<http://www.diva-portal.org>

Postprint

This is the accepted version of a paper published in *Discourse, Context & Media*. This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Wikström, P. (2016)

When I need/want to: Normativity, identity, and form in user construals of 'talk-like' tweeting

Discourse, Context & Media, 14: 54-62

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2016.09.003>

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:kau:diva-46957>

Author's post-print

when I need/want to: Normativity, identity, and form in user construals of 'talk-like' tweeting

Abstract

The focus of this study is on how Twitter users construe *talk-like tweeting* in metalinguistic utterances. In a material of tweets containing or responding to explicit comparisons of tweeting to talking (N = 520), a broad range of construals are identified, showing Twitter users associating talk-likeness with, e.g., notions of the textual representation of voice, of grammatical (in-)correctness, of accurately reflecting one's 'real-life' identity, and of regional or social variation in language use. These associations frequently serve normative functions, enforcing or contesting linguistic and discursive norms in both serious and playful ways. The findings offer a novel perspective on the oft-debated orality of computer-mediated discourse, providing a window on how a process of enregisterment (Agha, 2007) is instantiated and how language norms are actively negotiated by participants in everyday online language use on Twitter.

Keywords: talk; orality; Twitter; normativity; reflexivity; metalinguistic; enregisterment

1. Introduction

The focus of the present study is on how users of the microblogging platform Twitter themselves construe *Talk-Like Tweeting* (TLT) when explicitly comparing Twitter discourse to talk (illustrated in Example 1).

(1) [sherry] **tweets like she talks**.....too fast

A material of tweets similar to (1) are analyzed in terms of how different conceptualizations and evaluations are expressed concerning tweeting, talking, and TLT.¹ Thus, the study aims to contribute a novel perspective on computer-mediated *orality* and to use metalinguistic activity as a window on how everyday language normativity is performed and how Twitter is *enregistered* (Agha, 2007; see Section 2).

¹ The acronym *TLT* is not introduced here as a theoretical innovation, but merely to enable ease of reference throughout the analyses presented below.

Linguistic research on computer-mediated communication (CMC) has frequently addressed the orality of written language in online contexts, often responding to popular assumptions that written CMC is somehow extensively spoken-like. Research has tended to reveal a more “mixed profile” in terms of how spoken-like CMC may be across different platforms (Baron, 2013, p. 148), along with a general emphasis on variation across CMC modes (Crystal, 2006; Dresner, 2005; Herring & Androutsopoulos, 2015; Herring, Stein, & Virtanen, 2013). Orality is a broad notion with aspects ranging from linguistic form to the cultural and ideological (Dürscheid & Frehner, 2013, pp. 46–48; see also Koch & Oesterreicher, 1994). Thus, it can encompass anything from structural features statistically associated with spoken registers or genres (Biber, 1988; Jonsson, 2013) to cognitive or cultural traits and social values associated with oral as opposed to literate traditions (Jahandarie, 1999; Ong, 1982). Arguably, CMC research has tended to focus on the former rather than the latter, though various scholars target different levels of discourse. These range from textual features (“speech-imitating” respellings, expressive typography, “paralinguistic” features such as emoticons, etc.; see e.g. Baron, 2009; Darics, 2013; Mar, 2006; Tagg, 2011; Walther, 2005), to interactional organization (synchronicity, rhythm, conversational floor, turn-taking, etc.; see e.g. Herring, 1999; R. Jones, 2013; Meredith & Stokoe, 2014; Simpson, 2005; Örnberg Berglund, 2009).

Orality has thus been of interest to CMC scholars. However, while there is a growing body of linguistic and interaction-oriented research on Twitter (see e.g. Page, 2012, 2014; Papacharissi, 2010; Zappavigna, 2012, 2014), research focusing expressly on the spoken-like or conversational quality of Twitter discourse appears to be quite limited. As one example, Honeycutt and Herring (2009) note how some of Twitter’s affordances enable and restrict conversational interaction and collaboration, focusing especially on Twitter’s addressivity device (the @-symbol prefacing a username, which tags a user in a tweet). Similarly, boyd, Golder, and Lotan (2010) discuss retweeting (i.e., reposting, and possibly commenting on, another user’s tweet) as a conversational practice, characterizing the conversationality afforded by retweeting as relatively loose in terms of coherence and broad in participatory scope. In a study on Twitter targeting spoken-like linguistic form, [Author] (2014a) examined reported speech using informal reporting frames such as *GO* or *BE like*. Specifically, [Author] identified a number of strategies (e.g. marked spelling choices and typographic iconicity) employed by Twitter users to animate their speech reports in ways that are partly comparable to face-to-face animation strategies such as voice imitation or gestures. Studies like these

indicate that Twitter affords some type of interactional conversationality, as well as some formal features that have been associated with spoken-likeness in research on other platforms. However, as with previous work, these studies approach computer-mediated orality 'from the outside.' That is, features of CMC platforms or CMC discourse are assessed as being potentially spoken-like or conversational based on external criteria selected by the researcher. By contrast, the present study takes a novel approach by attempting to identify endogenous, or discourse-internal, perspectives.

The specific discourse-internal perspectives in focus in this study are *user construals* of what it means to tweet like one talks. Thus, the study is designed to target metalinguistic activity on Twitter in which the discourse participants themselves do the conceptual and normative work of characterizing their linguistic register (cf. Agha, 2007, pp. 17–21). The study aims to determine what users of Twitter themselves associate with TLT, what the situated functions of these associations are, what norms they index, and how this reflexive activity contributes to the construction of Twitter as a register.

2. Enregisterment and Twitter

The kind of metalinguistic activity in focus here forms part of what Agha (2003, 2004, 2007) calls processes of *enregisterment*. A *register* may be regarded as a cultural model of discourse, a “classification of discourse [type] – linking speech repertoires to typifications of actor, relationship and conduct” (Agha, 2007, p. 145). In Agha’s linguistic anthropological framework, registers are regarded as being produced and maintained through social practices, which means that the study of register is the study of “reflexive social processes” (Agha, 2007, p. 146). This view of register may thus be contrasted with, e.g., the approach preferred by Biber and Conrad (2009), which construes register as a scholarly perspective on discourse that “combines an analysis of linguistic characteristics that are common in a text variety with analysis of the situation of use of the variety” (p. 2). That is to say, the framework employed here focuses on register as constructed ‘within’ the discourse, reflexively produced and indexed by discourse participants, rather than as it may be constructed from the outside (cf. the approach to Facebook interaction taken in Stæhr, 2015). Agha’s framework for thinking about register is thus preferred here because of how it corresponds with the aim of the present study.

