Jannis Androutsopoulos (Ed.)
Mediatization and Sociolinguistic Change

linguae & litterae

Publications of the School of Language & Literature
Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies

Edited by
Peter Auer, Gesa von Essen, Werner Frick

Volume 36

Mediatization and Sociolinguistic Change

Edited by
Jannis Androutsopoulos

DE GRUYTER

Contents

Section I: **Framing the issues**

Jannis Androutsopoulos
Mediatization and sociolinguistic change. Key concepts, research traditions, open issues

1 Introduction

Despite a fair amount of relevant scholarship in sociolinguistics and neighbouring fields, the role of media in processes of linguistic change is not yet fully understood. Outside linguistics, the effect of the media – a term that often remains unpacked – on language is a common assumption. In linguistics, researchers from various subfields have approached the issue in quite different ways; however, dialogue across these subfields and their respective views has been limited. The predominant position in variationist sociolinguistics, i.e. that the media play no role in systemic language change (cf. Chambers 1998: 124; Labov 2001: 228), is increasingly perceived as unsatisfactory (cf. Boberg 2000: 23, Tagliamonte 2012: 356). This volume aims to contribute to this discussion in the following ways:

First, it introduces the notions of sociolinguistic change and mediatization in order to create a more inclusive theoretical space than the one offered by the notions of 'the media' and 'language change', which predominate in the discussion so far (Herring 2003). Moving from media to mediatization and from language change to sociolinguistic change is more than just rebranding. By introducing these concepts and exploring their relationship, this volume broadens the theoretical and empirical scope of studying language-media relations in sociolinguistics.

Second, this volume extends the conceptualization of language-media relations in sociolinguistics beyond the notions of 'influence' and 'effect'. Relations of language and media in communicative practice are highly complex, and the influence of television on spoken language change is only part of a larger picture. This volume contributes to a broader perspective on the relevance of media to language in society.

The third aim is to move the discussion beyond fixed boundaries between 'media language' vs. 'community language' or 'mass media' vs. 'interpersonal contact'. Media language has often been perceived as 'artificial' or thoroughly standardized, and therefore fully distinct from what is thought of as the genuine empirical object of sociolinguistics, i.e. conversational language in the commu-

nity. There are problems with these dichotomies, as evidence across disciplines suggests that relations between media and community language are increasingly blurred. Media language becomes more conversational and vernacular, and media fragments are recycled in conversational interaction (cf. Androutsopoulos 2001, Coupland 2007, Stuart-Smith 2011). In media and communication studies, too, the traditional distinction between mass and interpersonal communication is being questioned.[1] The work presented in this volume focuses on interfaces of media language and conversational language and views their boundaries as synchronically fluid and historically shifting.

Fourth, this volume brings together various strands of current scholarship on language, media and socio-cultural change. The chapters present research in variationist sociolinguistics, interactional sociolinguistics, linguistic ethnography, media discourse studies, linguistic anthropology, language ideology, and minority language studies. All these lines of research are part of broadly-conceived sociolinguistics, yet have been largely unconnected so far. This is an attempt to examine their shared references and common lines of thinking, and to promote synergies in theory-building and empirical research.

This opening chapter begins by introducing the notions of sociolinguistic change and mediatization, which serve as conceptual brackets to the entire volume, and by reviewing some distinctions that seem necessary in order to transcend the blanket notion of 'the media'. Against this backdrop, it introduces five themes, or types of relations between sociolinguistic change and mediatization, which form the backbone to this volume. In brief, these are:

– Theme I – 'Media influence on language change' – covers research on the influence of mass media language, especially television, on language use and language attitudes.
– Theme II – 'Media engagement in interactional practice' – examines how media language and media experiences provide resources for social interaction.
– Theme III – 'Change in mass-mediatized and digitally mediated language' – shifts the perspective to changing language practices in the mass media and sociolinguistic change in computer-mediated communication.

---

1 Livingstone argues: "Society is witnessing a historic shift from a dualistic communication environment in which mass mediated communication variously gradually came to complement or undermine the traditional reliance on interpersonal communication. We are moving towards an environment characterized by diverse, intersecting, and still-evolving forms of multimodal, interactive, networked forms of communication" (Livingstone 2009: ix).

– Theme IV – 'Enregisterment of change in media discourse' – examines how media discourse represents processes of linguistic innovation and change, and how journalists themselves reflect on language change.
– Theme V – ' Mediatized spaces for minoritized languages' – addresses the role of both 'mass' and 'new' media in the sociolinguistic development of small and endangered languages.

The remainder of this chapter introduces theoretical and methodological background to each theme – key concepts, research traditions and open issues – and offers a summary of the chapters in each section of the volume.

2 From language change to sociolinguistic change

The term 'sociolinguistic change' is not entirely new, but not firmly established either. It is sporadically found in the literature, referring both to processes that have been examined in language change research, especially standardization (cf. Deumert and Vandenbussche 2003), and to processes that are beyond the scope of structural language change.[2] This volume develops the notion of sociolinguistic change and elaborates on its theoretical distinction to language change, with the aim of going beyond certain limitations of the latter.

In his contribution to this volume, Nikolas Coupland argues that sociolinguistic change "challenges the dualism that underlies two traditions in the study of change (linguistic and social) and brings them together" (cf. also Coupland 2009a). It conceptualizes language and society "as mutually constitutive processes" and theorizes linguistic change as part of social change. The focus therefore "would be less in discovering change in language systems" and more in examining "changing relationships between language and society" with an emphasis on the linguistic or discursive character of social changes. Coupland (in this volume) distinguishes five dimensions of sociolinguistic change: discursive practices, language ideologies, social norms, cultural reflexivity, and media(tiza)

---

2 The Google search "sociolinguistic change" yields 2,640 hits (26 February 2013, including repetitions). A detailed inspection of the first 100 hits suggests that besides occasional use in the sense of 'language change in terms of sociolinguistic variables', the term refers to processes such as language shift, language death and loss, linguistic obsolescence, minority language re-vitalization, pidginization and creolization, the post-creole continuum, the study of language in urban areas, linguistic ideology, and vernacular writing.

tion. We return to his discussion of vernacularization as a process of sociolinguistic change below (Section 7).

Building on and extending Coupland's approach, I suggest that as a theoretical notion, sociolinguistic change transgresses five limitations of language change:

(1) Sociolinguistic change enables the study of changing language-and-society relations that are neither limited to specific linguistic features nor by definition restricted to a 'single' language. It encompasses change at the level of linguistic repertoires in multidialectal and/or multilingual communities, including processes of language shift, revitalization or loss and a reconfiguration of standard-dialect relationships.

(2) Sociolinguistic change focuses not on linguistic features but on language practices, that is, the socially situated use of linguistic resources in communicative action. For example, chapters in this volume examine change in terms of the conversational recycling of media resources, the organization of social interaction around media devices, the conversationalization of media genres, and crossmodal relations of language to other semiotic modes.

(3) Sociolinguistic change transcends the rigid boundary between language use and language ideology, focusing on their interaction in processes of change. This includes the role of the mass media in the homogenization of language attitudes (cf. Kristiansen and Ota and Takano, in this volume) and the language-ideological impact of representations of linguistic variability in media discourse (cf. Coupland and Pietikäinen, in this volume). Language-ideological change is deemed relevant not just to the extent that it might lead to changes in language use, but as a dimension of change in its own right.

(4) Sociolinguistic change is not limited to spoken language in the community, but also examines language practices and linguistic flows across media and institutional contexts. This is indeed necessary in order to understand the circulation of linguistic innovations and discourses in mediatized societies. For example, research on sociolinguistic change can examine the mediatized representation of 'new' varieties (cf. Kerswill, in this volume) and the circulation of minority language practices across media spaces (cf. Moriarty and Pietikäinen, in this volume).

(5) Sociolinguistic change offers a conceptual space in which to integrate institutional policies with individual agency. Standardization, revitalization and other large-scale processes of sociolinguistic change entail the planning and policing of language use by state institutions and corporate organizations, journalistic style guides, etc. But a single speaker's activities can also be influential to sociolinguistic change, to the extent these activities are disseminated and responded to by large audiences (cf. Moriarty and Deumert, in this volume).

These five aspects of sociolinguistic change have in common an interest in the interrelation of language practices and ideologies, institutional and individual agency, and an extension of scope beyond immediate spoken language to various communicative settings. While the notion of language change is tied to a structuralist perspective of language, then the notion of sociolinguistic change proposed here ties in with a post-structuralist view of language as a set of resources and practices (Blommaert 2010, Heller 2007, Pennycook 2007), and integrates change in language use and ideology with processes of socio-cultural change such as globalization, commodification and, indeed, mediatization.

3 The 'media' in sociolinguistics

The media is entirely missing from earlier publications on sociolinguistic theory (e.g. Chambers 2003, Coupland, Sarangi and Candlin 2001) and becomes more relevant in recent scholarship on language, globalization and transnational flows (e.g. Blommaert 2010, Pennycook 2007). However, the term 'the media' is still often used in an undifferentiated manner, which often boils down to mass media and especially television. Media and communications scholars are clear on the term's limitations. As Couldry points out,

> It is a basic point of media research that the term 'media', and notoriously the phrase 'the media' result from a reification. Indeed, media processes involve a huge complexity of inputs (what are media?) and outputs (what difference do media make, socially, culturally?), which require us to find another term to differentiate the levels within and patterns across this complexity (Couldry 2008: 379).

Couldry goes on to consider mediation and mediatization as such alternative terms. We return to these in the next section. First, let us specify what 'the media' refers to in sociolinguistic literature on language change. This is important because, as Spitzmüller (in this volume) points out, different notions of 'media' result in very different assumptions of the role of media in language change. It seems useful to distinguish four referents of 'the media' in sociolinguistic literature: mass media, new media, media representations, and media engagement. They are briefly discussed in turn.

The interest in mass media, especially television, in the context of language change is grounded both in the social function of mass media and in properties of media language. As Kristiansen (in this volume) points out, technologies and institutions of mass communication are fundamental to the production and reproduction of public spheres in modern society. Mass media produce and disseminate discourses that reach very large audiences; media language is profes-

sionally scripted and widely perceived as a "working definition of the standard language" (Bell 2011:178). Variationist approaches to the media and language change do not examine media language, but rather operationalize media consumption, exposure or engagement as an independent variable (see Section 5). However, the chapters in this volume that examine the influence of television on language use and attitudes (cf. Kristiansen, Stuart-Smith and Ota, Ota and Takano) suggest that taking various genres and styles of media language into account can help to understand which patterns of media language might have an influence on audiences. For example, it is important to distinguish between standardized news language and the stylistically more varied usage in television genres such as soaps, reality shows or anime series. Other chapters in this volume unzip the media, focusing on particular genres, discourses, language style and multimodal patterns (cf. Coupland, Kerswill, Luginbühl, Pietikäinen, Schmitz, Squires and Iorio). Like Bell's pioneering research on language style (Bell 1984, 1991), this line of research is not interested in the influence of media on spoken language, but in changes in the domain of media language and discourse. Findings reported in this volume suggest that certain types of programme promote the vernacularization of media language (cf. Coupland); changing patterns of multimodality in print and web texts reinforce linguistic economy (cf. Schmitz); and certain processes of sociolinguistic change first become visible in media for a niche audience (cf. Pietikäinen).

The shift of perspective from mass to new media challenges a number of earlier assumptions about language and the media. In particular, the assumption that 'media language' equates to standardized language just doesn't hold true for a lot of written language on the internet, which lies beyond institutional regulation and shows extensive variability. Having said that, it is also true that digital media extend the technologies of mass communication and enable hybrid combinations of public and private, institutional and participatory discourses. A number of chapters in this volume discuss the role of digital media in sociolinguistic change. Schmitz argues that the web accelerates tendencies of fragmentation and multimodality that are already evident in the design of print media, resulting in a loss of autonomy for written language. Squires and Iorio show how the language style of Twitter posts is re-contextualized into professionally produced newspaper copy. Deumert suggests that the participatory opportunities offered by the web favour digital literacy in indigenous languages. Pietikäinen finds that both mass and new media are involved in the circulation of linguistic resources and innovations in a minoritized language.

A third perspective on media in sociolinguistic literature focuses on media representations. In the tradition of cultural studies, representation is defined as the use of semiotic resources in practices of meaning making (Hall 1977). The

study of representation entails a move beyond the formal analysis of media language and towards examining narratives, discourses, actors and characters in media text and talk. In sociolinguistic approaches to media performance and stylization, representation is key to the ways in which linguistic variability constructs identities in discourse (cf. Androutsopoulos 2010, Bell 2001, Bucholtz 2009, Hill 1995, Jaffe 2009; and papers in Bell and Gibson 2011, Androutsopoulos 2012). In the context of sociolinguistic change, "media representations of linguistic heterogeneity" (Jaffe 2009: 563), such as the use of local speech forms in the representation of a local community, are one aspect of the increasingly blurred boundaries between media language and community language (Stuart-Smith 2011). Another aspect is the metalinguistic discourse by which change in language and society itself becomes a subject of media representation (cf. Johnstone 2011, Kerswill in this volume). The mediatized performance of vernaculars can contribute to the construction of typical or 'exemplary' (Agha 2003) speakers and to a heightened reflexivity on language and identity.[3]

The fourth aspect of media in sociolinguistics, media engagement, shifts the focus back to language practices in conversational talk. Media engagement is understood here as cover term for interactional practices at the interface of media discourse and audience talk. It encompasses 'para-social interaction' during reception, talk about media experiences, orientation to media devices as focal points of interaction, and the creative recontextualization of media fragments. Unlike the rhetoric of 'influence', the focus on media engagement emphasizes the agency and creativity of audiences in how they deal with media language (see Section 6 of this chapter).

