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The aims of my paper today is…

(1) To review briefly the proposal of extension of (cyber)pragmatic research.

(2) To apply this model to online identity and its discursive management.

(3) To show that many issues on online identity addressed from other research areas are also covered by this extended model.

(4) To illustrate this application to online identity with a number of sample correlations.
Identity...

refers to the ways in which individuals and collectivities are distinguished from other individuals and collectivities in their social relations (Jenkins, 1996)

For me, identity is basically roles that we play on an ordinary basis

Identity is constructed

Positioning theory
(Davies & Harre)

Performative theory
(Goffman)
Identity is **not fixed**. Rather, it can be seen as a **discursive-performative construct** that takes form in **specific social and cultural contexts**. People are composed of **multiple identities** and at times contradictory ones; this enables them to **shift identity**—and consequently language use—depending on the social situations they encounter. [...] In each social action the speaker assigns **each identity a position on a hierarchy** and projects the one that s/he considers most appropriate at a given moment.

Shophocleous & Themistocleus (2014)
“Projecting social and discursive identities through code-switching on Facebook: The case of Greek Cypriots”
Interactions in a delimited group, emphasising discursive features of the participants.

Interactions with other groups that reveal discursive differences and stress the intra-group bonds.

Self as a person, individual self, who exhibits a specificity and a personal kind of discourse.

Self as a person who interacts with others in the everyday dialogues in which he/she participates.

“Analysing collective identity in discourse. Combining discourse-historical and sociocognitive approaches” (V. Koller, CADAAD 2010)
Personal identity. Positioning of the user in the world. “To be” on the Net

Social identity. Group membership, feeling of community

Interactive identity. Dialogues, Ambient awareness. Phaticness
Dialogues emphasising the social side of identity
Dialogues emphasising the personal side of identity
Personal identity

1. **Discursive self-expression** (discourse as performance of identity).

2. **Extimacy** (externalisation of intimate details).

3. Entries providing relevant **information on the user’s life**.

4. **Comments** as reinforcement of identity (self-esteem).

5. **Acknowledgement of the user’s presence** on the Net.
Interactive identity

1. Ambient awareness, to feel connected and noticed.
2. Language as a barrier of discursive specificity.
3. Discursive roles aiding in identity shaping.
4. Go beyond barriers (physical-virtual hybridisation).
Social identity

1. **Group identity** sustained discursively.

2. **Virtual communities.**

3. Physical-virtual **socialisation.**

4. **User-generated content** creation for the community.

5. Feeling of **co-presence.**

6. **Social capital** through shared virtual goods.
Extended chart of cognitive pragmatics research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXTUAL CONSTRAINTS</th>
<th>SPEAKER'S INTENDED PROPOSITIONAL INTERPRETATION</th>
<th>SPEAKER-SUPPORTED NON-PROPOSITIONAL EFFECTS</th>
<th>SPEAKER-OR HEARER-SUPPORTED PROPOSITIONAL IMPLICATIONS</th>
<th>NON-INTENDED NON-PROPOSITIONAL EFFECTS GENERATED IN HEARER BEYOND THE ACT OF COMMUNICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Positive or negative aspects that “frame”, as it were, the act of communication altering its eventual quality and the scope and range of balances of effects and effort | - Explicature  
- Strong implicature  
(implicated premises)  
(implicated conclusions)  
- Higher-level explicatures  
(propositional attitude) | - Affective attitude  
(feelings and emotions associated with the production of the utterance) | - Weak implicatures  
(triggered by speaker’s utterance and sometimes supported by him/her, and sometimes extracted by hearer’s sole responsibility) | - Positive or negative effects on the hearer beyond the interpretation of the utterance  
A: Within hearer’s awareness  
B: Beyond hearer’s awareness |
| Framing the actual act of communication and affecting its eventual (ir)relevance, even if prior to communication, by adding effects and/or effort | OSTENSIVE COMMUNICATION  
(typical object of cognitive pragmatics research) | Derived from the speaker’s utterance but often not overtly intended to be recovered | Extracted or derived by the hearer beyond utterance interpretation, but affecting eventual (ir)relevance of the act of communication |

