

## Internet-mediated communication

CONTEXTUAL CONSTRAINTS	SENDER USER'S INTENDED PROPOSITIONAL INTERPRETATION	SENDER-SUPPORTED NON-PROPOSITIONAL EFFECTS	S- OR H-SUPPORTED PROPOSITIONAL IMPLICATIONS	NON-PROPOSITIONAL EFFECTS GENERATED IN HEARER BEYOND COMM.
<p><b>A: User to system</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Familiarity with the interface. .....</li> <li>-Expertise in using web-mediated discourses. .....</li> <li>-Web page usability (good arrangement of text and image, good structure of links, being able to access content without unnecessary effort, etc.). .....</li> <li>-Reasons for surfing the Net (work, leisure, looking for a specific item of information or using the web to kill time...).</li> <li>.....</li> <li>-Presence/absence of effort-increasing elements on the page (pop-up advertisements, problems with bandwidth, etc.).</li> <li>.....</li> </ul> <p><b>B: User to user</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Degree of mutual knowledge existing between interlocutors. .....</li> <li>-Known addressee versus anonymous addressee. .....</li> <li>-Familiarity with topics, jargons, expected background knowledge. .....</li> <li>-Reason for act of communication (causal chat, formal piece of communication, getting information on a topic...).</li> </ul>	<p>Inferential strategies intended to turn what the user types (or says) into meaningful (and contextualised) explicit and/or implicated interpretations (<i>explicatures</i> and <i>implicatures</i>).</p> <p>Within <i>Cyberpragmatics</i> (Yus 2011), it is claimed that the characteristics of the different applications for Internet communication (chatrooms, WhatsApp, e-mail, Web pages, etc.) affect the quality and quantity of contextual information accessed by users, the mental effort devoted to interpretation, and the choice of an interpretation. Their “material qualities” (basically their position on the verbal-visual and oral-written scales in terms of options for contextualization) will have an impact on how relevant the eventual interpretation is.</p>	<p>Much of cyberpragmatic research focuses on the users' ability to connote their messages with different attributes of orality typically found in the vocal (e.g., repetition of letters and creative use of punctuation marks) and the visual (e.g., emoticons) channels of oral interactions. Therefore, cyberpragmatics analyses the challenges that users face when they attempt to compensate for this lack of orality. And very often more effort has to be devoted to tracking down underlying intentions, feelings, and emotions conveyed by text-based utterances.</p> <p>In a sense, then, many strategies for connotation of text with vocal and visual aspects of communication have to do with the user's willingness to communicate non-propositional effects such as certain feelings and emotions held while the text is being typed (or said, if the interface allows for that).</p>	<p>Weak implicatures, some of them not directly backed-up by the “user sender”, while others are obtained by the addressee user's responsibility.</p> <p>Analysts are often too focused on judging the effectiveness of communication in terms of objectively interesting information that offsets the effort that getting it demands. But on the Internet there are many kinds of interactions and ways of processing of content that have little informational value in a purely objective way. Eventual relevance does not only depend on the information itself but on the derivation of weak implicatures and non-propositional effects that satisfy the user more than pure content.</p> <p>This is the case of <i>phatic communication</i>, which conveys “social implications” that sometimes are intended by the speaker and sometimes are extracted beyond the sender's intentions.</p> <p>We see a shift from dialogue and communication between actors in a network, where the point of the network was to facilitate an exchange of substantive content, to a situation where the maintenance of a network itself has become the primary focus... communication has been subordinated to simple maintenance of networks and the notion of a connected presence. This has resulted in a rise of ‘phatic media’ in which communication without content has taken precedence (Vincent Miller 2008).</p>	<p><b>A: User to system</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-<i>Blurring of the physical/virtual divide</i>. Impact on the current physical activity of the user, providing cognitive reward in the way the system manages to aid the specific user in a physical place. .....</li> <li>-Satisfaction from being able to use <i>the interface appropriately</i> and obtain the expected information. .....</li> <li>-<i>Individuation / personalization</i>. Users expect information in a highly personalized way, adapted to personal profiles and preferences</li> </ul> <p><b>B: User to user</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-<i>Feeling of connectedness</i>. Social awareness, feeling of being part of the interactions and friendships. To be noticed by others on the Net. .....</li> <li>-<i>User's identity shaping</i>. .....</li> <li>-<i>Feeling of community membership</i>. The management of social identity usually involves feelings of group or community membership, or being acknowledged by others as part of the network of friends or relatives. .....</li> <li>-<i>From community to user</i>. Community's acknowledgment of the user's presence in the group. .....</li> <li>-<i>From user to community</i>. Feelings arising from one's presence felt and acknowledged by the other users. .....</li> </ul>