In the present classification scheme, the term “familiar” is used rather than “reproduced” to suggest continuities in (rather than copies of earlier) discourse phenomena. Familiar patterns are presumed to have manifested more or less continuously on

the web from the 1990s until the present, albeit not necessarily on the same sites. The term “reconfigured,” rather than “adapted,” is used to highlight the structural reshaping of some discourse phenomena that takes place in Web 2.0 environments. To be sure, users adapt to changes in ICTs, but their adaptations are only relevant to CMDA when they manifest in tangible discourse behaviors. However, the term “emergent” is preserved from Crowston and Williams (2000), in that new web genres and discourse phenomena can equally be described as emerging—that is, becoming evident where previously there was no general awareness of their existence.

A Three-Part Classification Scheme

In the following sections the proposed rubric of familiar-reconfigured-emergent is applied to classify examples of Web 2.0 discourse phenomena, with discussion of some of the challenges each category raises for CMDA.

Familiar Aspects of Web 2.0 Discourse Contrary to the impression conveyed by much new media research that almost everything on the web today is new and different, a great deal—and perhaps the majority—of Web 2.0 discourse phenomena are familiar. For one thing, text remains the predominant channel of communication among web users, whether in blogs, microblogs, wikis, comments on news sites, or web discussion forums. The latter, in particular, remain very popular and illustrate many of the same kinds of phenomena as did asynchronous online forums in the 1990s. These include nonstandard typography and orthography, code switching, gender differences, flaming, and email hoaxes and scams.⁵

Contemporary practices, especially when situated in new environments, may not seem familiar at first blush. Vaisman (2011) recently documented a creative typographic practice among Israeli preteen girl bloggers that she calls “Fakatsa” style (*fakatsa* means a silly, fashion-conscious girl), in which letters of the Hebrew alphabet are replaced by characters of similar appearance, including numbers, symbols, and letters from the roman alphabet. Vaisman gives the following example, the user ID of one of the bloggers, which translates as “Gal [a Hebrew name] the hot babe”:

~|§|¢~5ג°°

In standard Hebrew typography, this name would be written גל הכוסיט. The section symbol (§) in the Fakatsa version replaces the Hebrew letter that resembles (in this font) a small O, the cent symbol (¢) replaces the Hebrew letter that looks like a backward C, and the Arabic numeral 5 substitutes for the Hebrew letter *lamed* (ל); these substitutions are based loosely on graphical resemblance. Moreover, the Fakatsa version of the word includes extra symbols—such as a tilde (~) in two places and the dots on the right—that are purely decorative.

On the face of it, Fakatsa writing appears novel and exotic. Although nonstandard typography and orthography are familiar characteristics of CMC (netspeak expressions such as “ur gr8” [You’re great] themselves have antecedents in offline writing [Crystal 2008]), Fakatsa seems to take this practice to a new level, including requiring norms of

reading that differ from those for netspeak. Yet as Vaisman points out, Fakatsa shows many parallels with *leetspeak* or *leet*, an English subcultural variety that originated with computer hackers in the 1980s. Leet replaces letters from the roman alphabet with non-alphabetic characters and symbols based on visual resemblance, similar to Fakatsa, as illustrated in the following example: “1 k4n 7ÿp3 1337” (I can type leet). The similarities between the two varieties do not appear to be due to any direct contact between them; rather, they share a common generative principle that appears to have been exploited spontaneously in the two different writing systems (for further examples of graphic-based substitutions in computer-mediated Arabic and Greek typography, see Danet and Herring 2007). This example illustrates the first level of CMDA: structure.

Historical continuities in CMD are also evident on the broader level of social interaction. Gender differences in discourse style were documented in public online discussion forums and chat rooms throughout the 1990s that showed males to be more assertive, insulting, sarcastic, and profane, and females to be more accommodating, supportive, affectionate, and upbeat (Cherny 1994; Herring 1993, 2003a). These patterns reproduced gender styles in spoken conversation as described by Tannen (1990). Moreover, despite a tendency of scholars and lay people alike to imagine that such stylistic differences reflect outmoded gender role differences that have tended to disappear over time, a recent study of teen chat sites (Kapidzic and Herring 2011a) found similar differences in message tone: In 2011, males were still significantly more aggressive and flirtatious and tended to be more sexual, whereas females were significantly more friendly in their chat messages. Girls also still used more emoticons, especially those representing smiles and laughter, than boys did (Kapidzic and Herring 2011b), as shown in figure 1.3. Similar to the findings of earlier research (such as Wolf 2000), the only emoticon that boys used more was the winking face, which is associated with both sarcasm and flirtation.




Figure 1.3 Emoticon use in teen chat by gender per 1000 words (Kapadizic and Herring 2011b).

Familiar Discourse 2.0 phenomena lend themselves readily to CMDA in its current form, since they are the kinds of phenomena the paradigm was designed to address. The challenges they pose mainly concern identification: familiar phenomena may be mistaken for new (as a researcher unfamiliar with leet might be tempted to do with Fakatsa) or assumed to be different by virtue of the passage of time (as in the case of online gender styles). There is a need to trace relevant antecedents to gain perspective where familiar online discourse phenomena are concerned, in order to do conscientious research. This, in turn, requires some familiarity with earlier CMDA research. Alternatively, familiar phenomena may simply be passed over by researchers in favor of newer, more exotic CMD phenomena.

Reconfigured Aspects of Web 2.0 Discourse Although Discourse 2.0 may not be as different as popular belief holds, changes have taken place in both technology and communicative practices. These have resulted in the reconfiguration or reshaping of a number of aspects of CMD. Examples include personal status messages, quoting others' messages, small stories,⁶ and customized advertising spam—which might on the surface appear new but have traceable online antecedents—as well as reconfigurations of such familiar phenomena as topical coherence, turn-taking, threading, and intertextuality.