Covered by relevance-theoretic research
## Extended chart of cyberpragmatic research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXTUAL CONSTRAINTS</th>
<th>SENDER USER’S INTENDED PROPOSITIONAL INTERPRETATION</th>
<th>SENDER-SUPPORTED NON-PROPOSITIONAL EFFECTS</th>
<th>S- OR H-SUPPORTED PROPOSITIONAL IMPLICATIONS</th>
<th>NON-PROPOSITIONAL EFFECTS GENERATED IN HEARER BEYOND COMM.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: User to system</td>
<td>Inferral strategies intended to turn what the user types (or says) into meaningful (and contextualised) explicit and/or implicit interpretations.</td>
<td>Much of cyberpragmatic research focuses on the users’ ability to connect with others using different attributes of orality typically found in the vocal (e.g., music of speech and creativity of language) and the visual (e.g., emotions) channels of oral interactions. Therefore, cyberpragmatism analyses the challenges that users face when they attempt to compensate for this lack of orality.</td>
<td>Weak impulations, some of them not directly backed-up by the user sender, while others are obtained by the addressee user’s responsibility.</td>
<td>A: User to system - Blending of the physical/virtual divide. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Familiarity with the interface.</td>
<td>Within Cyberpragmatics (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 visual-verbal and oral-written scales in terms of options for contextualization) will have an impact on how relevant the eventual interpretation is.</td>
<td>In a sense, then, many strategies for communication 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). Connotations typically involve the use of emoticons, repeated letters, strategic use of capitalisation, etc.</td>
<td>Analyses 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 implications and non-propositional effects that satisfy the user more than pure content.</td>
<td>- Satisfaction from being able to use the interface appropriately and obtain the expected information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expertise in using web-mediated discourses.</td>
<td>Another aim of Cyberpragmatics is to analyse why Internet users often find relevance in text-based communication even though several options of contextualization (Webcam, microphones) are available.</td>
<td>This is the case of phatic communication, which conveys “social propositional implications” that sometimes are intended by the speaker and sometimes are extracted beyond the sender’s intentions.</td>
<td>- Individualisation / personalisation. Users expect information in a highly personalized way, adapted to personal profiles and preferences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Web page usability (good arrangement of text and image, good structure of links, being able to access content without unnecessary effort, etc.).</td>
<td>- Reasons for surfing the Net (work, leisure, looking for a specific item of information or using the web to kill time…).</td>
<td>B: User to user - Feeling of connectedness. Social awareness, feeling of being part of the interactions and friendships. To be noticed by others on the Net.</td>
<td>- User’s identity sharing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Presences/absences of effort-increasing elements on the page (pop-up advertisements, problems with bandwidth, etc.).</td>
<td>- Known addressers versus anonymous addressers.</td>
<td>- Feeling of community membership. The management of social identity usually involves feelings of belonging to a group or community membership, or being acknowledged by others as part of the network of friends or relatives.</td>
<td>From community to user - Community’s acknowledgment of the user’s presence in the group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Familiarity with topics, jargons, expected background knowledge.</td>
<td>- Reason for act of communication (casual chat, formal piece of communication, getting information on a topic…).</td>
<td>- From user to community. Feelings arising from one’s presence felt and acknowledged by the other users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Prototypical scope of cognitive pragmatics and cyberpragmatics:

Recovery of intended **explicit** and/or **implicated** interpretations (propositions) plus **higher-level explicatures** (propositional attitude)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Constraints</th>
<th>Sender User's Intended Propositional Interpretation</th>
<th>Sender-Supported Non-Propositional Effects</th>
<th>S- or H-Supported Propositional Implications</th>
<th>Non-Propositional Effects Generated in Hearer Beyond Comm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inferential strategies intended to turn what the user types (or says) into meaningful (and contextualised) explicit and/or implicated interpretations (explicatures and implicatures).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cyberpragmatics (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. The “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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another aim of Cyberpragmatics is to analyse why Internet users often find relevance in text-based communication even though several options of contextualization (Webcam, microphone) are available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Also covered by cognitive pragmatics and cyberpragmatics:

**Affective attitude**: feelings, emotions and impressions felt by the speaker upon producing the utterance (and *intended* to be communicated)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXTUAL CONSTRAINTS</th>
<th>SENDER USER’S INTENDED PROPOSITIONAL INTERPRETATION</th>
<th>SENDER-SUPPORTED NON-PROPOSITIONAL EFFECTS</th>
<th>S- OR H-SUPPORTED PROPOSITIONAL IMPLICATIONS</th>
<th>NON-PROPOSITIONAL EFFECTS GENERATED IN HEARER BEYOND COMM.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Much of cyberpragmatic research focuses on the users’ ability to connotes 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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). Connotations typically involve the use of emoticons, repeated letters, strategic use of capitalisation, etc. |
A Pepi Martínez Llorens y otras 2 personas más les gusta esto.

**María Prior P** Maldita sea Pepi! Mi peor pesadilla xD
9 de junio de 2012 a la(s) 2:21 a través de móvil · Me gusta · 1

**Pepi Martínez Llorens** jajaja, aún sobró y todo...los próximos inquilinos del piso lo beberán y sufrirán la peor resaca de sus vidas gracias a nosotras, jeje
9 de junio de 2012 a la(s) 13:22 · Me gusta · 1

**Cris Izquierdo** jajajajaja maldito vodka pakí...es puro veneno aparentemente destilado!!
9 de junio de 2012 a la(s) 22:03 · Me gusta · 1

**María Prior P** diosss es tan solo ver la foto y empezar a encontrarme mal!
10 de junio de 2012 a la(s) 22:48 · Me gusta · 1

**Cris Izquierdo** para qué tomar café con sal si existe esto!!
10 de junio de 2012 a la(s) 22:50 · Me gusta · 1

**Cris Izquierdo** veo esta foto y algo en el alma y en todo el cuerpo se me revuelveeeeeeeeee arrgg
11 de junio de 2012 a la(s) 16:05 · Me gusta · 1
Fall is coming
3. Also covered by cognitive pragmatics and cyberpragmatics: **Weak implicatures**, some of which are backed up by the speaker and some are extracted by the hearer’s sole responsibility
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXTUAL CONSTRAINTS</th>
<th>SENDER USER’S INTENDED PROPOSITIONAL INTERPRETATION</th>
<th>SENDER-SUPPORTED NON-PROPOSITIONAL EFFECTS</th>
<th>S- OR H-SUPPORTED PROPOSITIONAL IMPLICATIONS</th>
<th>NON-PROPOSITIONAL EFFECTS GENERATED IN HEARER BEYOND COMM.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weak implicatures, some of them not directly backed-up by the &quot;user sender&quot;, while others are obtained by the addressee user’s responsibility. Analysists 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. This is the case of phatic communication, which conveys &quot;social propositional implications&quot; that sometimes are intended by the speaker and sometimes are extracted beyond the sender’s intentions. 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, 2009).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Online hotel review
(Vásquez 2014, quoted in Tagg 2015)

I know $125 is not a great deal of money these days. I was not expecting a heck of a lot. However, I was expecting basic clean and comfortable accommodations. I have traveled quite a bit, and I have stayed in everything from Marriott Resort Hotels and Hyatt Resorts to Days Inns, Hampton Inns, Best Westerns, Residence Inns, La Quintass, and various Mom and Pop Motels to name a few. I have NEVER felt this ripped off. My stays have not always been perfect but I have always felt like I got what I paid for.
4. My proposal of extension:

To add the terms **contextual constraint** and **non-intended non-propositional effect** to the chart of the (ir)relevance of (Internet) communication.
The term *contextual constraint* is restricted to aspects that underlie or “frame” communication and interaction (i.e. they exist prior to the interpretive activity) and constrain its eventual (un)succesful outcome.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXTUAL CONSTRAINTS</th>
<th>SENDER USER'S INTENDED PROPOSITIONAL INTERPRETATION</th>
<th>SENDER-SUPPORTED NON-PROPOSITIONAL EFFECTS</th>
<th>S- OR H-SUPPORTED PROPOSITIONAL IMPLICATIONS</th>
<th>NON-PROPOSITIONAL EFFECTS GENERATED IN HEARER BEYOND COMM.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: User to system</td>
<td>- Familiarity with the interface.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Expertise in using web-mediated discourses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Web page usability (good arrangement of text and image, good structure of links, being able to access content without unnecessary effort, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reasons for surfing the Net (work, leisure, looking for a specific item of information or using the web to kill time...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Presence/absence of effort, increasing elements on the page (pop-up advertisements, problems with bandwidth, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: User to user</td>
<td>- Degree of mutual knowledge existing between interlocutors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Known address versus anonymous address.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Familiarity with topics, jargons, expected background knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reason for act of communication (causal chat, formal piece of communication, getting information on a topic...).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Satisfaction from being able to use the interface appropriately and obtain the expected information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Individuation/personalization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Feeling of connectedness. Social awareness, feeling of being part of the interactions and friendships. To be noticed by others on the Net.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- User’s identity shaping.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Feeling of community membership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community’s acknowledgment of the user’s presence in the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- From user to community. Feels arising from one’s presence felt and acknowledged by the other users.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contextual constraints are important, since they have an impact on...

How much discourse is produced

What kind of discourse is produced

What kind of reaction is expected (user’s expectations)

What kind of discourse is possible (interface affordances)

What kind of discourse is expected (audience validation)
The term, **non-intended non-propositional effect**, refers to feelings, emotions, impressions, etc. which are not overtly intended, but are generated ("leaked") from the act of communication, and add positively or negatively to the relevance of the interpretation of the online discourse.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXTUAL CONSTRAINTS</th>
<th>SENDER USER’S INTENDED PROPOSITIONAL INTERPRETATION</th>
<th>SENDER-SUPPORTED NON-PROPOSITIONAL EFFECTS</th>
<th>S- OR H-SUPPORTED PROPOSITIONAL IMPLICATIONS</th>
<th>NON-PROPOSITIONAL EFFECTS GENERATED IN HEARER BEYOND COMM.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: User to system</td>
<td>- Familiarity with the interface.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A: User to system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Expertise in using web-mediated discourses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Blurring of the physical/virtual divide. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Web page usability (good arrangement of text and image, good structure of links, being able to access content without unnecessary effort, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Satisfaction from being able to use the interface appropriately and obtain the expected information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reasons for surfing the Net (work, leisure, looking for a specific item of information or using the web to kill time...).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Individuation / personalization. Users expect information in a highly personalized way, adapted to personal profiles and preferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Presence/absence of effort-increasing elements on the page (pop-up advertisements, problems with bandwidth, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: User to user</td>
<td>- Degree of mutual knowledge existing between interlocutors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B: User to user</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Known address versus anonymous address.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Feeling of connectedness. Social awareness, feeling of being part of the interactions and friendships. To be noticed by others on the Net.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Familiarity with topics, jargons, expected background knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- User’s identity sharing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reason for act of communication (causal chat, formal piece of communication, getting information on a topic...).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Feeling of community membership. 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Non-intended non-propositional effects are important, since they have an impact on...

The +/- outcome of one’s acts of communication

The preference for a specific site /medium / channel

Why certain interactions are (un)profitable despite the lack of/existence of interesting information

One’s awareness of personal and social roles (through interactions)

What kind of “residue” is leaked from everyday acts of communication (and how it makes us feel)
INTENDED PROPOSITIONAL INFORMATION
explicit interpretation (*explicature*)
strongly implicated interpretation (*implicature*)
weakly implicated interpretation (*implication*)
propositional attitude

INTENDED NON-PROPOSITIONAL INFORMATION
(affective attitude – feelings/emotions held and intended)

NON-INTENDED NON-PROPOSITIONAL INFORMATION
(feelings, emotions, impressions beyond act of communication)