4 From media to mediation and mediatization

In current media and communication studies, mediation and mediatization are two concepts that transcend the limitations of 'the media' (Couldry 2008, Hepp in this volume).The focus of this discussion is on mediatization, and a full discussion on mediation would go beyond its scope. Suffice it to say that mediation is the broader concept of the two and already being used in linguistics, e.g.

---

3 Coupland and Kristiansen (2011: 31) argue that "modern media are increasingly flooding our lives with an unprecedented array of social and sociolinguistic representations, experiences and values, to the extent that (to put the case negatively) it is inconceivable that they have no bearing on how individuals and communities position themselves and are positioned sociolinguistically."

in the framework of mediated discourse analysis (cf. Norris and Jones, 2005). In broad terms, mediation refers to the cultural, material, or semiotic conditions of any communicative action. All symbolic communication is mediated by semiotic means (Agha 2011). In a narrower sense, some researchers limit mediation to writing as opposed to other technologies of communication (Kristiansen in this volume). In communication studies the two terms are not clearly distinguished, and some scholars use 'mediation' to refer to processes termed 'mediatization' by others (cf.Couldry 2008, Livingstone 2009, Lundby 2009).

The more recent concept of mediatization is used in communication studies for the critical analysis of interrelations between socio-cultural and media-communicative change (Hepp, in this volume). According to Lundby (2009: 1), mediatization "points to societal changes in contemporary high modern societies and the role of media and mediated communication in these transformations". The notion emphasizes the proliferation of media communication in all areas of social life. According to Livingstone (2009), we are moving from a society where mass media was one among many institutions of modern life to a stage where "everything is mediated" and no social process can be understood without taking (mass and new) media into account.

In his critical review of mediatization research in media and communication studies, Andreas Hepp (in this volume) distinguishes between an institutional and a social-constructivist version of the concept (see also Schulz 2004, Lundby 2009). The first focuses on changing relations between media and other social institutions such as politics, religion and sports, which gradually adapt to the "logic of the media" (Hjarvard 2008). Mediatization of society is, then, "the extension of the influence of the media (considered both as a cultural technology and as an organization) into all spheres of society and social life" (Lundby 2009:5). The social-constructivist version proposes a broader understanding of mediatization as a "meta process by which everyday practices and social relations are historically shaped by mediating technologies and media organizations" (Livingstone 2009: 10). It is closely associated with the work of German communications scholar Friedrich Krotz (2007, 2009) who draws on symbolic interactionism, ethnomethodology and cultural studies. Krotz defines mediatization as "a historical, ongoing, long-term process in which more and more media emerge and are institutionalized", so that "media in the long run increasingly become relevant for the social construction of everyday life, society, and culture as a whole" (2009: 24). He too distinguishes mediatization from 'mediated communication', which is roughly equivalent to mediation as defined above. Krotz argues that mediatization is a 'meta-process' at the same level of abstraction as globalization, individualization and commercialization, and therefore too multi-layered to be verified or falsified by any single research project.

In linguistic anthropology, Jaffe (2009, 2011) proposes an understanding of mediatization that "includes all the representational choices involved in the production and editing of text, image, and talk in the creation of media products" (Jaffe 2009: 572). Here mediatization is roughly equivalent to what is elsewhere described as 'staging'. Agha (2011: 163) defines mediatization as a "special case of mediation". While mediation refers to all semiotic means by which people relate to each other within frameworks of communicative activity, mediatization refers to "institutional practices that reflexively link processes of communication to processes of commoditization" (Agha 2011: 163). He writes:

> Today, familiar institutions in any large scale society (e.g., schooling, the law, electoral politics, the mass media) all presuppose a variety of mediatized practices as conditions on their possibility. In linking communication to commoditization, mediatized institutions link communicative roles to positions within a socioeconomic division of labor, thereby expanding the effective scale of production and dissemination of messages across a population, and thus the scale at which persons can orient to common presuppositions in acts of communication with each other. And since mediatization is a narrow special case of mediation, such links also expand the scale at which differentiated forms of uptake and response to common messages can occur, and thus, through the proliferation of uptake formulations, increase the felt complexity of so-called "complex society" for those who belong to it (Agha 2011: 163).

In Agha's sense, mediatized representations of cultural practices such as marriage differ from other forms of semiotic mediation in that they are designed for large audiences and thereby "provide massively parallel inputs to recontextualization" (2011:167). Even though people may respond to mediatized messages in many different ways, they all engage with the same messages and treat these "as indexical presuppositions of whatever it is they do or make" (Agha 2011: 67). So, whereas Jaffe's notion of mediatization focuses on media discourse as such, Agha's focuses on relations between mediatized messages and their recontextualization by audiences in everyday practices of semiotic mediation.

Which approach to mediatization is more productive from the viewpoint of sociolinguistic change? Not all chapters in this volume draw on the concept, and those which do adopt different readings. Kerswill draws on Jaffe's understanding of mediatization to explore metalinguistic discourse on 'Jafaican' in British newspapers. Kristiansen elaborates on the distinction between mediation and mediatization to theorize between direct and indirect influences of media on spoken language. He defines mediation as written representation of a language and mediatization as the process of "language being invested in the power and value hierarchies which support and are supported by the technologies and institutions of mass media communication". Coupland suggests that mediatization "creates affordances for sociolinguistic changes", which he locates both in media representation and speaker engagement with mass and new media.

In my own understanding, the social-constructivist approach to mediatization developed by Krotz and Hepp (in this volume) seems most promising for sociolinguistic theory. In this approach, mediatization is a facet of socio-cultural change that is specifically tied to the expansion and differentiation of communication media. Mediatization is constructed in analogy to other notions of socio-cultural change – other 'izations', as it where – which sociolinguists are already exploring in terms of their interrelation to language, such as globalization or commodification. Moreover, mediatization offers an alternative to the preoccupation with technology and its effects that shapes, more or less explicitly, a lot of earlier linguistic thinking about language and media.[4] Research on mediatization differs from media effects research in that it rejects a deterministic, cause-and-effect view of media technologies in relation to human behaviour (Hepp, in this volume). Mediatization research challenges the understanding of media as 'external' influence on social behaviour, focusing on institutional and community practices with media rather than media technologies themselves. Even though Krotz' and Agha's approaches on mediatization differ in their terminology, they are both interested in the interface between mediation (i.e. interpersonal communication in speech or writing) and the mass dissemination of standardized messages, Several several chapters in this volume adress this interface. Linguistics seems well positioned to investigate synchronic or diachronic relations between mediation and mediatization in processes of sociolinguistic change, for example how changes in technologies of writing played a role in standardization (Anderson 2006, Giesecke 1992, Ong 1982). A synchronic example is how changes in technologies of interpersonal literacy – from handwriting to typewriters to keyboards and screens) relate to the changing mediatization of interpersonal relationships.

To conclude this section, this volume argues that extending the theoretical scope from language change to sociolinguistic change immediately brings up issues of mediatization. The remaining sections of this chapter provide an overview of these issues in terms of their research traditions, methodologies, and empirical subjects.

---

4 Herring (2003) critically discusses approaches that rely on 'technological determinism', that is, the widespread assumption that media themselves affect or determine the communication they 'contain'.

5 Media influence on language change: Theme I

Theme I represents probably the most well-known approach to media and language change in sociolinguistics. As Herring (2003) points out, this approach conceptualizes the mass media, and in particular television, as a contextual parameter or independent variable whose impact on language variation and change can be studied in terms of single sociolinguistic variables. Different subfields and national traditions of linguistics have assessed the issue in quite diverse ways (cf. Stuart-Smith 2011, 2012). For example, German linguists have been quite receptive to the idea that mass media can have an impact on ordinary language use, although some of their suggestions are based on anecdotal evidence and lack solid empirical support.[5] Holly and Püschel (1993:148–152) suggest four types of influence of television on contemporary German:

1. *Popularization of the standard variety*: In the second half of the twentieth century, the spread of electronic mass media promoted the passive and then active competence of standard language across the German-speaking area and accelerated dialect levelling.
2. *Awareness of other (non-standard) varieties*: Through media representations, audiences gain access to regional and social dialects of German and thereby increase their awareness of non-standard varieties of language even in the absence of interpersonal contact to their speakers.
3. *Norm tolerance in spoken standard language*: The relaxation of norms of public usage that can be observed on television may act as a model for tendencies of norm relaxation in spoken language.
4. *Multiplication of linguistic trends*: Television can act as a multiplier and intensifier of neologisms and linguistic fads, which may have their origin in interpersonal language use but are disseminated via broadcast. Holly and Püschel argue that television discourse intensifies rather than creates linguistic innovations.

This approach casts the net widely: television influence encompasses here standardization (in the sense of dialect levelling), an impact on language attitudes, and the spread of neologisms and vogue words. By contrast, Anglophone variationist sociolinguistics has developed a much narrower perspective, in which most of these aspects are *a priori* excluded from investigation.

---

5 For example, Schmitz (2004: 30) claims that the media 'speed up and differentiate language change more than any other type of communication' (my translation). For further discussion, see Brand 2000; Holly 1996, Holly and Püschel 1993, Muhr 2003, Schmitz 2004, 2005.

The variationist perspective on language change is premised on the transmission of linguistic innovations by interpersonal accommodation during face-to-face interaction (Labov 2001, Trudgill 1986, Auer and Hinskens 2005: 336). As Stuart-Smith (2006: 140) points out: "The consensus seems to be that since we cannot interact with television characters in the same way as with our friends, neighbours and workmates, represented television dialects are unlikely to affect our own speech." The primacy of accommodation in interaction has often been understood as ruling out by definition any influence of television on the diffusion of innovations. In Trudgill's (1986: 40) words: "The point about the TV set is that people, however much they watch and listen to it, do not talk to it (and even if they do, it cannot hear them!), with the result that no accommodation takes place." In addition, systemic language change below the level of consciousness is sharply distinguished from change that involves 'superficial' (Chambers 1998) linguistic features. Trudgill argues that "highly salient linguistic features, such as new words and idioms, or fashionable pronunciations of individual words, may be *imitated* or *copied* from television or radio (rather than accommodated to)" (1986: 40–41, emphasis in the original). The role of media in lexical innovation and change (neologisms, new idioms, fashionable pronunciations of individual words, new variants in core vocabulary) is thus readily acknowledged, but excluded from analysis.[6] The same holds true for the impact of mass media on language awareness and attitudes. Milroy and Milroy point out that "although radio, film and television may not have had much influence on everyday speech, they are amongst the many influences that promote the consciousness of the standard and maintain its position" (1999: 31). Researchers of language variation and change have repeatedly observed that the stigmatization of on-going linguistic changes in media representations can prompt speakers of the stigmatized variant to modify their linguistic behaviour (cf. Pappas 2008, Zilles 2005). However, the variationist assumption has been that media representations reflect and reinforce language attitudes which already exist in the community (cf. Zilles 2005: 44, Pappas 2008: 495).

The three chapters in this section engage with four open issues in the current discussion on media influence on language change. First, the role of broadcasting in dialect levelling or de-dialectalization (cf. Kristiansen 2001). Included in

---

6 Trudgill (1986: 41) discusses the adoption of American English lexis and idioms into British English (e.g. *radio* for 'wireless', *toilet* for 'lavatory') and assumes that "radio and television play a major role in the diffusion of innovations of this type". Chambers (1998: 126) suggests that "mass communication diffuses catch-phrases" and "lexical changes based on the media are akin to affectations. People notice them when others use them, and they know their source."

Holly and Püschel's (1993) catalogue above, this is an issue repeatedly raised in non-Anglophone sociolinguistics and social dialectology, including Germany and Japan (cf. Ota and Takano, this volume; Auer and Spiekermann 2011, Brandt 2000, Hjarvard 2004, Lamelli 2004, von Polenz 1999: 457). I briefly discuss two studies which suggest that mass media language can serve as model for the adoption of standard forms. In the first, Lamelli (2004, 2006) found real-time shift from dialect to standard in the speech of town councillors in two German cities from the 1920s to 1960. Lameli finds a shift towards standard variants in the speech of councillors born in the 1930's and suggests it could have been driven by the spread of standard German via the radio since the 1920s (Lameli 2004: 108–111). Broadcasting influence is evoked here as a likely explanatory factor, though not investigated any further. The second study is Carvalho's (2004) research on language change in Uruguayan Portuguese, a border dialect of Brazilian Portuguese spoken as minority language by communities in Uruguay. Carvalho finds an orientation to features of mainstream Brazilian Portuguese among young female speakers, which "would be difficult to explain solely by frequency of contact with speakers of the standard dialect" (2004: 141). Based on interviews, Carvalho argues that her informants consciously orient to Brazilian television as a model in order to change their (stigmatized) dialect by a variety they deem urban, modern and prestigious. In some variationist literature, the role of broadcast media as a model for the adoption of standard variants has been explained away as an instance of individual "copying", just like the acquisition of new lexis via the media, and therefore as a process that is beyond the realm of systemic language change.[7] However, Kristiansen (in this volume) claims with regard to Denmark that "the view on media influence would have been less dismissive if the state-of-the-art view had been developed in a less Anglo-world focused discipline".