Twitter is a widely used microblogging and social networking service (boyd & Ellison, 2007), which is perhaps too diverse a platform for linguistic interaction to be described as a single register in a traditional sense. Users of Twitter range from private individuals sharing slice-of-life status updates intended for close friends to official user accounts of institutions or businesses sharing information or managing public relations. This diversity aside, however, the metalinguistic comparisons of tweeting to talking analyzed below form part of a process of enregisterment in Agha's sense. These Twitter users are positioning and negotiating the linguistic character of their platform, contributing to turning Twitter style into a socially recognizable register (cf. Johnstone, 2010). The notion of Twitter language as a differentiable register is broadly comparable to the conceptualization of SMS text messaging by Tagg (2011, p. 9) as a more-or-less distinct form of discourse, *Txt*, "that emerges through a configuration of texting strategies" (see also Shortis, 2007). However, in this regard, the purpose of the present study is not to identify such a configuration of "strategies" per se, but rather to identify how users metalinguistically index their own ideas of what characterizes Twitter discourse.

The social process of enregisterment is also, centrally, a performance of linguistic normativity, perhaps most obviously in terms of *competing valorizations* (Agha, 2007, pp. 157–159). That is, several models of the 'same' register may be at play in competition with one another, serving different normative agendas in terms of how they characterize the register. As a case in point regarding competing valorizations of Twitter in the public sphere, a 2011 *Telegraph* article attracted attention when it cited actor Ralph Fiennes blaming Twitter's famous 140 character length constraint for supposed linguistic decay (L. Jones, 2011). As this story was spread, some agreed whereas others came to Twitter's defense, rejecting language snobbery and claiming that Twitter communication is actually "making [the English language] better" (Greenfield, 2011). Research on CMC has to some extent addressed questions of how various modes of CMC may be evaluated (see e.g. Baron, 2008; Crystal, 2008; Thurlow & Brown, 2003; Turkle, 1996; Varnhagen et al., 2010), often with a focus on challenging popular, or 'folk,' valorizations. In a particularly explicit response to folk linguistic construals, Thurlow (2006) analyzed a large number of international press articles commenting on forms of communication such as text messaging. He found that construals of CMC in this material tended to be negatively framed, and tended to exaggerate the differences between online and offline language relative to scholarly descriptions. The

present study does not further consider debates in the media, but continues in the vein of investigating the normative dimension of folk linguistic construals. The folk linguistics considered here is contained in, rather than produced about, computer-mediated discourse. What Twitter users do in comparing tweeting to talking, as the analyses will show, is to engage in the everyday performance of linguistic normativity.

3. Material and method

In line with the aim of investigating metalinguistic activity comparing tweeting with talking, this study uses a targeted retrieval method. Specifically, the material for this study comprise a set of retrievals of the search string “tweet/-s like [pronoun] talk/-s” for each of the pronouns *I*, *you*, *he*, *she*, and *they*. This search string was settled on after initial test searches using various strings with roughly equivalent paradigmatic substitutions (e.g. *write* for *tweet* or *speak* for *talk*). Focusing solely on this string was preferred for three main reasons. Firstly, the string yielded a high ratio of relevant to irrelevant retrievals (that is, good precision in terms of targeting metalinguistic activity). Secondly, the inclusion of variant strings would raise problems of comparability (e.g. in terms of comparing one user’s notion of talk-like tweeting to another’s notion of speech-like writing). Thirdly, the avoidance of variants such as *write* for *tweet* permits a more stringent focus on how users of Twitter construe linguistic activity on Twitter specifically.

The searches were conducted in February, 2015, using the advanced search interface provided by Twitter (<http://www.twitter.com/search-advanced>). Separate searches were conducted for each of the exact phrases listed in Table 1. For each of the searches, “All” rather than the filtered “Top” search results were displayed and sorted by date, and the 60 most recent occurrences, limited by end-date August 31, 2014, were collected.² The first person plural *we* was excluded, on the basis that it provided comparatively few relevant retrievals. For the other pronouns, only a small number of individual instances had to be excluded (due to syntactic irrelevance, e.g. “How do people even tweet? Like I talk to myself.” or “I tweet like I talk to somebody but I only talk to myself”).³

² The end date was arbitrarily chosen. Since the most recent occurrences were collected, the material comprises tweets posted during the summer of 2014, though a few tweets date back as far as March, 2014.

³ Note that Twitter’s exact phrase search ignores case and punctuation.

As Table 1 shows, out of the 300 retrievals, 230 are individual tweets (column “Single”). Further, Twitter users can *reply* to another user’s tweet, creating a chain of two or more tweets that Twitter automatically marks as a *conversation* (column “Convers.”). The 70 retrievals marked as part of such conversations were collected together with the rest of their respective reply-chains. In total, 220 additional tweets from such reply-chains were collected as conversational cotexts (column “Cotexts”).

Table 1. Outline of the TLT material.

<i>Search string</i>	<i>Retriev.</i>	<i>Single</i>	<i>Convers.</i>	<i>Cotexts</i>	<i>Total</i>
a) “tweet like i talk”	60	50	10	29	89
b) “tweet like you talk”	60	33	27	80	140
c) “tweet like he talks”	60	45	15	51	111
d) “tweet like she talks”	60	48	12	32	92
e) “tweet like they talk”	60	54	6	28	88
Total	300	230	70	220	520

3.1 Analytical procedure

The analytical procedure was informed by the ethnomethodological/conversation analytic emphasis on uncovering discourse-internal perspectives and prioritizing participant understandings (Garfinkel, 1996; Goodwin & Heritage, 1990; Schegloff, 1997, 2005). The procedure may thus be characterized as inductive microanalysis (see Giles, Stommel, Paulus, Lester, & Reed, 2015). In line with this ‘bottom-up’ approach, the material was not analyzed according to an a priori coding scheme. There were attempts to develop a set of categories from the material, to enable a quantitative overview of how different types of construals were distributed. To this end, all instances in the material were read on a case-by-case basis with a focus on (1) what categories, if any, are associated with talk-likeness; (2) what evaluations, if any, are expressed in relation to TLT; and (3) what the authors of the tweets are doing by comparing tweeting to talking (for example, ‘complaining’ or ‘justifying stylistic choices’). However, while these analytical foci are still retained in the discussion of examples below, it was ultimately concluded that rigid categorization would do disservice to the complexity and nuance found in the various construals of TLT. Instead, it was decided to organize the presentation of the analyses in terms of somewhat more loosely defined themes.