As a first illustration, let us consider personal status updates of the sort that have been popularized on Facebook and Twitter, in response to a generic prompt such as “What are you doing?” “What’s on your mind?” or “What’s happening?” The issues raised by the analysis of status updates involve the CMDA levels of structure (syntax), meaning (semantics and pragmatics), and interaction management. Lee (2011) provides the following examples in her study of Hong Kong users of Facebook, which compares the communicative functions of status updates produced before and after Facebook changed the default response format from “[Name] is” (with the third-person singular form of the verb “to be”) to simply “[Name]”:

1. Amy is in a good mood.
2. Snow is “I’ve seen you in the shadow.”
3. Kenneth quitting facebook.
4. Ariel thinks that no news is good news.
5. Katy: ?

Example 1 is a grammatical sentence formed from the prompt “Amy [name of user] is.” Example 2 is also built on the “name is” prompt, but what follows (“I’ve seen you in the shadow”) is a song lyric; the result is not a grammatical sentence. Status update 3 (“Kenneth quitting facebook”) is also ungrammatical, but for a different reason: it lacks the auxiliary verb “is,” which by this time had been omitted from the default Facebook prompt. The presence, explicit or implicit, of “is” in the Facebook response format thus results in some status descriptions that are syntactically nonstandard.

The update in 4 (“Ariel thinks that no news is good news”), in contrast, is syntactically well formed, but pragmatically appropriate in the simple present tense only if Ariel’s thinking is generally true, which is not the most likely interpretation in this context (it is more likely that Ariel is responding to some specific news, or lack thereof).

This use of simple present tense is presumably a carryover of the simple present tense of the former “is” in the prompt. Its use in place of, say, the present progressive lends the utterance a performative feel, as if Ariel performs the act of thinking that no news is good news by typing it. Finally, if Katy’s status update in 5—consisting of only a question mark (presumably to indicate that she is confused or does not know what to say)—is treated as an utterance, it is both syntactically and pragmatically ill formed.⁷

In fact, these kinds of utterances have characterized CMC since the early days of Internet Relay Chat (IRC [Werry 1996]) and MUDs and MOOs (text-based virtual reality environments [Cherny 1994, 1995, 1999]). Those chat environments made available special commands (called “action descriptions” on IRC and “emotes” on MUDs and MOOs) that produced third-person present tense descriptions of first-person actions and states, such as “Chris is in a bad mood” and “Lynn waves.” These often had a performative flavor, especially when used to describe actions rather than states (for further discussion of performativity in CMD, see Virtanen (2013) and chapter 9, this volume. Utterances that play with the convention itself, analogous to example 5 above, were also common in early chat environments (in a perfect parallel, Cherny 1999 gives examples of MOO utterances consisting solely of “[Name] ?” as well as “null-emotes,” emotes left intentionally blank such that only the username appears).

However, status updates do not simply reproduce these earlier practices. Rather, they have been structurally and functionally reconfigured in comparison to action descriptions and emotes. Syntactically, the inclusion of “is” in an earlier version of Facebook has led to a greater use of “is” constructions, even when these are not prescriptively correct. One of my Facebook friends has continued to start each of his updates with “[Name] is,” inserting the “is” as a stylistic affectation even when another finite verb is present in the utterance, e.g., “[Name] is has a headache.” Functionally, status updates on Twitter and Facebook serve as prompts that trigger comment threads, unlike the earlier constructions, which were single utterances.

The second example of a reconfigured phenomenon also involves interaction management—specifically, repeating parts of another participant’s message in one’s own message to create cross-message coherence. “Retweeting” on Twitter is the inclusion of a previous message (“tweet”) in a new message, sometimes with a comment added. boyd, Golder, and Lotan (2010) give the following typical example:

RT @StopAhmadi Bring down Khomeini’s website

Here, the (unidentified) user makes use of the abbreviation RT to retweet wholesale a tweet that was originally addressed to StopAhmadi (on the uses of @ as an addressivity marker, see Honeycutt and Herring 2009). Presumably the retweeter does this for the purpose of spreading further the sentiment expressed in the original tweet, *Bring down Khomeini’s website*.

Another example of retweeting given by boyd, Golder, and Lotan is more complex, in that it contains multiple levels of embedding:

@AndreaJarrell: Via @mStonerblog: RT @zephoria: new blog post “Is Facebook for old people?” socioecon and race are most interesting here <http://bit.ly/v0aPS>.

In this tweet the user is addressing to AndreaJarrell a message originally received from mStonerblog, who in turn retweeted a message from zephoria ("new blog post 'Is Facebook for old people?' <http://bit.ly/v0aPS>"). (The latter two instances of @ conventionally signal that what follows is a Twitter username and can effectively be ignored for the purposes of understanding this tweet.) To complicate the message further, the user inserts a comment of his or her own ("socioecon and race are most interesting here") before zephoria's link.

On the face of it, retweeting might seem a prime example of a discourse phenomenon that is new and that has arisen in response to the novel affordances and constraints of Twitter. In fact, retweeting is a modern form of the older practice in textual CMC of "quoting" in asynchronous messages (Severinson Eklundh 2010; Severinson Eklundh and Macdonald 1994). Quoted and retweeted segments are both flagged by a conventional symbol (an angle bracket [>] preceding each quoted line in Usenet, where the convention originated; RT in Twitter). Both incorporate the words of others in one's own message (intertextuality, to establish context), and embedded quotations such as those in Twitter example 2 above can occur in both CMC modes. The following schematic from Severinson Eklundh (2010) illustrates multiple embeddings in a traditional asynchronous system (fig. 1.4).