The second issue is the theoretical shift from the notion of 'exposure' to that of 'engagement'. The rare early variationist studies on media and language change were limited to correlations between linguistic variables and media exposure, which was measured in terms of hours of media consumption. Such correlations were either not found or not interpreted as causal (see discussion in Stuart-Smith 2012 and Stuart-Smith and Ota, in this volume). However, there is reason to doubt that the impact of media exposure on social behaviour can ever

---

7 Trudgill (1986: 41) suggests that an individual speaker's shift from dialect to standard is "one situation where core syntax and phonology *can* be influenced by the media (original emphasis)". People "may use the language of the media as a model", Trudgill continues, provided they make "a *conscious* decision to acquire the standard" and "there is considerable linguistic distance between a national dialect and local dialects" (original emphasis).

be scientifically established. In media and communication studies, it is now commonplace that the impact of media on social behaviour is much more complex and indirect than it was assumed in earlier media effects research (cf. Cormack 2007, Gauntlett 1998, Stuart-Smith 2012: 1081). The assumption that media exposure can be directly correlated to subsequent social behaviour is now viewed as unsuccessful and out-dated (cf. Gauntlett 1998) and has largely been replaced by more sophisticated models of media reception such as the 'uses and gratifications' theory. Qualitative approaches to 'active audiences' emphasize people's motivation for media consumption, their interpretive practices and engagement with media texts (cf.Hepp, in this volume; Stuart-Smith and Ota, in this volume). The implication of this paradigm shift for the study of sociolinguistic change is that the search for a supposedly unconscious impact of the broadcast media on speech is doomed to fail. Instead, the motivation to engage with media discourse and orient to media language as a model is theoretically foregrounded.[8] As Ichiro Ota and Shoji Takano (in this volume), tellingly put it: "TV cannot change language by itself. The change needs to be caused by speakers when they want something more than what they have." The Glasgow project led by Stuart-Smith (2011, 2012, in press) finds robust correlations between language use (focusing on three consonantal variables that spread from Southern England English to Glasgow English) and media engagement, though not media exposure.

The third issue is the notion of "off the shelf" changes. Originally introduced by Eckert (2003: 395), it refers to cases of rapid linguistic diffusion such as the global spread of the quotative *like* from American English to the entire English-speaking world (Buchstaller 2008). "Off the shelf" changes "are transmitted with no or relatively little interpersonal contact" (Buchstaller 2008: 36). Milroy (2008) juxtaposes changes "off the shelf" to changes "under the counter" whose transmission requires regular social interaction. The notion thus signals a tentative departure from the premise that social interaction is a prerequisite to any transmission of linguistic innovations. However, the potential role of the media in spreading "off the shelf" changes is implied rather than empirically investigated in previous literature.

---

8 Carvalho (2004: 143) points out: "It is doubtful that exposure to television and adoption of standard features may ever be directly correlated, because for this relationship to happen there needs to be both psychological and social motives that instigate dialect assimilation. It is essentially the desire among the young, the middle-class, and women to replace UP [Uruguayan Portuguese] features with BP [Brazilian Portuguese] that motivates their use of television as a model for dialect acquisition".

The fourth issue is the premise of interpersonal accommodation as site of diffusion of linguistic innovations. Auer and Hinskens (2005) contrast the variationist 'change-by-accommodation' model to the 'identity projection' model from the 'acts of identity' theory of Le Page and Tabouret-Keller (1985), which views "the adoption of certain dialect features [as] the outcome of the speaker's wish to identify with a certain group" (Auer and Hinskens 2005: 337). In this model, "frequency of contact is not essential, and neither is face-to-face contact. Convergence rather proceeds towards an abstract image of the group"(338). Auer and Hinskens suggest that interpersonal accommodation "is better explained as accommodation of a stereotypical *persona* or mental representation (model) of a social group" (343). Likewise, Carvalho (2004: 141–2) suggests that "accommodation may not be in response to a particular interlocutor, but to stereotypes of the group the interlocutor belongs to, or of a socially attractive group not actually represented in the immediate context."

The three chapters in this section examine the potential influence of mass media on language attitudes and use, drawing on findings from Danish, English and Japanese. All chapters reject the simplistic assumption that media influence can occur by mere exposure to television and adopt the view that speaker motivation and engagement are prerequisites for their orientation to media language.

Tore Kristiansen suggests that the mass-media experience that shapes the modern Danish society has a decisive influence on covert or 'subconsciously expressed' language attitudes, which may subsequently influence language use. In Denmark, the indirect, i.e. ideologically mediated, influence of broadcast media consists in establishing a new standard language ideology, which reallocates sociolinguistic prestige from standard to Copenhagen Danish, the variety of Danish used by most media celebrities. Kristiansen shows that evaluative patterns for local, conservative standard and modern Copenhagen accents have a 'copy-like quality' across Denmark. This is unlike Norway, where the mass media strengthen the tolerance for (and even promotion of) regional variation, with dialect use not just accepted, but on the increase in many media genres. Kristiansen's argument, then, is that mediatization reinforces sociolinguistic attitudes that prevail in each particular society, thereby paving the way for sociolinguistic changes such as dialect levelling.

Jane Stuart-Smith and Ichiro Ota draw on the notion of 'the shelf' in their analysis of stylistic variation in Scottish English and Japanese. They advance the understanding of this notion by suggesting, first, that 'on the shelf' features can be of different kinds, including accent and tonal features in Japanese and consonantal features in Glasgow English. In Japanese, the phrasal pitch that can be heard in the standardized speech of Tokyo newscasters is found to occur in regional forms of standard Japanese across the country. Anime fictional charac-

ters offer another kind of 'media shelf' with their stereotyped prosodic features, which female speakers from one particular region, Kagoshima, draw on in their performance of standard Japanese. In Glasgow, the rapid diffusion of consonantal features associated with London English correlates with speakers' engagement with a London-based television series, East Enders. The authors suggest that this series serves as "one particular media shelf which offers ... features *and* associated local meanings." Thus 'media shelves' can vary considerably in terms of media genres, available linguistic features, and the way they tie in with existing indexical fields for particular sociolinguistic variables.

In their combined analysis of original data and meta-analysis of previous research on Japanese, Ichiro Ota and Shoji Takano point out the difficulties in separating media influence on speech from the impact of other processes of social change in the second half of the twentieth century. They locate potential media influences on Japanese in the standardization of local dialects and the spread of non-local, non-standard features across Japan. They suggest that media influence can result in either a more or less unconscious adoption of linguistic variants or in a conscious, stylized performance of media speech styles; the two are not rigidly separated in practice. Ota and Takano provide evidence for striking cross-regional similarities in the patterning of sociolinguistic variables from standard Japanese across distant regions, thus begging the question of how such patterns could have come up, if not through a common 'uptake and response' (cf. Agha 2011) to a joint reference style that is readily available in society at large via the mass media.

6 Media engagement in interactional practice: Theme II

The turn from Theme I to Theme II mirrors an earlier paradigm shift in media and communication studies, namely the turn from asking 'what media does to people' to 'what people do with the media'. Research on audiences and their everyday media practices originates in cultural studies as a response to media effects models and aims "to elucidate how media are recruited by audiences as resources to inform and enhance their actions in a variety of social contexts" (Jensen 2002: 164; Gillespie 1995; Gauntlett 1998; Talbot 2007). Since the 1980s, this line of research spread from cultural studies to interactional sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology. It is by now well documented that audiences engage with media in various ways, including para-social interaction with show hosts; media talk (e.g. reanimation of jointly viewed films or series, comparison of real-life situations to media contexts, reference to media experiences as an occasion for talk); and recontextualization of media fragments, whereby "phrases and

discourse styles are extracted from radio broadcasting and then recycled and reanimated in everyday usage, outside of the contexts of radio listening" (Spitulnik 1997: 95). Gillespie (1995) was one of the first cultural studies researchers to notice the appropriation of media phrases in everyday talk, and numerous sociolinguists have confirmed her observations:

> One of the most tangible examples of the way that the discourses of TV and everyday life are intermeshed is when jingles, catch-phrases and humorous storylines of favourite ads are incorporated into everyday speech. Ads provide a set of shared cultural reference points, images and metaphors which spice local speech. There are countless examples of this in the data on TV talk but to mention just one: a common refrain which accompanies a spectacular feat, such as a goal, is the slogan 'I bet *he* drinks Carling Black Label!' (Gillespie 1995: 178; original emphasis).

Sociolinguistic research on audience practices has mostly focused on young people and often from transnational, diasporic or minority communities. It uses various terms (e.g. media quotations, media phrases, media fragments; recycling, reanimation, incorporation, integration into everyday speech) and draws on a number of theoretical frameworks, including the Bakhtinian concepts of polyphony and double-voicing the notion of bricolage from anthropology and cultural studies de- and recontextualization (Bauman and Briggs 1990) and Anderson's (2006) notion of imagined communities.[9] Before we turn to the relevance of this research to sociolinguistic change, it is useful to summarize its findings in five points: origin and inventories of media fragments, interactional settings of their recontextualization, modification of media fragments, multilingual practices, and discourse functions.[10]

Media fragments are lifted from various media genres, including news stories, celebrity talk ("poaching from personalities", Spitulnik 1997: 108), stage performance, music and fiction. Some researchers distinguish between media material

---

9 Cf. Ayaß and Gerhardt 2012, Leppänen and Piirainen-Marsh 2009, Pujolar 2001, Rampton 1995, Spitulnik 1997, Spreckels 2006, Talbot 2007.

10 These categories are informed by, though not identical to the analytic categories used by individual researchers. For instance, Branner (2002) examines the use of commercial slogans by a female peer group in terms of the contextual trigger for quoting a slogan; alterations in linguistic form; individual animation as opposed to joint co-construction; and the embedding of slogans in the on-going conversation. Spitulnik (1997: 99) examines the de- and recontextualization of fragments from radio talk in terms of "the inherent reproducibility and transportability of radio phrases; the dialogic overtones that are carried over into new contexts of use; the formal, functional, and semantic alterations that occur in the recontextualization; the degree to which knowledge of the original radio source is relevant for understanding the recycled phrase".

from a particular source and the animation of a media register (e.g. 'acting like a show host').[11] Drawing on their media experience, people assemble inventories of media voices whose composition indexes the lifestyle and media consumption of a particular community or group. Birken-Silverman (2003) reports on a group of Italian-German youth whose inventory of media voices includes US-American hip-hop, Sicilian music, and German television. Lytra (2006) found that the media resources of Turkish-Greek schoolchildren draw on both the majority (Greek) and minority (Turkish) language and culture. Schlobinski (1989) shows how young people recontextualize media sources from mainstream television and punk music to index distance and identification, respectively. This suggests that the cultural origin of media fragments shapes their indexical value in recontextualization.

Besides informal interaction, the recontextualization of media fragments is attested in classroom talk (Lytra 2006, Keim 2003, Rampton 1999). Its contextual trigger can be external to the on-going interaction or part of it (Branner 2002), and media fragments can be reproduced as a solitary activity that is not taken up by others or jointly co-constructed and elaborated on (see also Georgakopoulou, in this volume). Shankar (2004: 326–7) emphasizes the intertextual relation between media reception and subsequent media talk by pointing out that "the type of talk that occurs during the film – especially reciting dramatic dialogues, enacting comedy routines, and singing along with songs – anticipates the incorporation of such verbal practices in talk outside these viewing contexts".

Recontextualization can involve formal, functional and semantic modifications of media fragments. They are typically set apart from speaker's own voice by means of prosodic and metapragmatic cues (e.g. higher pitch, metadiscursive markers or allusions to the reference media texts). By means of lexical modifications, a media fragment is creatively altered to fit into the on-going activity or current topic (Brenner 2002). Moreover, recycling often involves code-switching (or more specifically language crossing) whereby a media fragment that originates in another language or language variety is inserted into the base language of on-going talk. Examples from the literature include code-switching from Greek to Turkish song lines, from colloquial regional German to stylized ethnic German, from American English to mock Spanish or Hindi from Bollywood films, and from vernacular British English to stylized Asian English.[12] These findings suggest that

11 Cf. Birken-Silverman 2003, Dirim and Auer 2004, Hewitt 1986, Lytra 2006, Pujolar 2001.
12 Cf. Deppermann 2007, Hill 1995, Lytra 2006, Rampton 1995, Shankar 2004. Hewitt (1986: 135) and Rampton (1995: 60, 238, 250) discuss how language crossing draws on media fragments.

media engagement clearly transcends the monolingual context that shapes the discussion of television and language change in the first theme.