Section 4 is thus divided into five thematic subsections which focus on describing and discussing selected examples. In order of presentation, the sections discuss notions of 'hearing' someone's voice in their tweets, the enforcing or challenging of conventional prescriptive norms, notions of somehow self-filtering the verbal content of one's tweets, notions of being 'real' in presenting oneself on Twitter, and notions of regional or social linguistic variation being reflected in tweets. In contrast to a set of typological categories, these themes can interweave. For instance, a single tweet could orient to a prescriptivist norm by complaining about how someone's spelling choices corresponds with how their social demographic supposedly sound when they speak, and would thus be representative of multiple themes at once. This particular set of five themes was settled on for two main reasons. Firstly, they were recurrent in the material, making them at least somewhat less likely to merely reflect completely idiosyncratic construals. Secondly, and more importantly, they capture the wide conceptual range of what is associated with TLT in the material, which goes from formal linguistic features to questions of individual and group identity, as well as the range of ways in which linguistic normativity is performed throughout

4. Findings

This section presents the results of the analyses, focusing on discussing selected examples from the material. Given the targeted selection of material, all individual tweets or conversations analyzed contain an explicit comparison of tweeting to talking. However, these comparisons are not always elaborated. Out of the 300 retrievals, 38 contained no identifiable conceptual or evaluative construal of TLT (see Example 2). Further, the 262 retrievals comprising some kind of construal vary in terms of how extended and explicit the construals of TLT are. In (3), for instance, there is an evaluation ("I love") coupled with a conceptual construal associating TLT with "commas and pauses and what not." In (4), however, there is only an evaluation ("it's so cute").

- (2) [Timmy] **tweets like he talks.**
- (3) I love that [Charlie] **tweets like he talks..** with commas and pauses and what not
- (4) He **tweets like he talks** lol, it's so cute.

In the presentation of examples from the material, all personal names and usernames except those of celebrities and public figures are anonymized.⁴ Altered personal names are put in square brackets. Usernames typically occur in the material by way of Twitter's mention- and addressivity-device @. When a username occurs in the body of a tweet as, e.g., @userB, this means that the tweet is addressing or mentioning User B, not that User B is the author of the tweet. If an example contains only one username, it is anonymized as @user, while multiple usernames will be labeled as @userA, @userB, etc. For simplicity, female personal pronouns will be employed to refer to the anonymized users in all cases except when male pronouns are directly motivated by the material itself.

4.1 Hearing familiar voices

Several of the explicit construals of TLT in the material were found to construe the notion in terms of 'hearing' someone's voice in their tweets, or suggesting that the tweets could or should be read in someone's voice.⁵ From a standpoint of linguistic normativity, such instances may be seen as reproducing on a micro-level a norm of positioning talk as prior to writing, the oral as primary to the literate (Ong, 1982), but to various degrees of explicitness.

Example (5) puts emphasis on the idea that some tweets can be heard in someone's voice by suggesting that this is what it means to really ("rely") tweet like one talks. Example (6), further, indicates a causal connection by means of the conjunctive *so*, stating that the user can hear Abby's voice in her head as a result of Abby tweeting like she talks.

- (5) Joseline rely **tweets like she talks** and I hear it in her voice lmao
- (6) [abby] **tweets like she talks** so everytime I read her tweets i can hear her voice in my head saying the words it's so funny

In both cases, what the users are doing is expressing amusement at someone's TLT (*lmao* 'laughing my ass off'; "it's so funny"), in reference to a reality TV celebrity (Joseline Hernandez) and a personal acquaintance respectively.

Example (7) is also focused on the voice of a celebrity. It shows a sequence of tweets from a single user, negatively evaluating the supposed TLT of "rdj," actor Robert Downey Jr.

⁴ Since all tweets collected for this study were publicly posted, anonymization is strictly speaking a mere courtesy, not a safeguarding of identity. Celebrities and public figures are excepted on the assumption that they are more likely to expect – and perhaps actively desire – that their tweets may be scrutinized by readers outside of their immediate acquaintances and circles of followers.

⁵ There was also a single instance making reference to visualizing embodiment, specifically to "seeing" someone's "face and body" in reading a specific tweet.

Downey Jr.'s voice is positioned as a kind of familiar and shared resource in the second tweet, where A not only claims to be able to hear his voice in his tweets herself, but claims that “you can actually hear him talking...”.

(7)

User A rdj is gonna ruin my fucking life
User A he **tweets like he talks** it's like you can actually hear him talking when
you read his tweets it is torture
User A @userB i am telling u this is the end of the world
User A @userB i really can't think of any better way

Rather than simply expressing amusement, User A performs a highly playful evaluation of TLT. User A heaps hyperbolic scorn on Downey Jr.'s TLT, culminating in the prophecy, specifically directed at User B, that “this is the end of the world.”⁶ The shift in tone in the final tweet, “i really can't think of any better way [for the world to end]” structures the series of tweets as a comic setup leading into a punchline.

In Example (8), User A is attributing an utterance in quotes to Barbara “Babs” Evans, either reporting something that Babs said on the MTV show *Teen Mom 2* or mimicking something one might imagine her saying.

(8)

User A "JAH-nelle it's time TA go get yah aborshannnnn!!!" -Babs #TeenMom2
User B @userA have you read her tweets? She **tweets like she talks!** It's
awesome! @BabsEvansMTV #TeenMom2

User B's reply mentions Babs Evans' username and evaluates Babs' tweeting positively as being talk-like. Thus, it seems that A's stylization of Babs' speech is what occasions the comparison of tweeting to talking. While the connection is not made explicitly, it seems plausible that B is reacting to the formal features of the quote – case-alternation, letter repetition, respelling, and emphatic punctuation (cf. e.g. Darics, 2013; Tagg, 2011).