Although some systems include quoted text automatically when the user responds using the reply function, users can also set the default such that quoted text is not included or edit the quoted text selectively. Evidence of the latter can be seen in the message in figure 1.4, especially where B had previously responded to A point by point, interleaving his text (at two levels of embedding) with text by A (at three levels of embedding).




Figure 1.4 Schematic structure of a message received by A with three levels of quotation (Severinson Eklundh 2010).

As the figure suggests, in quoting the repeated material is set off on a separate line, whereas on Twitter, because of the character limit on tweets, quoted and non-quoted material appear together without line breaks, giving the two practices different surface appearances. Retweeting can thus be considered a form of quoting that is adapted to, and reconfigured by, the Twitter environment. The reconfiguration involves condensing quoted content to fit within 140 characters, including omitting information and reducing URLs to abbreviated bit.ly links, and using new (user-generated) conventions for referring or attributing, resulting in a visually very different format (that includes a small image of the sender, as well) but with a similar underlying function.

The third and last example of a reconfigured phenomenon also involves interaction management, this time with a focus on topical coherence. Conversational exchanges on many Web 2.0 platforms tend to be prompt focused—that is, comments respond to an initial prompt, such as a news story, a photo, or a video, more often than to other users' responses. Although this pattern was attested in older CMD, notably in online learning contexts in which students responded to an instructor's prompt, it was not common in public discourse on the internet. Rather, patterns of topical development tended to involve stepwise digression away from the original topic in multiparty exchanges in chat rooms (Herring 1999) and discussion forums (Lambiasi 2010). These differing patterns are illustrated in figure 1.5 using the Visual DTA (Dynamic Topic Analysis) tool developed by Herring and Kurtz (2006). The diagram on the left, showing the prompt-focused pattern, represents a Flickr (photosharing site) community comment thread in response to a photograph of a dog in a party hat (Herring 2009), and the diagram on the right, showing stepwise topical digression, represents a conversation on a recreational IRC channel (Herring 2003b). In the diagrams, messages are numbered in chronological order along the y axis, and the x axis represents cumulative semantic distance from the initiating message.

Both diagrams illustrate thematically coherent patterns of interaction involving multiple participants that begin with an initial prompt, but in the Flickr comment thread (and much other Discourse 2.0) responses are mostly directed to the prompt throughout, resulting in limited topical development, whereas in the IRC example the topic shifts progressively from the upper left to the lower right through interaction among participants. The former pattern can be considered an adaptation of topical coherence to CMC environments in which entertainment and news content is presented for users to consume and comment on. As a consequence of this adaptation, patterns of interaction are reconfigured not just at the individual level but at the group level.

Because they may appear quite different on the surface, reconfigured phenomena are at an even greater risk than familiar phenomena of being mistaken for emergent CMD, with consequent loss of comparative insight. An additional challenge posed by reconfigured phenomena for CMDA is the need to abstract common structures, functions, or social dynamics across different media affordances in order to identify what they are reconfigured from and the reasons for the reconfigurations.




Figure 1.5 Two patterns of topical development. Left: prompt focused (Flickr comment thread [Herring 2009]). Right: stepwise progression (Internet Relay Chat [Herring 2003b]).

Emergent Aspects of Web 2.0 Discourse Given that much of what has been claimed to be unprecedented on the web has been found, upon deeper examination, to have online or offline antecedents (or both), caution must be exercised in asserting that any phenomenon is entirely new. This section tentatively identifies several Web 2.0 discourse phenomena that appear to be emergent and unprecedented, at least as common practices.⁸ These include the dynamic collaborative discourse that takes place on wikis, along with conversational video exchanges, conversational exchanges via image texts, and multimodal conversation more generally. In the domain of non-bona fide discourse, the phenomena of sock puppets and link building are also mentioned.

Collaborative text production of the sort that takes place on Wikipedia represents a new kind of online discourse. It is democratic and anarchic: There is no central organization, and anyone can contribute to any part of a text. It is massively multi-authored by internet users who usually do not know one another. It leaves a manifest trace both front stage, in article pages, and backstage (Goffman 1959) in talk and user pages. Moreover, every addition, deletion, or alteration of the text is preserved in history pages, which in themselves constitute a new kind of text. It is process focused rather than product focused (Wagner 2004); even its most stable content, articles, are dynamic documents subject to frequent updating. To be sure, texts such as group reports are sometimes constructed collaboratively in offline contexts, but typically each person is responsible for one part; the number of contributors is limited; their talk about the task is ephemeral; the tasks are centrally coordinated; and at some point, the product is deemed complete and no further editing takes place. The anarchic nature of contribution to Wikipedia, in combination with the platform's ease of updating and technical affordances that make process visible, results in a discourse context that seems qualitatively unprecedented.

Interestingly, despite being arrived at by entirely different means, the text of Wikipedia articles can be strikingly similar to that of traditional print encyclopedias, both in quality of content (Giles 2005) and in style (Emigh and Herring 2005). In a corpus-based analysis of structural markers of formality and informality in fifteen articles in four corpora—Wikipedia, Everything2 (an online knowledge repository in which articles are individually authored), a traditional print encyclopedia, and Wikipedia talk pages—Emigh and Herring found that the degree of formality in Wikipedia and the traditional encyclopedia was statistically identical, whereas Everything2 and the talk pages were significantly less formal. As an explanation for this counterintuitive result, Emigh and Herring suggested that Wikipedia contributors have internalized cultural norms of encyclopedic style, which includes formality. However, this does not explain how the collaborative editing process takes place over time, or how hundreds of strangers come to an apparent consensus. A tool for visualizing the creation of Wikipedia articles over time has been developed by Viégas, Wattenberg, and Dave (2004), but it has yet to be applied by discourse analysts.