Media fragments have been found to act as contextualization cues that index a particular frame, which can disrupt or co-exist with the main on-going activity. In classroom interaction, media quotations can index a play frame and prompt funny talk that disrupts the institutional business of the classroom (Keim 2003, Lytra 2006). Others have focused on the double-voicing qualities of media fragments. Their creative recontextualization creates a tension between speaker and media voice, whereby a speaker can appropriate a media voice as part of their own contextually relevant identity or index a dissociation of speaker and voice for purposes of irony or parody. By drawing on media voices to accomplish conversational activities, speakers can distance themselves from the illocutionary force and/or the propositional content of their utterances and do things that would be considered transgressive or face-threatening if they were accomplished in their own voice (such as teasing, showing off, aggressive, sexist or racist comments etc.).[13] Media fragments can also serve as categorization devices by means of which a referent is indexed as member of a certain social category. Here media material evokes an implicit comparison between the referent (i.e. the person being categorized) and a shared media experience that entails certain category-bound properties. For example, singing a particular song as someone passes by can index a transfer of (stereotypical) attributes from the song's context to the passer-by (Spreckels 2006). Media resources can further be used to enact or reanimate a media performance (e.g. song, movie scene, commercial etc.) with varying degrees of modification and collaborative elaboration. Such impromptu performances have been reported to occur in transitional moments of an encounter, for example when conversationalists run out of steam or are uncertain about the further unfolding of the interaction (cf. Birken-Silverman 2003, Dirim and Auer 2004, Lytra 2006, Rampton 1995, Schlobinski 1989). At a higher level of abstraction, media fragments have been theorized as a resource for creating sociability, negotiating and displaying speakers' identities (Leppänen and Piirainen-Marsh 2009; Lytra 2006).In her study of how American teenagers of Indian heritage engage with Bollywood films, Shankar (2004: 317) points out that "the films provide narrative frameworks, prescribed dialogue, and socially recognizable

---

13 As Shankar (2004) points out, "Especially in the Desi context, where there are numerous social and parental restrictions placed on interacting with the opposite sex, [...] prescripted dialogues of flirting in movies are used by teens in their own conversations [...] certain dialogues can be especially instrumental to youth who are experiencing similar situations". Cf. Pujolar 2001 and Deppermann 2007 for similar findings.

registers and varieties of affect through which they enact their own dynamics of humor, flirting, conflict, and other types of talk".

The two chapters in this section further our understanding of media engagement as a practice with rich implications for socio-cultural and sociolinguistic change. Alexandra Georgakopoulou examines how (new) media experiences provide resources for everyday talk, thereby emphasizing that media engagement among young people is increasingly focused on digital media. In her case study of two girls, Georgakopoulou identifies two patterns of engagement with digital media: the popular girl, a leader in terms of media culture, is positioned by her stories as having 'media competence', for example being able to manage risk in new media spaces. Her talk about media experiences is positively assessed, e.g. frequently taken up by other participants. The less popular girl, a follower in terms of media culture, produces less media talk and is interactionally less successful with it in terms of uptake by others. Her stories position her as having experiences of trouble and being less able to handle new media. Georgakopoulou relates this difference to late-modern discourses about changing teenage femininities. The figure of 'girl power' is discursively constructed by, among other things, the ability to handle media engagement and be popular with it, whereas the opposite holds true for the 'the girl in trouble'.[14]

In her ethnography of language and communicative practices in a Turkish Saturday school in the UK, Vally Lytra examines the nexus of multilingualism, multimodality and media engagement in a transnational context. Lytra's analysis exemplifies the intersection between embodied multimodality in interaction and the mediatized multimodality of artefacts that integrate several modes and media. The pupils' engagement with mobile phones and rap music creates an alternative or background frame, which coexists with the discourses of ethnic identity and culture that predominate in official classroom activities. Lytra argues that media engagement offers resources for a dynamic coexistence of old and new cultural forms. It constitutes an alternative space of practice that proposes a "flexible, urbane response" to the tension between ethnic community and mainstream society.

The relevance of this research to sociolinguistic change might be less obvious at first sight. Indeed, this theme requires a radical departure from language change in the traditional sense and a different understanding of change altogether. It is about the mobility and 'mobilizability' (Spitulnik 1997) of language and its cir-

---

14 This also corresponds to the two sociolinguistic approaches to media reviewed so far: the figure of 'girl power' implies agency over media consumption, whereas the 'girl in trouble' figure evokes the powerless individual that is subject to media influence.

culation in society.[15] It is also about the change of the semiotic resources around which certain types of social interaction are organized. In a broader perspective, it is about shifts in interaction culture and the institutional practices by which certain types of identity are discursively constructed. I distinguish four ways in which the recontextualization of media resources is relevant to sociolinguistic change.

First, processes of conventionalization (or routinization) at the level of lexis and discourse. Media quotations are often ephemeral (Chambers 1998, Lytra 2006), and their fast pace of change is part of their social function, similarly to fashion and other trends. But some media phrases can "become normalized over years of repeated use" (Lytra 2006: 267), and this seems to hold true for quite specific categories of lexical and discourse items whose conventionalization is repeatedly attested. They include nicknames and categorizations derived from names of media celebrities or fictional characters;[16] metapragmatic discourse markers (expressions that regulate a communicative activity); and expressive interjections.[17] Conventionalized media items seem to feed into functional categories that are rich in social indexicality and undergo frequent renewal, as is indeed the case with social categorizations, intensifiers, evaluators and expressive interjections. However, the process by which media material is gradually integrated into a community or group's set of formulaic expressions is only poorly understood. It seems to entail a sort of intertextual bleaching, i.e. a decreasing interactional relevance of the fragment's intertextual link, so that its media origin is made ever less relevant in the actual instance of recontextualization.

Regardless of long-term conventionalization, the process of large-scale spread and circulation of media phrases is equally little understood. It remains to be examined how the creative recycling of media phrases in local, everyday interaction might be linked to the large-scale diffusion of media phrases that can

---

15 Spitulnik suggests "that the study of media discourse in popular culture is one such avenue for examining the dynamism and mobility of language, and that this mobility (and mobilizability) has far-reaching implications for both language change and the construction of public cultures and speech communities" (1997: 114).

16 Cf. Birken-Silverman 2003, Gillespie 1995, Spitulnik 1997, Spreckels 2006. Gillespie (1995:152) discusses how her London informants appropriated the term *Mangel* – derived from "Mrs Mangel, the key gossip character at Neighbours at the time of fieldwork" – "as a term of abuse for anyone who gossips". Spreckels (2006) discusses how a group of German female adolescents use the term *Britney* (i.e. pop star Britney Spears) as a categorization for a certain type of girls.

17 Spitulnik (1997) discusses radio phrases with the metapragmatic meaning of 'do you get it'. Examples from German include the expressive interjections *oops* originating in American English and *yoo-hoo*, which Spreckels (2006) attributes to the animation series, Simpsons.

be observed "sweeping through" a country, as Coupland (2007: 174) puts it on the example of the comedy-derived phrase *bovvered*, which illustrates the mediatization of a non-standard feature in British English, i.e. TH-fronting. When nationwide circulating media phrases include non-standard features, they act as hosts of sociolinguistic variability which gains symbolic or iconic status in the context of a particular mediatized performance.

A third aspect of change is the role of media engagement in shaping the interaction order. The key point here is that media resources of different kinds constitute increasingly common points of orientation for the establishment and management of social interaction. For example, media programmes and media devices provide typical occasions for small talk and offer conversationalists opportunities to index their group membership and lifestyle orientation. Media engagement carries considerable symbolic capital. There are followers and leaders in media engagement (Georgakopoulou, in this volume). Among young people, at least, the ability to perform with media voices and to spontaneously link media references to the topic of on-going interaction is a valued creative skill (Spreckels 2006). Not least, media devices are becoming increasingly important in establishing particular kinds of social action, as Lytra's (in this volume) parallelism of the mobile phone to the hopscotch illustrates.

These observations tie in well with the mediatization of interpersonal relationships as discussed by Krotz (2007). They make clear that the impact of media engagement practices reaches into the core empirical site of socially oriented linguistics, i.e. informal language use in private settings. To be sure, everyday talk has always been prompted by shared attention to some sort of significant object, be it media-related or not; the recycling of discourse fragments, in the broadest sense of the term, is certainly an older practice than electronic mass media. However, mediatization seems to bring a change of scale, a new order of relevance of media engagement for social interaction.

A fourth dimension of change is captured by Spitulnik's (1997) notion of "mediation of communities". Spitulnik argues that in large-scale societies, the type of communication required by the notion of speech community, (i.e. dense patterns of communication with frequency of interaction among speakers, only "occur in a vertical sense" (97), namely in people's everyday exposure to and consumption of mass media. Elements of these communication patterns are then instantiated at a horizontal level, i.e. in everyday talk, by means of people's "repeating, recycling, and recontextualizing of media discourse" (98). These recycling practices establish "an indirect connectivity or intertextuality across media consumers and across instances of media consumption" (98). Media fragments thus index joint frames of reference and thereby mediate societies into communities. Other researchers too have argued that the ability to recognize and

recontextualize media quotes creates common ground and enables people to construct themselves as members of a community. Shankar (2004: 332) suggests that "the Bollywood language practices of quoting dialogue, using *filmi* registers for humor and flirting, and engaging with songs and lyrics create a media-based community". In research on the recontextualization of stylized *Türkendeutsch* (i.e. foreign-accented German associated with Turkish-background youth), Androutsopoulos (2001: 20) found that fragments of stylized speech lifted from comedy and other media genres "can be used to create an atmosphere of togetherness, in which interlocutors reassure each other that they belong to the same community of media consumption."

7 Change in mass-mediatized and digitally mediated language: Theme III

Theme III covers research that has been largely unrelated to the two preceding themes. Located in the fields of media linguistics and media discourse studies, this research focuses on change in the language and communicative norms of mass media (cf. Herring 2003). Sociolinguists interested in language change have often conceptualized the media as a centripetal domain whose potential influence basically amounts to promoting standardization (cf. Chambers 1998, 2005; Milroy and Milroy 1999: 29). This view originated in the 1970s and 1980s, a time of considerably more uniformity in media content and discourse. Today, the genres and styles of media language are much more diverse, and the hegemony of standard language is challenged by extensive sociolinguistic heterogeneity. It is by now well documented that vernacular speech styles and hybrid language forms proliferate in media discourse (cf. Androutsopoulos 2010, Coupland 2009b, de Houwer 2003), and that their spread historically coincides with processes of institutional and technological mediatization such as the diversification of target audiences, the fragmentation and multimodality of media products, and the rise of the web as a new domain of mediated communication. The chapters on Theme III link these processes to aspects of sociolinguistic change such as conversationalization, vernacularization, genre change, the multimodality of media texts, and the embedding of digital writing into professional newspaper language. These are briefly reviewed in this section.

The term conversationalization (Fairclough 1994, 1995) describes a process of change that involves "the modelling of public discourse upon the discursive practices of ordinary life" (1994: 253). By orienting to everyday styles of talk, journalists and institutional actors such as politicians or advertisers aim at symbolically bridging the gap between institutions and the everyday experience of

audiences. Linguistically, this can manifest in innovative features of everyday conversational style that are used in contexts where more formal styles of speech or writing would have been expected, and in an increase of hybrid combinations of spoken and written or informal and formal features. Conversationalization promotes a restructuring of the boundary between private and public discourse and a relaxation of public language norms.

Although conversationalization was coined in a critical discourse approach that interrogates the economic and political interests and power relations behind mass-mediated discourse, its linguistic manifestations have been noticed by linguists working in other frameworks too.[18] For instance, Reynolds and Cascio (1999) show that English contracted forms (such as *it's* or *isn't*) increased in British newspaper language from the 1970s to the 1990s across newspapers with various target groups. Cotter (2003) suggests that the increase of sentence-initial connectors in American newspaper usage indexes journalists' changing strategies of relating to their audience. In her analysis, sentence-initial connectors are part of a shift from discourse to addressee orientation. They support understanding and transfer associations of informal conversation to written news discourse. As a cross-linguistically attested process of sociolinguistic change, conversationalization leads to stylistic pluralization in media language. Its directionality cannot be construed as an influence of media to community usage. Quite the opposite, it is media language that catches up with spoken language change (cf. Kristiansen, in this volume). However, the relaxation of broadcast norms can also trigger changes of usage in non-mediated contexts, as stipulated by Holly and Püschel (1993). There is evidence for such feedback concerning taboo expressions, for example, whose mediatized staging legitimizes their use in more formal face-to-face contexts (cf. Bell 2001).

The informalization of media language is itself embedded in and enabled by changes in media genres. Bell's (2003) comparison of news reports from the beginning and the end of the twentieth century suggests that immediacy of reporting enabled by audiovisual electronic media has had a dramatic impact on the development of news reporting towards conversational style. In this volume, Martin Luginbühl argues that television news offers a test bed for the study of change in media genres. Due to their complexity, television news are best regarded as a 'super genre' that is composed of different generic elements, whose configuration varies in time as well as across media channels and countries. In his study of American and Swiss television news shows during seven decades, Luginbühl coins the notion of 'genre profile' to describe the genre repertoires that make up

---

18 Cf. for German Burger (2005: 143), Schmitz (2005: 1617).

a news show, their frequencies, and their sequential order in the show. He finds only a few changes in the sequencing of the American news show, but a paradigm shift in the Swiss news show since the early 1980s. Some genre elements become obsolete, e.g. news items read by the newscaster; others gain in frequency, such as news presentation items and so-called 'packages', i.e. stories produced and told by a correspondent. The increasing segmentation of the Swiss *Tagesschau*, Luginbühl argues, is related to a changing orientation to the audience by which the structure of the news becomes more explicit, the style of reporting is more dialogue-oriented, and journalists are increasingly positioned as experts rather than just reporters. At the level of language style, these new genres create more space for conversationalization in the news.