Only a few construals of TLT in the material comprise more concrete notions of how written form might correspond to vocal sound or prosody (more concrete relative to holistic notions of hearing someone's voice). Example (3) above associated TLT with “commas and pauses,” and may thus have implicitly reproduced a somewhat clichéd notion that commas in writing represent pauses in speech. Another such conventional notion is the idea that typing in capital letters can represent loud speech or shouting (but see Darics, 2015, for a more nuanced view

⁶ There may have been replies from User B that have subsequently been deleted; however, in the list of search results as it appeared during retrieval, it seems as if User A was replying to her own tweets and B did not respond.

of what all caps can accomplish in CMC). Examples (9)–(11) show three different users orienting to this notion.

- (9) It's good to see Stephen A **tweets like he talks** #CAPSLOCK
- (10) @user **tweets like she talks**, in all caps. That bitch always be yelling #HOLLA
- (11) [Sheila] even **tweets like she talks**. Caps lock = Shouting

Example (9) is one out of four tweets in the material commenting specifically on the tweets of ESPN sports commentator Stephen A. Smith. In this case, the comparison of tweeting to talking is complemented by a hashtag, which functions along the lines of the “explanatory addition” category of tag uses described by Author (2014b). Here, the hashtag both references and demonstrates the common computer keyboard affordance of typing in all-capitals by toggling the “caps lock.” In (10) and (11), the construals of TLT are more explicitly connecting “all caps” in tweeting to yelling or shouting in speech. It is ambiguous in (10) whether the hashtag “#HOLLA” should be read as the direct object of *yelling* or as being positioned outside of the clause, but it is nevertheless clear that the capitalization of the tag is illustrative, as in (9).

Example (12) shows a user portraying herself as baffled to the point of speechlessness (see the emoji and the hashtag) as a result of some unspecified party (singular *they*) tweeting like she talks. The user not only associates TLT with feeling “like you can hear them say what they tweeted” but also associates this feeling with knowing a person. Example (13) does not contain any reference to hearing someone’s voice in their tweets but is similar to (12) in terms of associating TLT with knowing someone or knowing from experience how someone talks.

- (12) When you know a person and they **tweet like they talk** and you feel like you can hear them say what they tweeted 🤔 #Speechless
- (13) If you ever heard me talk you know I **tweet like I talk**

Both of these examples make explicit the assumption that knowing someone, having experience of face-to-face interaction with someone, or having at least heard someone talk are preconditions for assessing whether they tweet like they talk. With (13), the terse phrasing leaves open the possibility that it may not really be about how the person sounds, but rather about utterance content or some other aspect of how they talk. To this extent, (13) may be seen as suggesting, but only by implication, that tweeting like one talks means accurately

representing on Twitter what one is 'really' like as a person (instances which explicitly express this notion are presented in Section 4.4).

From an analyst's perspective, it is difficult to gauge whether certain formal properties of written online discourse may reasonably be taken as somehow corresponding to formal properties or non-verbal or paralinguistic elements of face-to-face interaction. For instance, it may seem likely that an orthographic rendering of *that* as 'dat' is intended to represent a manner of pronouncing the word – perhaps, for instance, as a way of representing or performing a Black Vernacular English spoken accent – but most of the time such analyses are strictly speaking speculative. The approach taken here of focusing on Twitter users' self-understandings of what they are doing and why they are doing it lend a certain kind of support to such speculative leaps. However, as is indicated by the examples presented here, as well as ones focused on spelling in Section 4.2, notions of textual forms representing voice or speech are interweaved with notions of self-presentation and normative appropriateness.

4.2 Enforcing or contesting spelling and grammar norms

Several instances in the material show users orienting to what may be termed prescriptive norms of language usage. As noted above, linguistic normativity is on some level implicitly present in most, if not all, elaborated construals of TLT in the material, but becomes especially visible in cases like these, which explicitly connect TLT with notions of incorrect spelling or grammar. These cases also clearly illustrate competing valorizations, both when it comes to how categories such as talk, spelling, and grammar are evaluated, and in the ongoing formulation of Twitter's linguistic norms. For instance, (14) shows a user apparently responding to tweets complaining about poor spelling.

- (14) LOL IF U TALKIN BOUT ME I KNOW HOW TO SPELL I JUST **TWEET**
 LIKE I TALK

Example (14) specifically connects TLT with a purposeful deviation from standard spelling, distinguishing this from an inability to spell. This expresses a folk linguistic equivalent to a scholarly distinction between an orthographical norm (i.e. a norm of 'correct' spelling) and a notion of functional and socially meaningful *respelling* (cf. Tagg, 2011). The conversational exchange in (15) shows this normative distinction being negotiated by two users in reaction to a tweet by the previously mentioned Babs Evans from the television show *Teen Mom 2* (see Section 4.1).

(15)

Babs WHO DID WHAT TADAY?
 User A @BabsEvansMTV HOW ABOUT TAKING SPELLING 101...
 User B @userA @BabsEvansMTV she **tweets like she talks** lol chill.

Babs' initial tweet is apparently an open invitation to her followers to share what they have been up to during the day. User A replies with the suggestion that Babs should take a course in basic orthography ("SPELLING 101"), presumably reacting to the form "TADAY." User B replies to A, admonishing A to calm down ("chill"), thus construing A's suggestion as overly critical or aggressive. B's reply suggests TLT as an explanation for, and by implication legitimization of, the 'misspelling.'

Other tweets in the material associate TLT with incorrect grammar. Examples (16)–(18) illustrate this association.

- (16) Some people **tweet like they talk** 😂😞 with that fucked up ass grammar
- (17) I hate when people text or **tweet like they talk** , where is your proper grammar ?
- (18) Ugh she **tweets like she talks**.. Full of ignorance and grammatical errors

Example (16) is a comment about "people" in general who tweet like they talk. The explicit construal makes clear that "fucked up ass grammar" is the salient characteristic of TLT. Similarly, (17) invokes "proper grammar" as a characteristic that is notably absent from talk-like tweets (as well as texts). Crucially, both of these examples express a presupposition that talk itself is grammatically deficient. Example (18) differs slightly in that it refers to the Twitter discourse and talk of a specific individual rather than a general collective. Her tweeting, like her talk, is "[f]ull of ignorance and grammatical errors." Deficient grammar is thus construed in (18) as a feature of this specific individual's talk rather than as a feature of talk in general. It is still, however, strongly normative in how it implies a connection between grammatical errors and "ignorance."

Example (19) also features a construal centered on "proper grammar," but differs notably in terms of normativity.