Another emergent Discourse 2.0 phenomenon is the use of channels other than text, and semiotic systems other than verbal language, to carry on conversational exchanges. Exchanges in which the turn unit is a video created by an individual and uploaded to a website have been analyzed by Pihlaja (2011) for YouTube, with a focus on verbal metaphor development; and by Kendall (2007) for a user-created animation sharing site, with a focus on the role of visual themes in creating cross-video coherence. McDonald (2007) analyzed conversational exchanges of still webcam images on a graphical community blog, describing four strategies used to create coherence across images: positional play (for example, showing a picture in which a person is pointing to another picture on the site that is outside the picture frame), animation, text-in-image, and image quotes. In image quotes, a picture or part of a picture posted by a previous contributor is used, sometimes with modification, in a response, as illustrated in the sequence in figure 1.6 (from McDonald 2007).



Figure 1.6 A conversation with image quotes from a community blog (McDonald 2007).

have been around since the first illuminated manuscripts and include such familiar genres as comics and children's books, dynamic image texts that develop collaboratively, as in figure 1.6, appear to be a recent phenomenon—one enabled by popular access to drawing and photo modification software.

Media convergence is also resulting in a trend for multiple modes of verbal communication to coexist in the same platform. For example, an individual may respond (asynchronously) to a YouTube video either via text comments or video; may chat (synchronously) while playing World of Warcraft via text or voice; and may send text messages (either synchronous or asynchronous, depending on whether the addressee is logged on at the same time) and speak (synchronously) to an interlocutor over Skype. On these platforms the mode options are accessed somewhat differently and tend to be used for different communicative purposes (Newon 2011; Pihlaja 2011; Sindoni 2011), although they may be used contemporaneously. On the multimodal discussion site *voicethread.com*, in contrast, asynchronous conversations

In the first image in this sequence, user Butah P. wishes luck to Valrik, who is leaving a web community to form his own. Valrik (“Val”) thanks Butah in the following image, showing himself holding up a screen with a cartoonish drawing of himself over the URL of his new website. Image (c) from user Dana wishes Valrik luck and says, via text, that they will miss him. The latter idea is taken up and exaggerated in image (d) from Runz with Sizzerrs, who took the cartoon image of Valrik’s head from image (b) and photoshopped it over a tombstone, implying that Valrik has died. In the last image of the sequence, Val denies this by photoshopping in Runz with Sizzerrs’s entire image and superimposing the red “no” circle over it; he also adds the text, “I’m not dead! I’ve just moved to [new URL].” In this series of exchanges, the cartoon image of Valrik serves as a reference object that is repeated and transformed dynamically through group interaction. Image quotes are also a key feature of discourse in image boards (image-based online discussion boards) such as 4chan (Bernstein et al. 2011) where they often “meme,” or spread virally.⁹

In the pre-internet era, videos (or films) were sometimes made that responded to other videos (or films), but this practice was restricted mostly to artistic contexts due to the cost and special equipment required. Video is now cheaper and easier to create, enabling qualitatively different kinds of communication to take place. And although images with text

(“VoiceThreads”) take place in which comments via text, audio, and video are fully integrated within a single interface display, as shown in figure 1.7. In the figure, the three modes of commenting are displayed as they appear when each type of message is played back in the VoiceThread interface. The case in point involves discussion of a video (in the center of the screen) about the dangers of speeding as part of a high school driver education class (from Herring and Demarest 2011).

The contents of the three comments in figure 1.7 are as follows.

AUDIO [teacher]: Hey ya’ guys, welcome to . . . VoiceThread. I want you to watch this video clip and give your feedback, either through a video recording or a voice recording. It’s a short clip on speeding, and I’m interested to hear your thoughts.

VIDEO [teacher]: Hey hey! It’s not actually Steve Perry, it’s just me . . . checking this thing out. Uh, this video clip . . . is pretty neat, I think . . . I especially enjoy his Australian accent, and I know it’s Australian because for a few reasons, uh . . . the biggest one of them obviously being that the car’s steering wheel . . . is on the right hand side of the car! So. Another cool thing that I . . . liked about this video, other than the information in it, was the special effects they used, he—he’s sorta walked out in front of the car, uh which . . . I wouldn’t think anybody would normally do, but he did it! And, uh, Steve Perry—come back for us all, please!

TEXT [student]: People may think that they have a quick reaction time but in fact it doesn’t matter whether you can break fast or you have good breaks [*sic*] on the car its what speed you are going before you notice something that either has run out on the road or that you are about to hit something. . . . Be aware on the surroundings and do the speed limit or this could be you!!!




Figure 1.7 An audio comment (top), a video comment (middle), and a text comment (bottom) in a VoiceThread (Herring and Demarest 2011).

Herring and Demarest argue that voicethread.com provides an unprecedented, authentic environment for research into mode choice, and they profit from it to analyze the effects of mode on participation by gender, expression of positive or negative attitude, and use of metadiscourse to index social awareness, all of which are found to vary according to mode. Audio and video comments in VoiceThreads are made more often by males than by females and contain more self-reference than text comments, whereas the text comments use more negative language than audio and video comments.

Some Web 2.0 sites take the trend towards convergence further by allowing users to embed text directly into video. An example is collaborative video annotations on YouTube, an innovation that came about when some users discovered that the URL to the interface that allows the person who uploads a video to add textual annotations to it could be shared with other users.¹⁰ Howard (2011) analyzed the referents, tenor, and functional moves performed through such textual annotations posted by education students on videos of teachers teaching a class (see fig. 1.8), with the aim of determining the effectiveness of the environment in fostering critical discussion. His findings were mixed; critical moves were evident, but contributors made little reference to each others' comments, hence the discourse was not very interactive.




Figure 1.8 Collaborative text annotation on a YouTube video (Howard 2011).