The notion of vernacularization, as developed by Nikolas Coupland (in this volume), describes a process of sociolinguistic change by which vernacular linguistic features and speech styles gain access "into domains that have been the preserves of standardness". By this definition, vernacularization could also be understood as a part of conversationalization, and overlaps in the linguistic manifestation of the two are perhaps to be expected. However, the scope of vernacularization is narrower in terms of linguistic forms and their indexical values. The concept focuses on (regional or social) non-standard varieties of language whose indexical contrast to standardness is salient and loaded with socio-cultural associations that bear on the referent, the propositional content of the utterance, or other aspects of context.

Vernacular speech forms typically occur in certain media genres, in particular advertisements, fictional series, audience participation genres (especially reality television) and niche media for particular target groups, such as youth-oriented programmes and channels (cf. Androutsopoulos 2010a, Bucholtz 2009, Coupland 2007, 2009b). In these genres, vernacular elements are deployed in reflexive performances of identity. The language-ideological implications of vernacularization concern the impact of its higher visibility and the contextualized contrast between standard and vernacular voices within a media text or performance. Touching here on the interface to the next theme, the mediatization of vernaculars can boost their supra-regional awareness, offering opportunities for metalinguistic reflexivity and leading to "a more positive valorization of vernacularity as well as a weakening or restriction of standard language ideology" (Coupland, in this volume). However, the stylized representation of vernacular speakers and their speech is not always empowering in its indexical inferences and the audience uptakes it enables. The media stylization of vernaculars can also lead to increased social awareness of stigmatized features or speech styles, thereby further reinforcing their stigmatization (cf. Hjarvard 2004; Hill 1995; Zilles 2005; Pappas 2008).

The chapter by Ulrich Schmitz turns to a different aspect of mediatization: how changing communications technologies impact on the semiotic structure of space-bound (print and online) texts. Although Schmitz does not draw on the notion of mediatization, his argument resembles Krotz's understanding of mediatization as a process of increasing complexity and differentiation of communication means, which leads to a "highly complex and simultaneous interplay of all kinds of engineered and direct communication". Focusing on semiotic economy as a tendency of language change, Schmitz analyses the changing multimodal composition of texts across media types. Comparing issues of a local newspaper from 1946 and 2012, he suggests that the latter contains more, but shorter and syntactically less complex texts, and that the share of 'mini texts' of just a couple of sentences (such as front page teasers referring to longer reports in the same edition) has increased over time. Moving to the website of the same newspaper, Schmitz points out its multimodal structure: there is no "single conventional full text whose coherence is produced solely through written means". In interactive web services such as Google Maps, the traditional autonomy of the written text is entirely absent, and written language only comes embedded in multimodal environments. Schmitz extrapolates certain tendencies of written language change in media environments: decrease of "autonomously coherent main texts", decrease in text length, and increase of paratexts (i.e. accompanying smaller texts) and non-written elements (photographs, graphics, videos, pictograms).

The advance of digital media – computer-mediated communication – complicates the relation of mediatization and sociolinguistic change in far-reaching ways. In certain ways, digital media extends the repertoire of media organizations, which nowadays use the web to complement and in part replace their 'old' media technologies of print and broadcasting. For example, Schmitz (in this volume) argues that tendencies of written language change that are already detected in print media are taken to extremes on the web. In addition, computer-mediated communication has created new spaces of public written language communication, which originally emerged independently of the established mass media. The implications of these new public spaces for sociolinguistic change are far from clear. Certain innovations in the language of the new media, such as emoticons and abbreviations, are well documented cross-linguistically. However, hardly any of these constitute instances of structural language change (Crystal 2011), and evidence for a patterned 'spill-over' of digital written language features to other domains and modes of written or even spoken usage is limited to single lexical items and interjections. Androutsopoulos (2011) therefore argues that a structuralist understanding of language stops short from cap-

turing the scale of sociolinguistic change that is brought about by computer-mediated communication.[19]

Drawing on the concept of *Ausbau*, Androutsopoulos (2011a) proposes to theorize sociolinguistic change in computer-mediated communication as an 'elaboration' of written language on three levels: a change of scale in the public circulation of vernacular written language; an increase in spelling variability; and a reconfiguration of written language repertoires.[20] I discuss these briefly in turn.

Computer-mediated communication makes vernacular written language – that is, language produced by non-professionals beyond institutional control– widely available in the public domain, for example in web forums and blogs, customer reviews and user comments. Ways of speaking that traditionally didn't find their way into public writing, such as regional or social dialects or minority and indigenous language, now gain opportunities of public representation (cf. Deumert, in this volume). This public vernacular writing is now often intertwined with professionally crafted and institutionally controlled written language and can thereby be transferred more easily into mainstream public written discourse (cf. Squires and Iorio, in this volume). We see here yet another take on the intermingling of the private and the public, a tendency that shapes sociolinguistic change in media discourse in general.

The massive change of scale in public vernacular written language has repercussions at a micro-level of spelling variability and a macro-level of written language repertoires. Digital writers transcend normative orthography, for example to represent allegro forms or vernacular speech, to simulate spoken language prosody, or to shorten the message. Spelling thus gains importance as a domain of sociolinguistic variation, thereby challenging the traditional sociolinguistic perspective on spelling as the most invariant level of linguistic structure (cf. Sebba 2007, Squires 2012). Unconventional spellings in digital writing neither replace standard orthography nor lead to a loss of normative awareness. Rather, evidence suggests that speakers broaden their written language repertoires by developing new styles of written language without entirely abandoning the formal written

---

19 The remainder of this section draws on Androutsopoulos (2011a).

20 The notion of elaboration differs from *Ausbau* (cf. Haarmann 2004). *Ausbau* describes an extension of written language use into new institutional domains as part of a broader language standardization process. However, the elaboration of digital written language is, at least in Europe, a 'post-standardization' process in the sense that it is carried out against the backdrop of fully standardized national languages. Moreover, *Ausbau* extends the written use of a language beyond the field of 'everyday prose' and towards increasingly abstract and technical written registers. By contrast, much digital written language is part of everyday language practices, which are being recontextualized and extended by means of digital media.

language that is required for non-digital, non-vernacular settings. In this process, the metapragmatic awareness of variability in written language changes too. The elaboration of digital written language thus implies a pluralization and local-ization of the ways in which written language can index social identity. Written language norms are pluralized to the extent distinct styles of writing are deemed appropriate for different communicative circumstances, and localized to the extent certain written language forms only circulate in specific online commu-nities or networks. With regard to orthography and punctuation, the elaboration of digital written language can be thought of as a process of destandardization in the sense of status change (rather than structural change).[21] The normative claim of standardized orthography is challenged and partially replaced by small-er-scale conventions.

Two caveats are in order here. First, the elaboration of digital written language as a process of sociolinguistic change is more complex than a linear development towards greater destandardization or vernacularization. The small amount of available diachronic research on feature-based language change in CMC suggests that phases of innovative destandardization give way to more conventional, stan-dard-oriented usage.[22] Second, interfaces of unregulated digital writing with stan-dardized media language must be considered too. In this volume, Lauren Squires and Josh Iorio examine such an interface: how Twitter messages by celebrities are quoted in news reports. The authors examine the occurrence of 'netspeak' features and representations of prosody in reported tweets from 2009–2011. Their findings suggest that the non-standard orthography that is regarded as iconic of Twitter decreases over time. As a result, reported tweets gradually become less deviant from the orthographic norm of newspaper language. As the authors point out, "rather than the growth of new media pushing highly regulated spaces of dis-course to relax their standards [...] the language of tweets is represented as being in closer alignment with the language of the standard news media itself." Squires and Iorio link this development both to editing practices by journalists and to the regulation of celebrity athletes' tweets by their professional institutions.

---

21 As described by Auer (1997) and Coupland (2009a), destandardization implies a language-ideological shift by which the standard variety loses (some of) its generally binding normative claim and is replaced in that regard by a number of smaller-scale standards (e.g. regional stan-dards).

22 For example, a recent study on language change in French chat interaction (Strätz 2011) shows for a course of five years a decrease in performance mistakes (typos), increase in syntactic complexity and punctuation norms, decrease in abbreviations and a range of stylistic changes towards more communicative distance, i.e. more formal styles of writing.

8 Enregisterment of change in media discourse: Theme IV

Variability and change in language have long been subject to commentary and debate in the media (cf. Blommaert 1999; Milroy and Milroy 1999). Language changes in progress can be stigmatized in the media, thereby increasing the "overt social awareness" (Zilles 2005: 44) of the on-going change. The assumption that the media has an influence on language use is widespread and often put forward in media discourse itself, and media language is often held responsible for declining standards of usage (cf. Moschonas, in this volume; Thurlow 2006). Against this backdrop, Theme IV focuses on representations of linguistic change in media discourse. The three chapters examine how media discourse contributes to the enregisterment of sociolinguistic change, and how metalinguistic reflection among professional journalists constructs change in media usage.

Mass media – and increasingly also new media – are widely regarded as an influential site of metalinguistic discourse (see Blackledge 2005; Blommaert 1999; Johnson and Milani 2010; Johnstone 2011). As Milani and Johnson (2010: 4) put it, "the power of the media in language ideological processes lies to a considerable extent in their practices as gatekeepers in the regimentation of 'expert systems' (Giddens 1991) on language related issues." The media, they continue, open up discursive spaces, "thereby giving a public voice to a variety of social actors who compete with each other in staking various claims regarding what counts as *legitimate* knowledge in the domain of language" (Milani and Johnson 2010: 4). Metalinguistic discourse in the public sphere involves actors from various institutions and a range of discourse practices by which metalinguistic labels, classifications and distinctions are proposed, thereby often reproducing relations of social inequality and exclusion.

The chapters in this Section draw on three influential frameworks of language-ideological analysis that are widely used in sociolinguistic studies of metalinguistic discourses in the media. These are the semiotic processes of language ideology formation by Irvine and Gal, Silverstein's framework of indexical order, and Agha's framework of enregisterment. Irvine and Gal (2000) propose an analysis of language ideology formation in terms of three semiotic processes, i.e. iconization, fractal recursivity, and erasure. Their framework has been used to examine media representations of new varieties of national languages among migrants and migrant-background youth (cf. Androutsopoulos 2010b, Milani 2010). Silverstein's notion of orders of indexicality centres on the idea that indexical meanings in a community's linguistic repertoire are hierarchically organized (Silverstein 2003, Blommaert 2007, Johnstone, Andrus and Danielson 2006, Johnstone 2010). Orders of indexicality denote "a stratified general repertoire,

in which particular indexical orders relate to others in relations of mutual valuation – higher/lower, better/worse" (Blommaert 2007: 117). Three levels of indexical meaning are distinguished: first-order indexicality denotes observable correlations between linguistic forms and social categories, which are however not deployed by speakers themselves in meaning-making. Second-order indexicality occurs "when people begin to use first-order correlations to do social work, either interpretive or performative" (Johnstone et al. 2006: 83). Third-order indexicality is the stage at which enregistered speech forms become available for "reflexive performances of local identities" (Johnstone et al. 2006: 83).

Enregisterment is defined by Agha (2003: 231) as the process by which "a linguistic repertoire becomes differentiable within a language as a specially recognized register of forms". Discourse registers involve linguistic resources on various levels of structure (lexis, prosody, constructions), which are associated with social groups or practices (Agha 2007: 147–154). This association is established by means of metapragmatic stereotypes, which link speech forms with recognizable speaker stereotypes and social contexts of use (Johnstone 2011). The metapragmatic typification of a register can be found in "everyday reflexive behaviors" and "metadiscursive genres", including journalistic, literary and pedagogic representations of language use. Genres of metapragmatic discourse include "glosses of language use; names for registers and associated speech genres; accounts of typical and exemplary speakers; propositions on usage; standard of appropriate use; positive or negative assessments of the social worth of a register" (Agha 2007: 150–1). In his work on the enregisterment of Received Pronunciation, Agha distinguishes five "genres of accent metadiscourses" (2003: 245), each with a specific scale of circulation extending to recipients with specific demographic traits, among them popular handbooks, novels and "weekly pennies". Enregisterment includes the discursive construction of typical or 'exemplary speakers', which can change in the course of time (2003: 265).[23] In the framework of enregisterment, mass media "formulate models of language" (Squires 2010: 471) by making metapragmatic typifications of registers available to large audiences for recontextualization and response. As already pointed out in the discussion on mediatization above (Section 4), Agha emphasizes the scale

---

23 Agha's (2003) notion of 'exemplary speakers' resonates with the sociolinguistic concept of 'model speakers' proposed by Ammon (2003) in the context of standardization. However, Ammon's conception of 'model speakers' focuses on agents of standard norm maintenance such as newsreaders or other professional speakers. In the light of enregisterment theory, it seems more useful to assume that broadcast in late-modern societies offers a variety of 'model speakers' for the typification of registers at various levels of formality or standardness. Mediatized model speakers can also typify covertly prestigious speech styles (cf. Cutler 1999).

of collective response that mass-mediatization enable. Mediatized circulation is the aspect of the enregisterment process by which "some events within such processes set the initial condition for very large-scale forms of response" (2003: 269). Agha points out: "However particular audiences may respond, most of them are responding to the same thing" (2003: 266).