- (19) I **tweet like I talk**...I'll use proper grammar when I need/want to

Examples (16)–(18) express negative sentiment concerning talk-like grammar in tweets ("fucked up," "I hate...", "Ugh"). The author of (19), on the other hand, construes "proper

grammar” as something to be employed if required. In this way, the author of (19) orients to a notion of adapting language use to contextual requirements, and preempts negative evaluations of her own Twitter discourse. This user thus construes grammatical norms in a manner that is comparable to how the author of (14) orients to spelling norms. Further, there is no presupposition in (19) that talk is grammatically deficient. Thus, there is a diversity of normative stances expressed in the material – a tweet-by-tweet process of “valorization and countervvalorization” (Agha 2007, p. 148) – even when it comes to specific linguistic topics such as spelling or grammar.

4.3 Filter or no filter: self-editing norms

Several construals of TLT in the material may be characterized as centering on a verbal or lexical level, as opposed to the levels of spelling or grammar covered in Section 4.2. For instance, in (20), a user connects TLT with use of the discourse marker *like*, apparently feeling a need to remove this marker from her tweets to make them less talk-like.

(20) I **tweet like I talk** . I have to take "Like" out of almost all my tweets 😂

(21) 😂😂 sometimes when I **tweet like I talk** it doesn't make any sense.
Smh lol I add so many verbal fillers

Similarly, in (21), a user is construing her own tweeting as talk-like – in this instance by reference to “verbal fillers” – and orienting to this form of talk-likeness as a source of incomprehensibility (“it doesn’t make any sense”). In both cases the tone is playful (see the emojis, and the acronyms *lol* and *smh* ‘shaking my head’). Nonetheless, the notions expressed – that *like* is an item that should be removed and that there are such things as “verbal fillers” which cause incomprehensibility – reproduce a kind of stylistic normativity. As with some of the grammar and spelling examples, thus, these instances show linguistic feature being associated with talk and construed as deficient or inappropriate.

Other instances in the material center on verbal quantity rather than word choice, as exemplified in (22). The very notion that there is such a thing as tweeting “too much,” especially coupled with apologetic hashtags, implies a normative expectation that one should restrict one’s Twitter production. Still other users orient to a notion of not ‘filtering’ oneself, as shown in (23)–(24). In (23), it is unclear whether what supposedly would need filtering is the amount or the type of verbal content, whereas (24) specifically focalizes “vulgarity.”

- (22) I **tweet like I talk**.. Too much. #timetoshutup #sorryppl #canthelpmyself
- (23) @user I agree with that. I just **tweet like I talk**. There's really no filter where I'm concerned. I'm an acquired taste :)
- (24) I **tweet like I talk**. Vulgarities and all. Don't like it? Fuck you too.

The suggested transfer, at least in (22), of a norm of not talking too much from the domain of face-to-face interaction is perhaps most interesting because on Twitter, one's quantity of production is unlikely to impinge on other participants' access to the conversational floor. While instances such as (20)–(21) and (22)–(23) presuppose the appropriateness of some kind of self-filtering in how expresses oneself on Twitter, the authors of (23) and (24) notably display resistance to such norms. To this extent, (23) and (24) are similar to some of the instances centered on being 'real,' discussed in Section 4.4.

4.4 Keeping it real

Many instances in the material may be seen as implying that tweeting like one talks in some way means being 'real' or representing one's offline identity accurately, as noted in Section 4.1. This section focuses on instances where this norm is made explicit. For instance, (25) begins with User A posting a general reflection concerning how someone's tweets may eventually add up to revealing an "accurate picture" of their personality, clearly positioning Twitter as a secondary representation.

- (25) User A Twitter, like a reality show, won't reveal "exactly" who someone is. But over time, reveals a pretty accurate picture of ones personality...
- User B @userA yup I **tweet like i talk** so yeah uh huh

User B agrees with this idea. Further, B adds the self-evaluation that she tweets like she talks to that agreement, framing TLT as a form of warrant for the accuracy of self-representation ("I tweet like i talk so yeah").

In a similar vein, examples (26)–(27) feature explicit distinctions between Twitter discourse and "the real world" or "real life." In (28), there is a similar distinction made between tweeting and "actually saying" something.

- (26) Its like weird when you know someone and they don't **tweet like they talk** in the real world.. Funny as hell tho
- (27) Only a handful of my followers **tweet like they Talk** in real life.
acting hard but can't show hands when they get called for it

- (28) People don't **tweet like they talk**. Cause niggas definitely wouldn't be actually saying some of the shit they tweet 😂

These distinctions reproduce a conventional division between the virtual and the real, construing online discourse and online identity as something apart from discourse and identity 'in real life' (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006, pp. 244–246; see also Deumert, 2014). While authors of such utterances do not necessarily consciously intend to construe virtual discourse as less real in a literal sense, they are plainly employing metalanguage that reproduces such an assumption. The supposed failures of accurate representations of real life selves mentioned in (26)-(28) are construed as funny rather than seriously disconcerting. However, these playful reactions still index a normative assumption that linguistic identity performances in the virtual domain would normally be expected to correspond accurately to the non-virtual domain (cf. the discussion of 'accented' tweeting in Section 4.5).

A slightly different association between talk-like tweeting and identity also emerged in the material, having to do with identification rather than self-representation. Example (29) shows a user protesting that another user must "not really" be reality TV star Joseline Hernandez. Supposedly, the impostor is too grammatically correct, which implies that the real Joseline talks 'incorrectly' and would be identifiable from tweeting in this incorrect way.

- (29) The reason I know it's not really Joseline is because she's too grammatically correct. Jos **tweets like she talks**.
(30) Why do yawl think she's hacked? She **tweets like she talks** so I'm confused. 😂😂

Interestingly, the author of (30), who is not communicating directly with the author of (29) but is referring to the same Joseline, has the opposite opinion. In (30), it is suggested that there is no reason to suspect that there is an impostor ("Why do yawl think she's hacked?") precisely because she tweets like she talks. There is no further elaboration of the notion of talk-likeness, but it is clear that (29) and (30) are alike in construing tweeting like one talks as a salient warrant for *identification* (even though different conclusions are reached). This may be compared with the instances associating familiarity with being able to hear someone's voice in their tweets described in Section 4.1.

Finally, Example (31) shows a user asking whether either of two Twitter accounts is the "real thing" (that is, really the American women's basketball coach Lin Dunn).