Finally, in the domain of non-bona fide communication, artificial intelligence (AI) agents (or bots) have been present in online chat spaces since the early days of the public internet, and they have occasionally succeeded in fooling some people into thinking they were human (Turkle 1995). But recent developments have largely bypassed sophisticated AI, creating fraudulent participants in online forums through the manipulation, computational or otherwise, of simpler notions such as frequency and timing of participation. For example, multiple fake online personas called "sock puppets" are generated automatically and, posing as real people, made to join online forums for various purposes, including posting comments to create the illusion of consensus on controversial issues (Romm 2011). Another practice, link building, involves unobtrusively inserting links to a company in web forums in order to boost the company's search engine ranking. One strategy for doing this is to infiltrate a forum and post messages, and after the discussion has moved on to another topic (and the forum moderator is presumably no longer paying attention), edit one's posts to include the links (Haltom 2011). These practices raise the question of how the discourse of non-bona fide participants (including and in addition to their participation patterns) differs from that of real participants, a question that CMDA analysts are well qualified to address, and one that has practical implications for fraud detection.

With the exception of the articles cited above, however, little analysis of these new discourse phenomena has been conducted. A general challenge for emergent media environments is that they need to be analyzed descriptively first before more sophisticated, theoretically informed analyses can be carried out; this often results in a lag between the emergence of new environments and scholarly understanding of them. The discourse that takes place in emergent environments also raises numerous challenges for the CMDA paradigm. Non-bona fide discourse participants call for new ways of understanding participation. Wikis call for new conceptual understandings of what constitutes a text, what can be data for analysis, and what authorship means. Finally, multimodal discourse requires the analyst to devise new analytical methods and to draw from theoretical frameworks outside linguistics (such as visual semiotics). This last point leads to the question of whether multimodal discourse requires a new level of analysis in the CMDA toolkit, or whether it can be accommodated within the existing paradigm with the addition of semiotic methods to address each level. If the latter, at what level does integrative analysis of the meanings and functions of the complex whole take place, and what theories and methods exist to guide it? Table 1.3 suggests one possible format for incorporating multimodal discourse into the existing CMDA paradigm, as a new level.

Practically speaking, there is also a need to devise parallel transcription and visualization displays for textual and nontextual communication, which differ in a number of respects, including temporality. (Newon [2011] offers one approach to this in her study of text and voice chat in *World of Warcraft*.) Such displays should include the representation of silences, and the new norms and meanings surrounding them, in multimodal environments. Finally, it is likely that some apparently emergent phenomena will have antecedents that one is not aware of. Given the inherent difficulty of supporting a claim (of newness) that requires negative evidence, researchers need to be circumspect in making such claims.

Table 1.3
Multimodal communication as an additional level of CMDA

Level	Issues	Phenomena	Methods
Multimodal communication	Mode effects, cross-mode coherence, reference and address management, generation and spread of graphical meaning units, media coactivity, etc.	Mode choice, text-in-image, image quotes, spatial and temporal positionality and deixis, animation, etc.	Social semiotics, visual content analysis, film studies (?)

Implications

The tripartite familiar–reconfigured–emergent classification presented above raises questions that have the potential to lead to new theoretical insight. Why, for example, do some discourse phenomena persist, others adapt, and others arise anew in technologically mediated environments?

I have previously (Herring 2007) emphasized the importance of taking into account facets of the technological medium and the social context in analyzing CMD. In the case of Discourse 2.0, technological facets that are especially relevant are media convergence and multimodality, including use of images and channel choice. Social facets that continue to be especially relevant include number of participants, anonymity, communicative setting, and cultural context. To these two faceted dimensions I propose adding a linguistic dimension, based on the observation that different linguistic phenomena appear to be variably sensitive to technological and social effects. One tentative generalization that follows from the examples presented above is that social phenomena such as gender styles (level 4 of CMDA) seem most resistant to technological reshaping, perhaps because they exist at a higher level of abstraction and their expression is not bound to a specific communicative modality. In contrast, interactional phenomena (level 2 of CMDA) seem most likely to be reconfigured. This is understandable, in that changes in system design often affect turn-taking, yet conversational exchanges persist even on platforms not primarily designed to support them (Herring 2009; Herring et al. 2009; Kendall 2007; Zelenkauskaitė and Herring 2008), necessitating reconfigured strategies of interaction.¹¹ However, emergent phenomena do not appear to be associated with any particular linguistic level; the analyses cited above involve all four CMDA levels: structure (such as formality markers), meaning (such as functional moves), interactional coherence (such as cross-turn reference), and social phenomena (such as expressions of sociability and negativity), as well as the nonlinguistic level of participation. Even if a new level is posited for CMDA to capture the semiotics of multimodal communication, as in table 1.2, discourse constructed collaboratively through online multimodal systems is only emergent at the present time; in the future it will be familiar or perhaps reconfigured by newer multimodal systems. Thus it is difficult to link emergence with any specific aspect of language use; rather, in the examples presented here, emergence is tied to technological developments.

Classifying online discourse phenomena in terms of their novelty can make explicit what phenomena are new and in need of basic descriptive research; these low-hanging fruit can be attractive objects of study. Reconfigured phenomena can suggest interesting comparative studies that shed light on the effects of technological change on online discourse. Familiar phenomena can be rewarding to analyze, too, especially when familiar patterns are thought to no longer exist or when they are incorrectly labeled as new. Recognizing what is familiar or reconfigured as such is an important antidote to the tendency towards ahistoricity in new media studies. The three-way classification scheme also has other practical benefits. Once a topic for research has been selected, the scheme can be used to frame a research study, select literature for review, determine appropriate methods of analysis, and make interpretive comparisons. However, the scheme should not be applied too strictly; it is coarse grained and intended as a first-pass classification of discourse phenomena, subject to refinement from further investigation.