A recent study of sociolinguistic change that builds on indexicality and enregisterment is the research on Pittsburghese by Barbara Johnstone and associates (cf. Johnstone 2004, 2009, 2010, 2011). Framed as "a particularistic approach to linguistic and ideological change" (Johnstone et al. 2006: 77), this research links the public circulation of language ideologies to processes of sociolinguistic change in Pittsburgh's urban community. Its findings suggest that mediatization becomes relevant at the third level of indexical order, whereby features perceived as belonging to Pittsburghese are explicitly talked about and used in reflexive performances of identity. While second-order indexicality arises as a consequence of mobility, with speakers from Pittsburgh becoming aware of particularities in their own speech, third-order indexicality emerges as incomers to the city of Pittsburgh seek linguistic resources by which to position themselves towards established local identities. Pittsburghese features that are already enregistered become available for stylization to young locals whose own vernacular speech is less locally marked than the speech of their parents' generation. In this process, the indexical meaning of Pittsburghese features shifts from class to place: features that were previously perceived as signifiers of working class are now heard as indices of local urban identity. As Johnstone et al. (2006: 84, 94) point out, a range of media representations contribute to this process:

> Only a subset of the features of regional speech have been taken up into the third order of indexicality, in which using words and pronunciations from a highly codified repertoire is a way people who may have few of the resources for second-order indexicality can show that they know how Pittsburghers sound. [...] These people notice regional speech features, now as often in mass media representations like folk dictionaries and Web sites that metapragmatically link regional speech and local identity as by actually interacting with locals engaging in metapragmatic practices that link local forms with class and correctness. They use them in reflexive, self-conscious attempts to claim local identity by displaying local knowledge.

The mediatized representation of language varieties involves a multitude of genres (e.g. reports, radio features, online discussions, encyclopaedia entries, academic articles, folk dictionaries, merchandise); discourse spaces (e.g. newspapers, local broadcasting, web discussion forums); and 'ideology brokers', including journalists and language scholars (Androutsopoulos 2010b, 2011b; Kerswill, in this volume). Local and participatory media increasingly gain importance in the

'making' of new dialects (Johnstone 2011). Likewise, the enregisterment of 'netspeak' unfolds by means of speech chains that link mediatized representations to mediated responses, e.g. discussions in internet forums (Squires 2010).

In this volume, Paul Kerswill examines media representations of Jafaican ('fake Jamaican'), a recent label by which British newspapers refer to multi-ethnic vernacular forms of London English. Kerswill's account links a corpus and discourse analysis of 'Jafaican' to previous extensive research on Multicultural London English, thereby assessing mediatized representations against the backdrop of spoken language innovations. Kerswill uses the concept of mediatization in Jaffe's sense, i.e. the staging of metalinguistic discourse in media reports. He identifies a number of both positive and stigmatizing discourses which link Jafaican to social problems, entertainment culture, and socio-demographical change in London.

The notion of enregisterment seems particularly well suited to study the discursive construction of speech forms that are perceived as recently emerging in the context of socio-demographic and technological change. However, enregisterment processes are also at work when regional dialects – themselves the outcome of earlier processes of enregisterment – become anew the subject of metadiscursive awareness, with their indexical values being refashioned in the course of broader socio-economic and cultural changes such as regionalization and commodification. Johnstone's finding in the case of Pittsburghese is an indexical shift, or reindexicalization, of local features from meanings of class to those of place, would seem to hold true for other cases where regional dialects are metadiscursively transformed into emblems of commoditized places. Merchandise targeted to tourists and diaspora communities is a resource in this continuous reindexicalization (cf. Beal 2009, Johnstone 2009). The reinterpretation of indexical links between local speech forms, discursive practices and social identities can be observed in audio-visual performances too. For example, a study of the performance of German dialects in amateur videos on *YouTube* finds that "dialect discourses on *YouTube* destabilize existing mass-mediated regimes of dialect representation by pluralizing the performance and stylization of dialects"(Androutsopoulos 2013: 66). This study found that representations of the Berlin city dialect on *YouTube* transgress the traditional stereotype of the male, working class dialect speaker and stage new 'exemplary speakers' of the city dialect such as trendy young women and technologically savvy men. These representations are available for public evaluation and comment, illustrating how social media extend the authority to participate in enregisterment. We see here a topic worth in pursuing in further research: how mediatization induces shifts in the construction of public metadiscursive expertise (cf. Johnstone and Baumgart 2004).

Given the role of journalists in the production of mass media language, it is surprising that little attention has been paid to their practices in the context of language change. The second topic covered in this section is how journalists thematize linguistic change in and through the media.

The chapter by Colleen Cotter examines how an influential stylebook for professional journalists responds to linguistic and social change. Drawing on ethnographic research into journalistic practices and linguistic analysis of newspaper discourse, Cotter conceptualizes language attitudes in the professional community of journalists as a tension between the 'protection' of standards and the 'promotion' of innovations. News professionals see themselves as agents of the maintenance of language standards. They endorse a journalistic language ideology that builds on the principle of consistency and engage "in prescriptive routines at every level of practice" (Cotter, in this volume). At the same time, they act as promoters of innovations in language use and "consciously alter their usage patterns to reflect social change in progress". Cotter's analysis of several print editions and the online version of the Associated Press Stylebook suggests that the stylebook claims to feature "entries that reflect the language of our world". Its new or amended recommendations primarily concern 'socially sensitive' and 'politically correct' lexical items. However, its recommendations on grammatical rules remain consistent through time. The stylebook's responses to language change do not match actually observable patterns of structural change in the language of news, e.g. the frequency of determiner deletion (Bell 2011) or the general tendency of economy and fragmentation (cf. Schmitz, in this volume). Nonetheless Cotter concludes that journalists' awareness of change in language "is more attuned than one might think".

In his chapter, Spiros Moschonas asks how journalists and language experts conceptualize the effects of broadcast media on language change. While Cotter focuses on the community of news professionals, Moschonas emphasizes the fuzzy boundaries between lay, expert and academic metalinguistic discourse, pointing out that some folk conceptions of language change "are being propagated in and through the print media by linguists themselves". Based on a corpus of Greek newspaper data from 1986–2011, Moschonas outlines a "conceptual topology" of language-related issues, which include a strong belief in media-induced language change, language relativism, prescriptivism, and standardization. The metalinguistic discourse of Greek newspapers is predominantly prescriptivist and equates language change to deviation from written language norms. This discourse is also characterized by "an unequivocal belief in the reality of media-induced language change" (Moschonas, in this volume). Commenters share the assumption that mass media language creates standards by the mere reality of its large-scale reception and traditional authority. Interest-

ingly, various types of media are assessed differently in terms of their assumed effects on language: print media are viewed as 'protectors' (in Cotter's sense) of language standards, whereas television and the internet are held responsible for introducing or propagating undesired linguistic changes.

As several chapters in this volume suggest, understanding the language-ideological processes that are associated with mediatization is in the centre of the current discussion of media and sociolinguistic change (cf. in particular the chapters by Coupland, Kristiansen, Stuart-Smith and Ota, Moriarty, and Pietikäinen). In a traditional sociolinguistic perspective on language change, metalinguistic discourse gains relevance only to the extent it correlates with language change at the feature level. However, Kristiansen (in this volume) and Johnstone maintain that "the existence of second-order indexical relations eventually influences the first-order 'facts on the ground', since the sociolinguistic value of a form affects the demographic distribution of its use" (Johnstone et al. 2006:84). For example, representations of German ethnolects in film, comedy and media discourse (Androutsopoulos 2001, 2010b, 2011b) have given rise to sociolinguistic knowledge, which is then indexed, by means of intertextual chains, in subsequent media representations. Metalinguistic representations in the media are readily available for recontextualization in various discursive sites. They can be thematized in pedagogic publications, stylized in talk shows or prompt an avoidance of enregistered features on the part of the speakers in their encounter with a fieldworker (cf. Auer 2013). Androutsopoulos (2011b) describes how schoolbooks on the German language recontextualize earlier media reports and comedy catch phrases in their representation of "the ethnolect" as a new variety of German. In a framework of sociolinguistic change, then, we can ask how mediatized represenations of language in society prompt subsequent mediatized representations and mediated responses in which audiences creatively recontextualize media fragments by exemplary speakers into their own performances.

9 Mediatized spaces for minoritized languages: Theme V

Theme V introduces a field of language-media relations in which several processes discussed so far are interrelated. It focuses on the role of (mass and new) media in the development of languages that can be regarded in certain ways as 'functionally incomplete'. By this I mean the opposite of what Moring (2007) calls 'functional completeness': a state where "speakers of the language, if they so choose, can live their life in and through the language without having to resort to other languages, at least within the confines of everyday matters in their com-

munity (Moring 2007:18).[24] Incompleteness in Moring's sense seems characteristic for languages which lack *Ausbau*, i.e. elaboration in function, in particular towards scientific prose (cf. Haarmann 2004). We can distinguish languages that never achieved 'completeness' from languages that are in the process of losing an earlier stage of 'completeness'. The former include for example indigenous languages that lack codification and mass literacy (see Deumert, in this volume), the latter include so-called threatened and/or endangered languages that are losing public and institutional domains, Low German and Yiddish being examples.[25] In any case, languages characterized by 'functional incompleteness' are typically minoritized languages regardless of their historical trajectory and official status.

Media are implicated in the current development of 'incomplete' languages in ways that are historically distinct, but functionally related. As is well known, the media are often seen as an important part of the maintenance or revitalization of threatened and endangered languages (cf. Moriarty and Pietikäinen, in this volume). More recently, computer-mediated communication has been regarded as relevant to the functional expansion of indigenous languages towards literacy and public representation (cf. Lexander 2011 and Deumert, in this volume). The three chapters in this section discuss both developments. Before turning to a short summary, a brief overview of research in this field is given.

Probably the earliest sociolinguistic account of the role of media for minoritized languages is Joshua Fishman's model of Reversing Language Shift (Fishman 1991, 2001), which represents the revitalization of a threatened language as an eight-step process that leads from the reconstruction of intergenerational transmission to the presence of the language in public and institutional domains. The media appear at the model's two "top stages": stage 1 features nationwide mass media; stage 2 includes local regional media. Fishman is critical of the relevance of media to RLS. Being part of a "high power" stage, mass media are in his view "particularly problematic for [threatened languages] because of the [majority group's] social control" (Fishman 2001: 473). Minority language media are in Fishman's view "often very pale imitations of [majority language] media" (473).[26] However, Fishman makes a distinction between mass media and what he

---

24 Discussing minority language media, Moring (2007) distinguishes 'functional completeness' (the actual use of minority language media by speakers) from 'institutional completeness' (the availability of a range of media types and media content to a minority language community).

25 The two types are not clear-cut. For example, Corsican combines aspects of both.

26 Fishman argues, "Black English media programmes have not made Black English speakers out of 'White English' listeners" (2001: 474). But in cases such as that of 'Mike' (cf. Cutler 1999), rap music and hip-hop media have had precisely this effect. Fishman's view seems grounded in a somewhat narrow, or perhaps simply outdated, perspective on 'ethnic' media content.

terms "self-regulated communications technologies", which he views as "content neutral" and "facilitators of any stage" (482). He suggests that "RLS-teachers must be linked to each other [...] via the most modern media that can be under their own regulatory management [...] and they must become skilled at using such media for RLS purposes". However, Fishman points out that media "only creates a 'virtual community'" and cannot substitute 'real' community relations and face-to-face interactions in the RLS process (2001: 458, 473, 482). We encounter here, I would suggest, a rigid distinction between 'media' and 'community' that also characterizes earlier variationist discussions.

Research on media and minoritized languages discusses the media as both a resource for and a potential threat to revitalization and maintenance (cf. Clyne 1991: 376, Cormack 2007, Cormack and Hourigan 2007, Cotter 2001, Jaffe 2007). According to Cormack (2007: 54–5), minority language media can offer 'language support' in three ways: it "puts large amounts of language use into public domain", can "function as a signifier that a community is fully modernized, capable of taking part in contemporary life", and can "meld people into a sense of a larger community". Cormack also distinguishes three types of media impact on language maintenance: active promotion of language use, "opportunities and motivations for language use", and "provision of a background against which language use can be developed" (2007: 60). However, such statements seem to be driven more by the instrumental and symbolic power of broadcasting than by empirical evidence. Critical voices point out that it is very difficult to empirically establish a direct positive effect by minority language media on actual language use. Cormack himself argues against expecting "to find direct evidence of how successful or not media use has been in encouraging language use" and points out that "the role that media can play in the more direct forms of language maintenance – that is, actually encouraging people to use a language – should not be over-estimated" (Cormack 2007: 62, 66). Media provision is a necessary, but not sufficient means of minority language support (cf. Moring 2007, Moriarty, in this volume). In order to be actually used by the minority language community, media must be attractive to audiences, but this is often not the case, especially with young audiences.

More recent 'ecological approaches' (Cormack 2007) to minority language media turn from the provision of minority language content to more fleeting and transitional processes of minority language circulation across media, thereby responding to the shift from traditional mass media to digital media and cross-media networks, in which boundaries between professional and participatory authorship dissolve (cf. Theme 3 above). A recent special issue on "Jewish languages in the age of the internet" (Benor and Sadan 2011) emphasizes "the role of the internet in the maintenance of endangered languages [and] in the

negotiation of language ideologies and practices" (Benor 2011: 95). It suggests that the digitally-mediated use of Jewish languages such as Yiddish, Ladino and Judeo-Greek does not lead to a fully-fledged revitalization but to a "post-vernacular" stage of predominantly symbolic rather than practical communicative use. As a site of participatory discourse, the internet enables public metalinguistic debates on the social and cultural meanings of these languages and offers opportunities for practices of 'vernacular norming'(cf. Johnstone and Baumgart 2004). This is an example for the interaction of several themes addressed in this volume.