- (31) Is [@coachlindunn](#) the real thing? [@Coach_Dunn](#) is verified, but [@Catchin24](#) RTed the 1st one. Just gimme the one that **tweets like she talks**.

The user account mentioned second is apparently “verified,” which means that Twitter has confirmed the identity of the account holder.⁷ Interestingly, the author of (31) then requests “the one that tweets like she talks,” assuming no necessary link between tweeting like coach Lin Dunn and actually being Lin Dunn. This means that there are competing assumptions at play also when it comes to whether TLT permits identification or not.

4.5 How they talk: regional or social variation

In several instances, the notion of talk-likeness is explicitly substantiated by reference to some kind of group belonging, e.g. national, ethnic, or social, that is construed as talking in some characteristic way. This was most prevalent with the third person plural retrievals (“tweet like they talk”). This may be in line with expectations, on the assumption that we are more likely to engage in this kind of stereotyping of talk when it comes to groups we do not ourselves belong to. A few instances in the material involved references to regional groups, such as in Examples (32)–(34).

- (32) Recently started following some NYC folk. They really **tweet like they talk**.
 (33) 🥲🥲🥲 People from South Louisiana **tweet like they talk** shit be funny
 (34) when people from different areas of the country **tweet like they talk**, I get so confused and I don't really know what's happening

Examples (32) and (33) refer to Twitter users from New York (“NYC folk”) and “South Louisiana” respectively. Neither case contains any explicit elaboration on what aspects of their tweets are talk-like, although (33) does contain evaluation by means of multiple crying emojis and the comment “shit be funny.” Example (34) shows a user expressing confusion at “people from different areas of the country” tweeting like they talk, without further elaboration. Examples (35)–(37) show similar references to national or ethnic group belonging.

- (35) It's funny when Scottish people **tweet like they talk**
 (36) When mexicans **tweet like they talk** 🥲 It's the funniest thing ever
 (37) my lil' cousin half Jamaican and **tweet like they talk**. I don't understand shit she be talking bout!

⁷ This is typically done for public personalities to allow followers to distinguish trusted accounts from impostors.

Both (35) and (36) are expressions of amusement at Scottish and Mexican people, respectively, who tweet like they talk. Example (37) refers specifically the user's half-Jamaican cousin, who is construed as tweeting like Jamaicans in general supposedly talk. The user associates this specific form of talk-likeness with incomprehensibility. In terms of linguistic normativity, it is notable that a Twitter user orienting to 'Mexican TLT' as funny or to 'Jamaican-like' tweeting as incomprehensible is indexing an expectation that Twitter language in general does not reflect spoken accent. This in and of itself constructs a norm – 'accented' tweeting would not be laughable or incomprehensible if it were normal. In this sense, even the a laughing emoji to a tweet is the kind of "reflexive operation" that "can fractionally transform a norm" (Agha, 2007, p. 8).

Example (38) features a more detailed construal, emerging over several conversational turns, which makes relevant lexical and orthographic textual properties.

- (38)
- User A Lol I don't understand"@userB: Ao else uwan mk e b..like we pooing?
@userA: Nigerians **tweet like they talk**... In every essence."
User A LMAO no need to prove"@userB: Ao else uwan mk e b..like we pooing?
@userA: Nigerians **tweet like they talk**... In every essence.""
User B Lol "@userA: LMAO no need to prove"@userB: Ao else uwan mk e
b..like we pooing? @userA: Nigerians **tweet like they talk**..

The first tweet from User A contains previous turns in the exchange as quotes within quotes. User A originally posted the tweet "Nigerians tweet like they talk... In every essence," which User B subsequently quoted with the comment "Ao else uwan mk e b..like we pooing?" While no explanation is given in the material, this string of discourse could perhaps be glossed as something like 'How else do you want to make it be? [That we tweet] like we poo?'⁸ In the first tweet of (43), User A orients to the utterance as incomprehensible ("I don't understand"). Subsequently, however, A preempts any explanation from B by posting another tweet expressing an understanding, "LMAO no need to prove," indicating that A now construes B's obscure utterance as an amusing (*LMAO*) demonstration of how Nigerians tweet like they talk. User B neither affirms nor resists this understanding, but indicates laughter (*lol*).

Examples (39) and (40) show users invoking other identity categories in a similar manner.

⁸ Note that if the suggested gloss is correct, User B is playfully indexing a norm that directly contradicts the one discussed in relation to (35)–(37), namely that it is only natural that Nigerians tweet like they talk.

- (39) If teenage girls would just **tweet like they talk**. Then that would be like incredible like 4real [#TweetLikeATeenagegirl](#)
- (40) Like most males I **tweet like I talk!** Short, sharp, to the point and move on! Unlike most females who would go on forever given the chance

Specifically, (39) makes relevant two age-related categories, *teenage* and *girl*, of which the latter is obviously also a gendered category. There is no further explicit description of how teenage girls talk. It seems plausible to understand the tweet itself as an imitative performance of the talk-like style that teenage girls supposedly display (note especially the stylized overuse of focuser “like,” a feature stereotypically associated with the speech of young females; see e.g. Dailey-O’Cain, 2000). This understanding is especially invited by the imperative hashtag *#TweetLikeATeenagegirl*. Example (40) shows a user explicitly construing the qualities “Short, sharp, to the point” as characteristic of male talk as well as male TLT. The user also explicitly contrasts these qualities with the discourse of “most females.” This characterization reproduces familiar stereotypical ideas of men being “more direct speakers” (Cameron, 2003, p. 450; see also Talbot, 2003).

As is the case with many examples throughout the material, it is unclear in the absence of contextual information what exactly the users accomplish (or, more so, what they may be intending to accomplish) by invoking these identity categories. Example (39), for instance, may be understood as expressing annoyance, or as either playfully or maliciously performing a joke, by way of the construal of teenage girls’ talking and tweeting. Regardless, the tweet is constructed as a relevant contribution to the timeline of the hashtag *#TweetLikeATeenagegirl*, which appears to be relatively frequently employed by a variety of users. The precise functions these users identity categories aside, however, it is plainly the case that users of Twitter repeatedly make notions of identity relevant to notions of talk and TLT.