Summary and Conclusion

Discourse in Web 2.0 environments is mostly CMCMD; that is, it occurs on converged media platforms. CMCMD still has a strong textual component, and many CMD phenomena carry over into CMCMD. At the same time, CMCMD increasingly co-occurs with information in other semiotic, especially graphical, modes, leading to the emergence of new converged CMD phenomena. These differences notwithstanding, and although multimodal online discourse presents special challenges, CMDA remains a useful lens through which to analyze new social media.

This last point becomes more evident when discourse-focused approaches to contemporary web phenomena are contrasted with Web 2.0 approaches. Each is a lens with a central focus and a periphery, and certain phenomena are outside the scope of each. Web 2.0 as a lens has centrally in its sights phenomena such as user-created content, user control of content, collaborative processes, and folksonomies. Social interaction and communication are on the periphery, and CMD in contexts other than Web 2.0 sites lies outside its scope. In contrast, CMCMD as a lens focuses on language, communication, conversation, social interaction, and media coactivity as they occur anywhere online (including via mobile phones), with collaboration on the periphery; noninteractive content is outside its scope. Each lens is valuable, but CMCMD focuses more squarely on phenomena of interest to discourse analysts. At the same time, it overlaps considerably with Web 2.0 and thus remains a timely lens through which to examine online communicative content.

If this chapter demonstrates one thing, it is that Discourse 2.0 offers a rich field of investigation for discourse analysts. Especially urgently needed in future research is integrated multimodal analysis. Longitudinal analysis is also needed, and it is increasingly feasible given the preservation of digital records and computer-assisted corpus analysis methods. Finally, large-scale automated analysis can and should coexist, in my view, with ethnographic case studies. Indeed, it seems likely that in the short term, integrated analyses of multimodal communication will be qualitative and ethnographic in nature, at least until the interplay of different semiotic systems in online environments is understood well enough to distill parameters that can be subjected to systematic, quantitative analysis.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to Deborah Tannen and Anna Marie Trester for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this chapter. Any shortcomings that remain are my responsibility alone.

NOTES

1. On the creation of the web, see Wikipedia (2011a).
2. With the possible exception of WikiLeaks, which is the most recent, all of these sites (and many more) can be found in lists of Web 2.0 sites available online (see, e.g., www.sacredcowdung.com/archives/2006/03/all_things_web.html and edudemic.com/2011/11/best-web-tools/).
3. For some proposed expansions to CMDA methodology, see the articles in Androutsopoulos and Bießwenger (2008).
4. These are considered to be CMC environments because in each case, the site's original purpose was something other than conversational exchange.
5. Herring (2001) provides an overview of many of these practices in the CMD of the 1990s. For discussion of the offline historical predecessors of English-language CMC, see Baron (2000).
6. Small stories are nontraditional narratives and are often personal rather than fictionalized. In Web 2.0 environments they are reconfigured from their offline antecedents in that they tend to be interactive, hypertextual, and collaborative (see Georgakopoulou 2013).
7. It is syntactically ill formed because "Katy: ?" is not a grammatical sentence, and pragmatically ill formed because the default expectation of a Facebook status update is that it provide information about what the user is doing or thinking.
8. These examples are advanced with the caveat that more astute researchers may find plausible antecedents to them. Some could be argued to have antecedents in specialized offline contexts; however, to the best of my knowledge, none have previously existed as common communicative practices online or offline.
9. An example of this is "lolcat" images—photographs of cats with text superimposed (in misspelled and ungrammatical English [e.g., "I can haz cheezburger"])—which originated on 4chan and spread subsequently to other online environments (Bernstein et al. 2011).
10. Craig Howard, email communication, January 8, 2012.
11. Numerous examples of this can be found in the CMD literature (e.g., Cherny 1999; Herring 1999). For an extreme example of reconfigured turn-taking in a synchronous chat system, see Anderson, Beard, and Walther (2010).

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Nate. 2006. Tim Berners-Lee on Web 2.0: "[N]obody even knows what it means." *Ars Technica*. arstechnica.com/business/news/2006/09/7650.ars.
- Anderson, Jeffrey F., Fred K. Beard, and Joseph B. Walther. 2010. Turn-taking and the local management of conversation in a highly simultaneous computer-mediated communication system. *Language@Internet* 7, article 7. www.languageatinternet.org/articles/2010/2804.
- Androutsopoulos, Jannis. 2011. From variation to heteroglossia in the study of computer-mediated discourse. In *Digital discourse: Language in the new media*, ed. Crispin Thurlow and Kristine Mroczek, 277–98. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Androutsopoulos, Jannis, and Michael Beißwenger, eds. 2008. Data and methods in computer-mediated discourse analysis. *Language@Internet* 5, article 2. www.languageatinternet.org/articles/2008.
- Baron, Naomi S. 2000. *Alphabet to email: How written English evolved and where it's heading*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Battelle, John, and Tim O'Reilly. 2010. Web 2.0 Summit is a wrap. *Web 2.0 Summit*. www.web2summit.com/web2010.
- Bernstein, Michael S., Andrés Monroy-Hernández, Drew Harry, Paul André, Katrina Panovich, and Greg Vargas. 2011. 4chan and /b/: An analysis of anonymity and ephemerality in a large online community. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*, 50–57. Menlo Park, CA: AAAI Press.