The three chapters in this section examine the use and representation of minoritized languages in complex media ecologies and offer accounts of their fluid and often fragmented use there. The chapter by Máiréad Moriarty examines the impact of native language broadcasting on Irish and Basque students in terms of their language attitudes and reported language practices. Moriarty's analysis brings together the increasing linguistic heterogeneity in media discourse, the emergence of micro-level agents of language policy and planning, and the ideological nature of minority language media, which aim to "provide innovative contexts and practices" for minority language use (cf. also Moriarty and Pietikäinen 2011). Moriarty's results suggest that Basque and Irish students overwhelmingly regard native language television channels as "positive promoters" of the Irish and Basque language and identify certain media personalities as particularly influential promoters. However, Moriarty also argues that the impact of these channels on the community's language ideology crucially depends on the style of media programme. In the Irish case, performance genres and individual performers contribute to transforming the indexical values of Irish. Moriarty quotes evidence from online discussion boards to support the claim that Bishop's performance "triggered an ideological shift" by which "the Irish language gains a new indexical value of being cool".

In her chapter, Ana Deumert focuses on the web representation of indigenous African languages that lack mass literacy. The web presents a novel space of public visibility and written practice for these languages, yet not all web spaces are equally conductive to this. Deumert's comparison of Wikipedia and Facebook, two globally popular sites of participatory content, brings to the fore striking differences in terms of the genres and content that is contributed in isiXhosa and other African languages. The mere availability of Wikipedia articles in these languages says nothing about their content, which mostly consists of 'stubs' (i.e. short, incomplete articles) that are contributed by non-native speakers of the language. By contrast, Facebook pages devoted to isiXhosa are lively and dynamic, demanding full use of the language. Deumert explains this difference in terms of the types of knowledge and social interaction they invite. Wikipedia's "Western view of knowledge" turns out to inhibit the use of indigenous languages, but

Facebook's emphasis on digitally recontextualized social interaction makes room for elements of traditional knowledge, and genres of communicative ritual and verbal art.

The chapter by Sari Pietikäinen focuses on the circulation of Sámi across Finnish media spaces. Drawing on the notion of rhizome and the framework of nexus analysis, Pietikäinen defines circulation as a "complex, rhizomatic sociolinguistic process". Even in the case of a small group of minoritized languages like Sámi, minority media spaces vary in terms of their target audiences, the cross-media spaces they operate in (e.g. combining a television programme with a website and social media pages), and the language practices and ideologies they endorse. Pietikäinen's analysis compares a "super fixed multilingual space" – a news television channel with Sámi-only language policy that tries "to police the boundaries by explicit norms and rules" – to a "strategically hybrid" space, i.e. a television comedy programme where Sámi is used together with Finnish and English in stylized performances of hybrid identities in a carnivalesque spirit.

In conclusion, Theme V examines a field of research that has been largely separate from the ones reviewed so far, and demonstrates how aspects of all five themes represented in this volume come together in practice. As far as minority language communities are concerned, the impact of media on language attitudes and use cannot be construed as 'copying' (cf. Trudgill 1986), thereby excluded from further theorizing. Having an impact on the minority community's language practices is an explicit aim of minority language media provision, and making a conscious decision to use the minoritized language is not an 'exceptional' case, as a traditional variationist view would assume. Likewise, the spread of new minority language vocabulary is not a peripheral aspect of media influence, but an important part of the intended revitalization process (cf. Moriarty, in this volume). We see in this research that "language change in minority language contexts is always [an] ideologically invested process" (Pietikäinen, in this volume). This suggests that language ideology processes ought to play a key role in the further study of mediatization and sociolinguistic change. Finally, this research demonstrates the importance of individual speakers as agents of sociolinguistic change, be it "diaspora elites" (Deumert) or performers whose mediatized language practices are widely recontextualized and responded to by audiences.

Acknowledgements

volume's realization was facilitated by a research fellowship at the Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies (FRIAS) from April to September 2012. I am indebted to Peter Auer, then director of the FRIAS School of Language & Literature, for his continuous support with this project. I also thank Florian Busch, postgraduate student in Hamburg, for editorial assistance in preparing the manuscript for publication.

I dedicate this volume to the sociolinguist and dear friend, Janet Spreckels (Heidelberg University of Education), who passed away too early in March 2014. Janet took part in the 2008 thematic panel, and her inspiring work on young people's media engagement lives on in this volume.

References

All weblinks last accessed and valid on 4 March 2013.

Agha, Asif 2003: The social life of cultural value. *Language and Communication* 23: 231–73.
Agha, Asif *2007*: *Language and social relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Agha, Asif 2011: Meet mediatization. *Language & Communication* 31 (3): 163–170.
Ammon, Ulrich 2005: Standard und Variation: Norm, Autorität, Legitimation. In: Ludwig Eichinger and Werner Kallmeyer (eds.), *Standardvariation: Wie viel Variation verträgt die deutsche Standardsprache*? 28–40. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Anderson, Benedict 2006: *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Revised edition. London/New York: Verso.
Andersson, Lars and Peter Trudgill 1990: *Bad language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Androutsopoulos, Jannis 2001: 'From the streets to the screens and back again: On the mediated diffusion of variation patterns in contemporary German'. *LAUD Linguistic Agency*, A:522, University of Essen. URL: http://www.linse.uni-due.de/online-shop/details/261.html.
Androutsopoulos, Jannis 2005: „…und jetzt gehe ich chillen": Jugend- und Szenesprachen als Erneuerungsquellen des Standards. In: Ludwig Eichinger and Werner Kallmeyer (eds.), *Standardvariation: Wie viel Variation verträgt die deutsche Standardsprache?*171–206. Berlin: de Gruyter (IDS-Jahrbuch 2004).
Androutsopoulos, Jannis 2010a: The study of language and space in media discourse. In: Peter Auer and Jürgen E. Schmidt (eds.),*Language and space: An international handbook of linguistic variation. Volume I: Theory and methods*, 740–758. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
Androutsopoulos, Jannis 2010b: Ideologizing ethnolectal German. In: Sally Johnson and Tommaso M. Milani (eds.), *Language ideologies and media discourse*, 182–202. London: Continuum.
Androutsopoulos, Jannis 2011a: Language change and digital media: A review of conceptions and evidence. In: Tore Kristiansen and Nikolas Coupland (eds.), *Standard languages and language standards in a changing Europe*, 145–161. Oslo: Novus.
Androutsopoulos, Jannis 2011b: Die Erfindung des Ethnolekts. *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 164: 93–120.

Androutsopoulos, Jannis (ed.) 2012: *Language and society in cinematic discourse*. Special Issue, *Multilingua* 31 (2).

Androutsopoulos, Jannis 2013: Participatory culture and metalinguistic discourse: Performing and negotiating German dialects on YouTube. In: Deborah Tannen and Anna Marie Trester (eds.),*Discourse 2.0. Language and new media*, 47–71. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Auer, Peter 1997: Führt Dialektabbau zur Stärkung oder Schwächung der Standardvarietät? Zwei phonologische Fallstudien. In: Klaus J. Mattheier and Edgar Radtke (eds.), *Standardisierung und Destandardisierung europäischer Nationalsprachen*, 129–162. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Auer, Peter 2013: Ethnische Marker im Deutschen zwischen Varietät und Stil. In: Arnulf Deppermann (ed.), *Das Deutsch der Migranten*, 9–40. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Auer, Peter and Frans Hinskens 2005: The role of interpersonal accommodation in a theory of language change. In: Peter Auer, Frans Hinskens and Paul Kerswill (eds.), *Dialect change. Convergence and divergence in European languages*, 335–357. Cambridge: CUP.

Auer, Peter and Helmut Spiekermann 2011: Demotisation of the standard variety or de-standardisation? The changing status of German in late modernity (with special reference to southwestern Germany). In: Tore Kristiansen and Nikolas Coupland (eds.), *Standard languages and language standards in a changing Europe*, 161–176. Oslo: Novus Press.

Ayaß, Ruth and Cornelia Gerhardt (eds.) 2012: *The appropriation of media in everyday life. What people do with media*. London: Benjamins.

Bauman, Richard and Charles L. Briggs 1990: Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 59–88.

Beal, Joan C. 2009: Enregisterment, commodification and historical context: "Geordie" versus "Sheffieldish". *American Speech* 84 (2): 138–156.

Bell, Allan 1984: Language Style as audience design. *Language in Society* 13: 154–204.

Bell, Allan 1991: *Language of the news media*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bell, Allan 2001: 'Bugger!' Media language, identity and post-modernity. *New Zealand Sociology* 16 (1):128–150.

Bell, Allan 2003: Poles apart: globalization and the development of news discourse across the twentieth century. In: Jean Aitchison and Diana M. Lewis (eds.), *New media language*, 7–17. London: Routledge.

Bell, Allan 2011: Leaving Home: De-europeanisation in a post-colonial variety ofbroadcast news language. In: Tore Kristiansen and Nikolas Coupland (eds.), *Standard languages and language standards in a changing Europe*, 177–198. Oslo: Novus.

Bell, Allan and Andy Gibson 2011: Staging language: An introduction to the sociolinguistics of performance. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15 (5): 555–572.

Benor, Sarah Bunin 2011: Jewish languages in the age of the Internet: an introduction. *Language & Communication* 31: 95–98.

Benor, Sarah Bunin and Tsvi Sadan (eds.) 2011: *Jewish languages in the age of the Internet*. Special Issue. *Language & Communication* 31 (2).

Birken-Silverman, Gabriele 2003: Mediale Genres im Kommunikationsstil einer Gruppe italienischer Migrantenjugendlicher. In: Stephan Habscheid and Ulla Fix (eds.), *Gruppenstile*, 247–270. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Blackledge, Adrian 2005: *Discourse and power in a multilingual world*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Blommaert, Jan (ed.) 1999: *Language ideological debates*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Blommaert, Jan 2005: In and out of class, codes and control: Globalisation, discourse and mobility. In: Mike Baynham and Anna De Fina (eds.), *Dislocations / Relocations: Narratives of displacement*, 128–141. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Blommaert, Jan 2007: Sociolinguistics and discourse analysis: Orders of indexicality and polycentricity. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 2 (2): 115–130.

Blommaert, Jan 2010: *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boberg, Charles 2000: Geolinguistic diffusion and the U.S.–Canada border. *Language Variation and Change* 12: 1–24.

Brandt, Wolfgang 2000: Sprache in Hörfunk und Fernsehen. In: Werner Besch, Anne Betten, Oskar Reichmann and Stefan Sonderegger (eds.), *Sprachgeschichte*, Vol. 2, 2159–2168. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.

Branner, Rebecca 2002: Zitate aus der Medienwelt. *Muttersprache*2002 (4): 337–359.

Bucholtz, Mary 2009: From Stance to Style: Gender, interaction, and indexicality in Mexican immigrant youth slang. In: Alexandra Jaffe (ed.), *Stance. Sociolinguistic perspectives*, 146–170. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buchstaller, Isabelle 2008: The *localization* of global linguistic variants. *English World-Wide* 29: 15–44.

Burger, Harald 2005: *Mediensprache*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Carvalho, Ana Maria 2004: I speak like the guys on TV: Palatalization and the urbanization of Uruguayan Portugese. *Language Variation and Change* 16: 127–151.

Chambers, Jack K. 1998: TV makes people sound the same. In: Laurie Bauer, Peter Trudgill (eds.), *Language myths,* 123–131. London: Penguin.

Chambers Jack K. 2003: *Sociolinguistic Theory*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell

Chambers, Jack K. 2005: Media power. Talk the talk? *Do You Speak American?* Online document. URL: http://www.pbs.org/speak/ahead/mediapower/media/

Clyne, Michael 1991: *Community languages: The Australian experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cormack, Mike 2007: The Media and language maintenance. In: Mike Cormack and Niamh Hourigan (eds.), *Minority language media: Concepts, critiques and case studies*, 52–68. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cormack, Mike and Niamh Hourigan, (eds.) 2007: *Minority language media: Concepts, critiques and case studies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cotter, Colleen 2001: Raidióna Life: Innovations in the use of media for language revitalisation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 140: 136–147.

Cotter, Colleen 2003: Prescription and practice: Motivations behind change in news discourse. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 4 (1): 45–74.

Coupland, Nikolas 2001: Dialect stylization in radio talk. *Language in Society* 30: 345–375.

Coupland, Nikolas 2007: *Style. Language variation and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coupland, Nikolas 2009a: Dialects, standards and social change. In: Marie Maegaard, Frans Gregersen, Pia Quist and Jens Normann Jørgensen (eds.), *Language attitudes, standardization and language change*, 27–48. Oslo: Novus.

Coupland, Nikolas 2009b: The mediated performance of vernaculars. *Journal of English Linguistics* 37 (3): 284–300.

Coupland, Nikolas (ed.) 2010: *The handbook of language and globalization*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Coupland, Nikolas, Srikant Sarangi and Christopher N. Candlin (eds.) 2001: *Sociolinguistics and social theory*. London: Longman.

Crystal, David 2011: *Internet Linguistics*. London: Routledge.

Cutler, Cecilia 1999: Yorkville Crossing. White teens, hip hop, and African American English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3 (4): 428–442.

De Houwer, Annick 2003: Language variation and local elements in family discourse. *Language Variation and Change* 15: 329–349.