5. Discussion and conclusion

As noted in the Section 1, this study aims to complement previous research on the orality of CMC by its focus on endogenous construals. There is certainly value in an approach to the spoken-like or conversational style of informal written online language focused on linguistic form and structure from the theoretically informed, as opposed to ‘folk,’ perspective of the linguist. As Johnstone (2010, p. 4) notes, “‘style’ can label a set of patterns of co-occurrence that an outsider such as a researcher notices, but which an insider ... may not notice and probably does not label.” However, when these “insiders” start reflexively orienting toward

their own style as an object of discourse-internal scrutiny, there is plain, emic evidence of enregisterment (Johnstone, 2010, p. 5). As the present findings show, from the participants' perspectives, the relationship between literacy and orality is not just a matter of observable form, but also a matter of what meanings and values are attached to forms, and how such meanings and values are enacted and negotiated.

The construals of TLT in the material described above show a lot of diversity in terms of how talk and talk-like tweeting are conceptualized, as well as in terms of what functions the comparisons of tweeting to talking have. The construals are frequently directly pertinent to notions common in both popular debate and scholarly work, such as mode, register, correctness, appropriateness, and social variation. Formal linguistic features are made relevant only to a limited extent, e.g. in instances associating talk-likeness with grammatical and orthographic (in-)correctness or with textual means of representing dialect, accent, or personal voice. Evaluations are, by contrast, frequently present. There are competing valorizations at play between users who find TLT amusing and those who find it annoying, as well as between those who use comparisons of tweeting to talking to enforce 'traditional' or prescriptivist linguistic norms and those who resist or challenge such norms. In addition, the material features performances of affiliation with identity categories or notions of authentic identity, and the positioning of virtual discourse as an unreal second to real life interaction. Crucially, these various aspects of the construals TLT, ranging from assessments of linguistic forms to performances of social identity, do not happen in isolation from one another, but rather interweave.

It can be argued that when it comes to Twitter, processes of enregisterment such as those shown in this study, are at least partly conditioned by the *collapsed contexts* of social media (Marwick & boyd, 2011). Androutsopoulos (2014, p. 72), looking at audience design on Facebook, noted "the capacity of members of the 'invisible' networked audience to speak back and shape language style"; sometimes in his material, a "different slice of the collapsed audience" would step in to comment metalinguistically on a Facebook post, performing a kind of policing function of style and audience design. Something roughly comparable is evident in the conversational part of the present material whenever a Twitter user steps in uninvited to evaluate or otherwise comment on another user's TLT, in some sense policing the register. The notion of context collapse is potentially important here in that the negotiation between different norms (e.g. an orthographic versus a respelling norm) likely reflects a clash of

expectations for what kind of a context Twitter is supposed to be. Some users may experience Twitter as a platform for public, and perhaps mainly professional, writing, while others see it as a platform for private and phatic interpersonal communication, creating a “tension between intimacy and publicness” (Androutsopoulos, 2014, p. 71). Such user expectations are not structurally walled off from one another – the contexts collapse, and that is when expectations need to be reflexively managed.

This study shows how users of a technological communication platform engage in metalinguistic activity which both directly and indirectly differentiates and positions Twitter English in the interface of their various normative conceptions of writing and talk. These norms are expressed in relation to notions of form, content, appropriateness, and social identity. The analysis of a targeted keyword-based selection of material offers an emic window on matters of theoretical interest to the study of language and interaction, showing how a process of register formation is not only instantiated, but also actively negotiated by participants in everyday online language use, engaged in the everyday performance of linguistic normativity.

References

[Author]. (2014a). ---

[Author]. (2014b). ---

Agha, A. (2003). The social life of cultural value. *Language & Communication*, 23(3-4), 231–273. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309\(03\)00012-0](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309(03)00012-0)

Agha, A. (2004). Registers of language. *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, 23–45.

Agha, A. (2007). *Language and social relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Androutsopoulos, J. (2014). Linguaging when contexts collapse: Audience design in social networking. *Discourse, Context and Media*, 4-5, 62–73. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2014.08.006>

Baron, N. S. (2008). *Always on: Language in an online and mobile world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baron, N. S. (2009). The myth of impoverished signal: Dispelling the spoken language fallacy for emoticons in online communication. In J. Vincent & L. Fortunati (Eds.), *Electronic emotion: The mediation of emotion via information and communication technologies* (pp. 107–131). London: Peter Lang.

Baron, N. S. (2013). Instant messaging. In S. C. Herring, D. Stein, & T. Virtanen (Eds.), *Pragmatics of computer-mediated communication* (pp. 135–161). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Benwell, B., & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Biber, D. (1988). *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2009). *Register, genre, and style*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Wikström, P. (2016). when I need/want to: Normativity, identity, and form in user construals of 'talk-like' tweeting. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 14, 54–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2016.09.003>
- boyd, d. m., & Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social Network Sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 210–230. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00393.x>
- boyd, d. m., Golder, S., & Lotan, G. (2010). Tweet, Tweet, Retweet: Conversational Aspects of Retweeting on Twitter. *System Sciences (HICSS), 2010 43rd Hawaii International Conference on*. <http://doi.org/10.1109/HICSS.2010.412>
- Cameron, D. (2003). Gender and Language Ideologies. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The handbook of language and gender* (pp. 447–467). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Crystal, D. (2006). *Language and the Internet* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *Txtng: The gr8 deb8*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2000). The Sociolinguistic Distribution of and Attitudes Toward Focuser like and Quotative like. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4(1), 60–80. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00103>
- Darics, E. (2013). Non-verbal signalling in digital discourse: The case of letter repetition. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 2(3), 141–148. <http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2013.07.002>
- Darics, E. (2015). Deconstruction-Analysis-Explanation: Contextualization in Professional Digital Discourse. In E. Darics (Ed.), *Digital Business Discourse* (pp. 243–264). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. http://doi.org/10.1057/9781137405579_13
- Deumert, A. (2014). The performance of a ludic self on social network(ing) sites. In P. Seargeant & C. Tagg (Eds.), *The language of social media: Identity and community on the internet* (pp. 23–45). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dresner, E. (2005). The Topology of Auditory and Visual Perception, Linguistic Communication, and Interactive Written Discourse. *Language@internet*, 2(2). Retrieved from <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0009-7-1612>
- Dürscheid, C., & Frehner, C. (2013). Email communication. In T. Virtanen, D. Stein, & S. C. Herring (Eds.), *Pragmatics of computer-mediated communication* (pp. 35–54). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Retrieved from <http://libris.kb.se/bib/16539451>
- Garfinkel, H. (1996). Ethnomethodology's Program. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 59(1), 5–21. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2787116>
- Giles, D., Stommel, W., Paulus, T., Lester, J., & Reed, D. (2015). Microanalysis Of Online Data: The methodological development of “digital CA.” *Discourse, Context & Media*, 7, 45–51. <http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2014.12.002>
- Goodwin, C., & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19, 283–307. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2155967>
- Greenfield, R. (2011). Twitter is not the enemy of the English language. *The Wire*. Retrieved from <http://www.thewire.com/technology/2011/10/twitter-not-enemy-english-language/44344/>
- Herring, S. C. (1999). Interactional Coherence in CMC. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 4(4), 0. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.1999.tb00106.x>
- Herring, S. C., & Androutsopoulos, J. (2015). Computer-mediated communication 2.0. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (2nd ed., p. 127). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Herring, S. C., Stein, D., & Virtanen, T. (2013). Introduction to the pragmatics of computer-mediated communication. In S. C. Herring, D. Stein, & T. Virtanen (Eds.), *Pragmatics of computer-mediated communication* (pp. 3–32). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Honeycutt, C., & Herring, S. C. (2009). Beyond Microblogging: Conversation and Collaboration via Twitter. In *HICSS '09. 42nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 2009* (pp. 1–10).