- Blood, Rebecca. 2002. *The weblog handbook: Practical advice on creating and maintaining your blog*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.
- boyd, danah, Scott Golder, and Gilad Lotan. 2010. Tweet tweet retweet: Conversational aspects of retweeting on Twitter. In *Proceedings of the 43rd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, ed. Ralph Sprague. Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Press. csdl.computer.org/dl/proceedings/hicss/2010/3869/00/03-06-04.pdf.
- Cherny, Lynn. 1994. Gender differences in text-based virtual reality. In *Cultural performances: Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Women and Language Conference, April 8, 9, and 10, 1994*, ed. Mary Bucholtz, Anita C. Liang, Laurel A. Sutton, and Caitlin Liang, 102–15. Berkeley: Berkeley Women and Language Group, University of California.
- . 1995. The modal complexity of speech events in a social mud. *Electronic Journal of Communication* 5. fragment.nl/mirror/Cherny/The_modal_complexity.txt.
- . 1999. *Conversation and community: Chat in a virtual world*. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Crowston, Kevin, and Michelle Williams. 2000. Reproduced and emergent genres of communication on the World-Wide Web. *The Information Society* 16, no. 3:201–16.
- Crystal, David. 2008. *Txtng: The gr8 db8*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Danet, Brenda, and Susan C. Herring, eds. 2007. *The multilingual internet: Language, culture, and communication online*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Emigh, William, and Susan C. Herring. 2005. Collaborative authoring on the Web: A genre analysis of online encyclopedias. In *Proceedings of the 38th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, ed. Ralph Sprague. Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Press. ella.slis.indiana.edu/~herring/wiki.pdf.
- Eriksen, Lars B., and Carina Ihlström. 2000. Evolution of the web news genre: The slow move beyond the print metaphor. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, ed. Ralph Sprague. Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE. csdl.computer.org/dl/proceedings/hicss/2000/0493/03/04933014.pdf.
- Georgakopoulou, Alexandra. 2013. Narrative and computer-mediated communication. In *Handbook of pragmatics of computer-mediated communication*, ed. Susan C. Herring, Dieter Stein, and Tuija Virtanen. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Giles, Jim. 2005. Internet encyclopaedias go head to head. *Nature* 438:900–901. www.u.arizona.edu/~trevors/nature_15dec2005_wikipedia.pdf.
- Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Haltom, Aaron. 2011. How to spot a link builder. Unpublished manuscript.
- Herring, Susan C. 1993. Gender and democracy in computer-mediated communication. *Electronic Journal of Communication* 3, no. 2. ella.slis.indiana.edu/~herring/ejc.doc.
- . 1999. Interactional coherence in CMC. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 4, no. 4. jcmc.indiana.edu/vol4/issue4/herring.html.
- . 2001. Computer-mediated discourse. In *The handbook of discourse analysis*, ed. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi Hamilton, 612–34. Oxford: Blackwell.
- . 2003a. Gender and power in online communication. In *The handbook of language and gender*, ed. Janet Holmes and Miriam Meyerhoff, 202–28. Oxford: Blackwell.
- . 2003b. Dynamic topic analysis of synchronous chat. In *New research for new media: Innovative research methodologies symposium working papers and readings*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota School of Journalism and Mass Communication. ella.slis.indiana.edu/~herring/dta.2003.pdf.
- . 2004. Computer-mediated discourse analysis: An approach to researching online behavior. In *Designing for virtual communities in the service of learning*, ed. Sasha A. Barab, Rob Kling, and James H. Gray, 338–76. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2007. A faceted classification scheme for computer-mediated discourse. *Language@Internet* 4, article 1. www.languageatinternet.org/articles/2007/761.
- . 2009. New directions in CMC research: CMC. Plenary speech, Illinois Language and Linguistic Society Conference (ILLS 1), Urbana, May 31. flash.atlas.illinois.edu/Video.html?src=/ling/ling-v-2009-2/Keynote-Herring&player=SDNC.
- Herring, Susan C., and Bradford Demarest. 2011. Mode choice in multimodal comment threads: Effects on participation, sociability, and attitude. Unpublished manuscript.

- Herring, Susan C., and Andrew Kurtz. 2006. Visualizing dynamic topic analysis. In *Proceedings of CHI'06*. New York: ACM. ella.slis.indiana.edu/~herring/chi06.pdf.
- Herring, Susan C., Daniel O. Kutz, John C. Paolillo, and Asta Zelenkauskaite. 2009. Fast talking, fast shooting: Text chat in an online first-person game. In *Proceedings of the 42nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, ed. Ralph Sprague. Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Press. ella.slis.indiana.edu/~herring/hicss.bzflag.pdf.
- Herring, Susan C., Lois Ann Scheidt, Sabrina Bonus, and Elijah Wright. 2004. Bridging the gap: A genre analysis of weblogs. In *Proceedings of the 37th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, ed. Ralph Sprague. Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Press. ella.slis.indiana.edu/~herring/herring.scheidt.2004.pdf.
- Honeycutt, Courtenay, and Susan C. Herring. 2009. Beyond microblogging: Conversation and collaboration via Twitter. In *Proceedings of the 42nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, ed. Ralph Sprague. Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Press. ella.slis.indiana.edu/~herring/honeycutt.herring.2009.pdf.
- Howard, Craig. 2011. Collaborative video annotation as critical discourse. Paper presented at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, DC, March 12.
- Jucker, Andreas H., and Christa Dürscheid. 2012. The linguistics of keyboard-to-screen communication: A new terminological framework. *Linguistik Online*. vol. 56, no. 6, www.linguistik-online.org/56_12/juckerDuerscheid.html.
- Kapidzic, Sanja, and Susan C. Herring. 2011a. Gender, communication, and self-presentation in teen chatrooms revisited: Have patterns changed? *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 17, no. 1:39–59.
- . 2011b. Gender, innovation, and non-standardness in teen chat language. Paper presented at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, DC, March 12.
- Kendall, Lori. 2007. Colin Mochrie vs. Jesus H. Christ: Messages about masculinities and fame in online video conversations. In *Proceedings of the 40th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, ed. Ralph Sprague. Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Press. www.ideals.illinois.edu/bitstream/handle/2142/705/co?sequence=2.
- Kutz, Daniel O., and Susan C. Herring. 2005. Micro-longitudinal analysis of Web news updates. In *Proceedings of the 38th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, ed. Ralph Sprague. Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Press. ella.slis.indiana.edu/~herring/news.pdf.
- Lambiase, Jacqueline J. 2010. Hanging by a thread: Topic development and death in an online discussion of breaking news. *Language@Internet* 7, article 9. www.languageatinternet.org/articles/2010/2814.
- Lee, Carmen. 2011. Texts and practices of micro-blogging: Status updates on Facebook. In *Digital discourse: Language in the new media*, ed. Crispin Thurlow and Kristine Mroczek, 110–28. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lenihan, Aoife. 2011. "Join our community of translators": Language ideologies and Facebook. In *Digital discourse: Language in the new media*, ed. Crispin Thurlow and Kristine Mroczek, 48–64. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Linden, Greg. 2006. Tim O'Reilly and defining Web 2.0. *Geeking with Greg*, May 14. glinden.blogspot.com/2006/05/tim-oreilly-and-defining-web-20.html.
- McDonald, David. 2007. Visual conversation styles in web communities. In *Proceedings of the 40th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, ed. Ralph Sprague. Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Press. www.pensivepuffin.com/dwmcphd/papers/McDonald.HICSS-40.preprint.pdf.
- Miller, Caroline R., and Dawn Shepherd. 2004. Blogging as social action: A genre analysis of the weblog. In *Into the blogosphere: Rhetoric, community, and culture of weblogs*, ed. Laura J. Gurak, Smiljana Antonijevic, Laurie Johnson, Clancy Ratliff, and Jessica Reyman. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Libraries. blog.lib.umn.edu/blogosphere/blogging_as_social_action_a_genre_analysis_of_the_weblog.html.
- Newson, Lisa. 2011. Multimodal creativity and identities of expertise in the digital ecology of a World of Warcraft guild. In *Digital discourse: Language in the new media*, ed. Crispin Thurlow and Kristine Mroczek, 131–53. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nishimura, Yukiko. 2011. Japanese *keitai* novels and ideologies of literacy. In *Digital discourse: Language in the new media*, ed. Crispin Thurlow and Kristine Mroczek, 86–109. New York: Oxford University Press.