Deppermann, Arnulf 2007: Playing with the voice of the other: Stylized Kanaksprak in conversations among German adolescents. In: Peter Auer (ed.), *Style and social identities: alternative approaches to linguistic heterogeneity*, 325–360. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.

Deumert, Ana and Wim Vandenbussche 2003: Standard*languages: Taxonomies and histories*. In: Ana Deumert and Wim Vandenbussche (eds.), *Germanic standardizations: past to present*, 1–14. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Dirim, Inci and Peter Auer 2004: *Türkisch sprechen nicht nur die Türken. Über die Unschärfebeziehung zwischen Sprache und Ethnie in Deutschland*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Eckert, Penelope 2003: Elephants in the room. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7: 392–397.

Fairclough, Norman 1995: *Media Discourse*. London: Arnold.

Fairclough, Norman 1994: Conversationalization of public discourse and the authority of the consumer. In: Russell Keat, Nigel Whiteley and Nicholas Abercrombie (eds.), *The authority of the consumer*, 253–268. London: Routledge.

Fishman, Joshua A. (ed.) 1999: *Handbook of language and ethnic identity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fishman, Joshua A. (ed.) 2001: *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift revisited: A 21st century perspetive*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gauntlett, David 1998: Ten things wrong with the 'effects model'. In: Roger Dickinson, Ramaswani Harindranath and Olga Linné (eds.), *Approaches to audiences – A reader*, 120–130. London: Arnold.

Giesecke, Michael 1992: *Sinnenwandel, Sprachwandel, Kulturwandel: Studien zur Vorgeschichte der Informationsgesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Gillespie, Marie 1995: *Television, ethnicity and cultural change*. London: Routledge.

Haarmann, Harald 2004: Abstand-Language – Ausbau-Language / Abstandsprache – Ausbausprache. In: Ulrich Ammon, Norbert Dittmar, Klaus J. Mattheier and Peter Trudgill (eds.), *Sociolinguistics. An international handbook of the science of language and society*, 2nd ed. Vol.1, 238–250. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Hall, Stuart 1977: The Work of Representation. In: Stuart Hall (ed.), *Represenation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, 1–74. London: Sage.

Heller, Monica 2007: Bilingualism as ideology and practice. In: Monica Heller (ed.) *Bilingualism: a social approach*, 1–22. Palgrave Macmillan.

Herring, Susan C. 2003: Media and language change: Introduction. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 4 (1): 1–17.

Hewitt, Roger 1986: *White talk black talk. Inter-racial friendship and communication amongst adolescents*. Cambridge: CUP.

Hill, Jane 1995: Mock Spanish: A site for the indexical reproduction of racism in American English. URL: http://language-culture.binghamton.edu/symposia/2/part1/index.html.

Hjarvard, Stig 2004: The globalization of language: How the media contribute to the spread of English and the emergence of medialects. *Nordicom Review* 1–2: 75–97.

Hjarvard, Stig 2008: The mediatization of society. A theory of the media as agents of social and cultural change. *Nordicom Review* 29: 105–134.

Holly, Werner 1995: Language and television. In: Patrick Stevenson (ed.) *The German language and the real world*, 339–374. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Holly, Werner and Ulrich Püschel 1993: Sprache und Fernsehen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. In: Bernd U. Biere and Helmut Henne (eds.), *Sprache in den Medien nach 1945*, 128–157. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Holly, Werner, Ulrich Püschel and Jörg Bergmann (eds.) 2001: *Der sprechende Zuschauer: wie wir uns Fernsehen kommunikativ aneignen*. Wiesbaden: WestdeutscherVerlag.

Irvine, Judith T. and Susan Gal 2000: Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In: Paul V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities,* 35–84. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Jaffe, Alexandra 2007: Corsican on the airwaves: Media discourse, practice and audience in a context of minority language shift and revitalization. In: Sally Johnson and Astrid Ensslin (eds.), *Language in the Media*, 149–172. London: Continuum.

Jaffe, Alexandra 2009: Entextualization, mediatization and authentication: orthographic choice in media transcripts. *Text & Talk* 29 (5): 571–594.

Jaffe, Alexandra 2011: Sociolinguistic diversity in mainstream media: Authenticity, authority and processes of mediation and mediatization. *Journal of Language and Politics* 10 (4): 562–586.

Jensen, Klaus Bruhn 2002: *A handbook of media and communication research: qualitative and quantitative methodologies*. London: Routledge

Johnson, Sally and Tommaso M. Milani (eds.) 2010: *Language ideologies and media discourse*. London: Continuum.

Johnstone, Barbara 2004: Place, globalization, and linguistic variation. In: Carmen Fought (ed.), *Sociolinguistic variation: Critical reflections*, 65–83. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johnstone, Barbara 2009: Pittsburghese shirts: Commodification and the enregisterment of an urban dialect. *American Speech* 84 (2): 157–175.

Johnstone, Barbara 2010: Indexing the local. In: Nikolas Coupland (ed.), *The handbook of language and globalization*, 386–405. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Johnstone, Barbara 2011: Making Pittsburghese: Communication technology, expertise, and the discursive construction of a regional dialect. *Language & Communication* 31: 3–15.

Johnstone, Barbara, Jennifer Andrus and Andrew E. Danielson 2006: Mobility, indexicality, and the enregisterment of "Pittsburghese". *Journal of English Linguistics* 34: 77–104.

Johnstone, Barbara and Dan Baumgardt 2004: "Pittsburghese" online: Vernacular norming in conversation. *American Speech* 79: 115–145.

Keim, Inken 2003: Die Verwendung medialer Stilisierungen von Kanaksprak durch Migrantenjugendliche. *Kodikas/ Code. ArsSemiotica* 26: 1–2, 97–111.

Kristiansen, Tore 2001: Two standards: One for the media and one for the school. *Language Awareness* 10 (1): 9–24.

Kristiansen Tore and Nikolas Coupland (eds.) 2011: *Standard languages and language standards in a changing Europe standard language ideology in contemporary Europe*. Oslo: Novus.

Krotz, Friedrich 2007: *Mediatisierung. Fallstudien zum Wandel von Kommunikation*. Wiesbaden: VS.

Krotz, Friedrich 2009: Mediatization: A concept with which to grasp media and societal change. In: Knut Lundby (ed.), *Mediatization: Concept, changes, consequences*, 19–38. New York: Peter Lang.

Labov, William 2001: *Principles of linguistic change, Vol. 2 External factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lameli, Alfred 2004: *Standard und Substandard. Regionalismen im diachronen Längsschnitt*. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Lameli, Alfred 2005: Standard und Regionalsprache – Konstanz und Wandel. In: Eckhard Eggers; Jürgen E. Schmidt; Dieter Stellmacher (eds.), *Moderne Dialekte – Neue Dialektologie*, 495–513. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Le Page, Robert B. and André Tabouret-Keller 1985: *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leppänen, Sirpa and Arja Piirainen-Marsh 2009: Language policy in the making: an analysis of bilingual gaming activities. *Language Policy* 8 (3): 261–284.

Lexander, Kristin Vold 2011: Texting and African language literacy. *New Media & Society* 13 (3): 427–443.

Livingstone, Sonia 2009: *On the mediation of everything. Journal of Communication* 59 (1): 1–18.

Lundby, Knut 2009: Introduction: 'Mediatization' as key. In: Knut Lundby (ed.), *Mediatization: Concept, changes, consequences*, 1–18. New York: Peter Lang.

Lytra, Vally 2006: Mass media, music making and identities in an Athens primary school. In: Christa Dürscheid and Jürgen Spitzmüller (eds.), *Perspektiven der Jugendsprachforschung*, 261–280. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Milani, Tommaso M. 2010: What's in a name? Language ideology and social differentiation in a Swedish print-mediated debate. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 14 (1) 2010: 116–142.

Milani, Tommaso M. and Sally Johnson 2010: Critical intersections: language ideologies and media discourse. In: Sally Johnson and Tommaso M. Milani (eds.), *Language ideologies and media discourse*, 3–14. London: Continuum.

Milroy, James and Lesley Milroy 1999: *Authority in language: Investigating language prescription and standardisation*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge

Milroy, Lesley 2008: Off the shelf or under the counter? On the social dynamics of sound changes. In: Christopher Cain and Geoffrey Russom (eds.), *Studies in the history of the English language 3*, 149–172. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter

Moriarty, Máiréad and Sari Pietikäinen 2011: Micro-level language-planning and grass-root initiatives: a case study of Irish language comedy and Inari Sámi rap. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 12 (3): 363–379.

Moring, Tom 2007: Functional completeness in minority language media. In: Mike Cormack and Niamh Hourigan (eds.), *Minority language media: Concepts, critiques and case studies*, 17–33. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Muhr, Rudolf 2003: Language change via satellite: The influence of German television broadcasting on Austrian German. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 4 (1): 103–127.

Norris, Sigrid and Rodney H. Jones (eds.) 2005: *Discourse in action: introducing mediated discourse analysis*. London, New York: Routledge.

Ong, Walter J. 1982: *Orality and literacy. The technologizing of the word*. London/New York: Methuen.

Pappas, Panayiotis A. 2008: Stereotypes, variation and change: Understanding the change of coronal sonorants in a rural variety of Modern Greek. *Language Variation and Change* 20: 493–526.

Pennycook, Alastair 2007: *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Pujolar, Joan 2001: *Gender, heteroglossia and power: A sociolinguistic study of youth culture*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.

Rampton, Ben 1995: *Crossing. Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.

Rampton, Ben 1999: Deutsch in Inner London and the animation of an instructed foreign language. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3 (4): 480–504.

Reynolds, Mike and Giovanna Cascio 1999: It's short and it's spreading: The use of contracted forms in British newspapers: A change under way. In: Hans-Jürgen Diller (ed.), *English via various media*, 179–200. Heidelberg: Winter.

Schlobinski, Peter 1989: ,Frau Meier hat Aids, Herr Tropfmann hat Herpes, was wollen Sie einsetzen?' Exemplarische Analyse eines Sprechstils. *Osnabrücker Beiträge zur Sprach-theorie* 41: 1–34.

Schmitz, Ulrich 2004: *Sprache in modernen Medien*. Berlin: E. Schmidt.

Schmitz, Ulrich 2005: Sprache und Massenkommunikation. In: Ulrich Ammon, Norbert Dittmar, Klaus J. Mattheier and Peter Trudgill (eds.), *Sociolinguistics,* Vol. 2, 1615–1628. Berlin: de Gruyter (HSK 3/2).

Schultz, Winfried 2004: Reconstructing mediatization as an analytical construct. *European Journal of Communication* 19 (1): 87–101.

Sebba, Mark 2007: *Spelling and society. The culture and politics of orthography around the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shankar, Shalina 2004: Reel to real: Desi teens' linguistic engagement with Bollywood. *Pragmatics* 14 (2/3): 317–335.

Silverstein, Michael 2003: Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life.*Language and Communication* 23: 193–229.

Spitulnik, Debra 1997: The social circulation of media discourse and the mediation of communities. In: Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *Linguistic anthropology. A reader,* 95–118. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spreckels, Janet 2006: *'Britneys, Fritten, Gangschta und wir': Identitätskonstitution in einer Mädchengruppe. Eine ethnographisch-gesprächsanalytische Untersuchung*. Frankfurt am Main: Peer Lang.

Squires, Lauren M. 2010: Enregistering internet language. *Language in Society* 39 (4): 457–92.

Squires, Lauren M. 2012: Whos punctuating what? Sociolinguistic variation in instant messaging. In: Alexandra Jaffe, Jannis Androutsopoulos, Mark Sebba and Sally Johnson (eds.), *Orthography as social action*, 289–323. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Strätz, Esther 2011: *Sprachverwendung in der Chat-Kommunikation. Eine diachrone Untersuchung französischsprachiger Logfiles aus dem Internet Relay Chat*. Tübingen: Narr.

Stuart-Smith, Jane 2006: The influence of the media. In: Carmen Llamas, Louise Mullany and Peter Stockwell (eds.), *The Routledge companion to sociolinguistics*, 140–148. London: Routledge.

Stuart-Smith, Jane 2011: The view from the couch: changing perspectives on the role of the television in changing language ideologies and use. In: Tore Kristiansen and Nikolas Coupland (eds), *Standard languages and language standards in a changing Europe standard language ideology in contemporary Europe*, 223–239. Oslo: Novus.

Stuart-Smith, Jane 2012: English and the media: Television. In: Alexander Bergs and Laurel J. Brinton (eds), *Historical linguistics of English. An international handbook*, 1075–1088. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Tagliamonte, Sali A. 2012: *Variationist sociolinguistics : change, observation, interpretation*. Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell.

Talbot, Mary 2007: *Media discourse: Representation and interaction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Thurlow, Crispin 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). URL: http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol11/issue3/thurlow.html.

Trudgill, Peter 1986: *Dialects in contact*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Trudgill, Peter 1988: Norwich Revisited: recent linguistic changes in an English urban dialect. *English World-Wide* 9 (1): 33–49.

Trudgill, Peter 1999: Norwich: endogenous and exogenous linguistic change. In: Paul Foulkes and Gerard J. Docherty (eds.), *Urban voices: Accent studies in the British isles*, 24–140. London: Arnold.

von Polenz, Peter 1999: *Deutsche Sprachgeschichte*. Vol. III. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Zilles, Ana M.S. 2005: The development of a new pronoun: The linguistic and social embedding of 'a gente' in Brazilian Portuguese. *Language Variation and Change* 17, 19–53.