Wikström, P. (2016). when I need/want to: Normativity, identity, and form in user construals of 'talk-like' tweeting. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 14, 54–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2016.09.003>

<http://doi.org/10.1109/HICSS.2009.89>

Jahandarie, K. (1999). *Spoken and written discourse: A multi-disciplinary perspective*. Stamford: Ablex.

Johnstone, B. (2010). *Enregistering style. paper presented at the Rhetoric Society of America conference, May 2010*. Minneapolis: Rhetoric Society of America. Retrieved from <http://repository.cmu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1024&context=english>

Jones, L. (2011). Ralph Fiennes blames Twitter for “eroding” language. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/film/8853427/Ralph-Fiennes-blames-Twitter-for-eroding-language.html>

Jones, R. (2013). Rhythm and timing in chat room interaction. In *Pragmatics of computer mediated communication* (pp. 489–514). De Gruyter Mouton. Retrieved from <http://libris.kb.se/bib/16539451>

Jonsson, E. (2013). *Conversational writing: A multidimensional study of synchronous and supersynchronous computer-mediated communication*. Uppsala University: Engelska institutionen. Retrieved from <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-205653>

Koch, P., & Oesterreicher, W. (1994). Schriftlichkeit und Sprache. In H. Günther & O. Ludwig (Eds.), *Schrift und Schriftlichkeit. Ein interdisziplinäres Handbuch internationaler Forschung* (pp. 587–604). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mar, J. (2006). Leading an active (text) life. How language constructs life in the chat room. In D. Libbs & K.-L. Krause (Eds.), *Cyberlines 2.0. Languages and cultures of the internet* (2nd ed., pp. 49–87). Albert Park: James Nicholas Publishers.

Marwick, A. E., & Boyd, D. M. (2011). I tweet honestly, I tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience. *New Media & Society*, 13(1), 114–133. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1461444810365313>

Meredith, J., & Stokoe, E. (2014). Repair: Comparing Facebook “chat” with spoken interaction. *Discourse & Communication*, 8(2), 181–207. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1750481313510815>

Ong, W. J. (1982). *Orality and literacy: The technologization of the word*. London: Methuen.

Page, R. (2012). The linguistics of self-branding and micro-celebrity in Twitter: The role of hashtags. *Discourse and Communication*, 6(2), 181–201. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1750481312437441>

Page, R. (2014). Hoaxes, hacking and humour: analysing impersonated identity on social network sites. In P. Seargeant & C. Tagg (Eds.), *The Language of Social Media: identity and community on the internet*. (pp. 46–64). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Papacharissi, Z. (2010). *A networked self: Identity, community, and culture on social network sites*. New York: Routledge.

Schegloff, E. A. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse & Society*, 8(2), 165–187. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0957926597008002002>

Schegloff, E. A. (2005). On integrity in inquiry... of the investigated, not the investigator. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4-5), 455–480. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054402>

Shortis, T. (2007). Revoicing txt: Spelling, vernacular orthography and “unregimented writing.” *The Texture of Internet: Netlinguistics in Progress*, 2–23.

Simpson, J. (2005). Conversational floors in synchronous text-based CMC discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(3), 337–361. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605052190>

Stæhr, A. (2015). Reflexivity in Facebook interaction – Enregisterment across written and spoken language practices. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 8, 30–45. <http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2015.05.004>

- Wikström, P. (2016). when I need/want to: Normativity, identity, and form in user construals of 'talk-like' tweeting. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 14, 54–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2016.09.003>
- Tagg, C. (2011). *The discourse of text messaging: Analysis of text message communication*. London: Continuum.
- Talbot, M. (2003). Gender stereotypes: Reproduction and challenge. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The handbook of language and gender* (pp. 468–486). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Thurlow, C. (2006). From Statistical Panic to Moral Panic: The Metadiscursive Construction and Popular Exaggeration of New Media Language in the Print Media. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11(3), 667–701. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.00031.x>
- Thurlow, C., & Brown, A. (2003). Generation Txt? The sociolinguistics of young people's text-messaging. *Discourse Analysis Online*, 1(1), 30.
- Turkle, S. (1996). *Life on the screen. Identity in the age of the Internet*. London: Wiedenfeld & Nicolson.
- Walther, J. B. (2005). Let Me Count the Ways: The Interchange of Verbal and Nonverbal Cues in Computer-Mediated and Face-to-Face Affinity. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 24(1), 36–65. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X04273036>
- Varnhagen, C. K., McFall, P. P., Pugh, N., Routledge, L., Sumida-MacDonald, H., & Kwong, T. E. (2010). Lol: New language and spelling in instant messaging. *Reading and Writing*, 23, 719–733. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-009-9181-y>
- Zappavigna, M. (2012). *Discourse of Twitter and social media: How we use language to create affiliation on the web*. London: Continuum.
- Zappavigna, M. (2014). Coffeetweets: bonding around the bean on Twitter. In P. Seargeant & C. Tagg (Eds.), *The Language of Social Media: Communication and Community on the Internet* (pp. 139–160). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Örnberg Berglund, T. (2009). *Making sense digitally: Conversational coherence in online and mixed-mode contexts*. Department of language studies. Umeå University, Umeå.