- O'Reilly, Tim. 2005. What is Web 2.0? Design patterns and business models for the next generation of software. *O'Reilly Network*, September 30. oreilly.com/web2/archive/what-is-web-20.html.
- Peterson, Eric. 2011. How conversational are weblogs? *Language@Internet* 8, article 8. www.languageatinternet.org/articles/2011/Peterson.
- Pihlaja, Stephen. 2011. Cops, popes, and garbage collectors: Metaphor and antagonism in an atheist/Christian YouTube video thread. *Language@Internet* 8, article 1. www.languageatinternet.org/articles/2011/3044.
- Puschmann, Cornelius. 2013. Blogging. In *Handbook of pragmatics of computer-mediated communication*, ed. Susan C. Herring, Dieter Stein, and Tuija Virtanen. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 83–108.
- Romm, Joe. 2011. Denier-bots live! Why are online comments' sections over-run by the anti-science, pro-pollution crowd? *Think Progress*, February 20. thinkprogress.org/romm/2011/02/20/207554/denier-bots-live-why-are-online-comments-sections-over-run-by-the-anti-science-pro-pollution-crowd/.
- Severinson Eklundh, Kerstin. 2010. To quote or not to quote: Setting the context for computer-mediated dialogues. *Language@Internet* 7, article 5. www.languageatinternet.org/articles/2010/2665.
- Severinson Eklundh, Kerstin, and Clare Macdonald. 1994. The use of quoting to preserve context in electronic mail dialogues. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication* 37, no. 4:97–202.
- Sindoni, Maria Grazia. 2011. "Mode-switching": Speech and writing in videochats. Paper presented at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Washington, DC, March 11.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1990. *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: Morrow.
- Thurlow, Crispin, and Kristine Mroczek, eds. 2011. *Digital discourse: Language in the new media*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Turkle, Sherry. 1995. *Life on the screen: Identity in the age of the internet*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Vaisman, Carmel. 2011. Performing girlhood through typographic play in Hebrew blogs. In *Digital discourse: Language in the new media*, ed. Crispin Thurlow and Kristine Mroczek, 177–96. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Viégas, Fernanda B., Martin Wattenberg, and Dave Kushal. 2004. Studying cooperation and conflict between authors with history flow visualizations. In *Proceedings of the 2004 Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 575–82. New York: ACM.
- Virtanen, Tuija. 2013. Performativity in computer-mediated communication. In *Handbook of pragmatics of computer-mediated communication*, ed. Susan C. Herring, Dieter Stein, and Tuija Virtanen. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 269–90.
- Wagner, Christian. 2004. Wiki: A technology for conversational knowledge management and group collaboration. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* 13:265–89.
- Werry, Christopher C. 1996. Linguistic and interactional features of Internet Relay Chat. In *Computer-mediated communication: Linguistic, social, and cross-cultural perspectives*, ed. Susan C. Herring, 47–63. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Wikipedia. 2011a. *History of the World Wide Web*. en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_World_Wide_Web.
- . 2011b. *Web 2.0*. en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Web_2.0.
- . 2011c. *Facebook*. en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Facebook.
- Winston, Brian. 1998. *Media, technology, and society, a history: From the telegraph to the internet*. London: Routledge.
- Wolf, Alecia. 2000. Emotional expression online: Gender differences in emoticon use. *CyberPsychology and Behavior* 3:827–33.
- Zelenkauskaite, Asta, and Susan C. Herring. 2008. Television-mediated conversation: Coherence in Italian iTV SMS chat. In *Proceedings of the 41st Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, ed. Ralph Sprague. Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Press. ella.slis.indiana.edu/~herring/hicss08.pdf.