CONSTRAINTS (AFFECT EVENTUAL (IR)RELEVANCE OF COMMUNICATION)
Useful to explain today’s tendency towards a more “phatic” quality of Internet communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRAINTS</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>NON-PROPOSITIONAL EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desire of feelings of connectivity, need to be acknowledged by others, need to be regarded as part of the group, need for sustained interactions</td>
<td>Formulaic dialogue initiation (hi!), ritualised everyday topics, humour-filled utterances, mocking, teasing, ironical remarks emphasising areas of mutuality, etc.</td>
<td>Feelings of non-stop connection, feeling of being part of the group, acknowledged by peers, feelings of sustained friendship, “presence in the absence”, sense of intimacy, reaffirmation of social presence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTTERLY IRRELEVANT</th>
<th>UTTERLY RELEVANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(from a purely informational point of view)</td>
<td>(from a social, interactive point of view)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So... How can this extended model be applied to the analysis of online identity and its discursive management?
POSITIVE / NEGATIVE CONTEXTUAL CONSTRAINTS

RELATED TO THE MANAGEMENT OF AN INTERFACE (USER-TO-SYSTEM COMMUNICATION)

CONSTRAINTS ON SENDER USER / ADDRESSEE USER

WITHIN / BEYOND USER’S AWARENESS

POSITIVE / NEGATIVE NON-INTENDED NON-PROPOSITIONAL EFFECTS

RELATED TO THE MANAGEMENT OF AN INTERFACE (USER-TO-SYSTEM COMMUNICATION)

EFFECTS ON SENDER USER / ADDRESSEE USER

WITHIN / BEYOND USER’S AWARENESS

RELATED TO THE EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION AMONG USERS (USER-TO-USER COMMUNICATION)

CONSTRAINTS ON SENDER USER / ADDRESSEE USER

WITHIN / BEYOND USER’S AWARENESS

RELATED TO THE EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION AMONG USERS (USER-TO-USER COMMUNICATION)

EFFECTS ON SENDER USER / ADDRESSEE USER

WITHIN / BEYOND USER’S AWARENESS
THE DISCURSIVE MANAGEMENT OF ONLINE IDENTITY

FILTERED / APPLIED / ADAPTED if having some significance to...

ANTHROPOLOGY
COMPUTER SCIENCE
SOCIOLOGY
ETHNOGRAPHY

SOCIOLINGUISTICS
MEDIA STUDIES
PHILOSOPHY
SEMIOTICS
Identity-related constraints

(A) Interface-related

1. **Familiarity with the interface**. Effort or lack of effort when using links, frames, tabs, etc.
2. **Expertise in using web-mediated discourses**. Mastery of text oralisation, combinations of text and image, editing and upgrading sites, etc.
3. **Web page usability**. Good arrangement of text and image, good structure of links, etc. lead to being able to access content without unnecessary effort.
4. **Site affordances**. The resources and options provided by the company’s interface (e.g. Facebook) to manage one’s identity and communicative needs.
Identity-related constraints
(B) User-related

1. **Personal traits, personality, offline identity.** User’s feelings/emotions, attitudes (influence eventual quantity and quality of Internet-enabled discourse & interactions).
2. **Other users’ quality and quantity of content** uploaded.
3. **Other users’ comments** on the user’s profile.
4. **Social norms and expectations of group conformity.**
5. **Demographic factors** (sex-, age-related differences, etc)
User’s offline identity as constraint for online identity shaping and management

Society’s evolution of online identity / offline identity interfaces
Timeline of offline/online identity interfaces

1. Early 90s: Online identity as irrelevant

2. Late 90s / early 2000s: Online identity as alternative
Timeline of offline/online identity interfaces

1. Early 90s: Online identity as irrelevant
2. Late 90s: Online identity as alternative
3. Early 2000s: Online identity within offline virtualisation
Timeline of offline/online identity interfaces

1. **Early 90s:** Online identity as irrelevant
2. **Late 90s:** Online identity as alternative
3. **Early 2000s:** Online identity within offline virtualisation
4. **Mid 2000s:** User as a node
The user as a node

- Community of neighbours
- Mobile phone
- Weblog
- Video-conference
- Chat room
- Electronic mail
- 3G services on the mobile
- Instant messaging
- Workplace
- Interactive web page
- Newsgroups, web forums
- SMS and Twitter
- Virtual worlds
- School community
- Virtual community
- Social networking sites
- The neighbourhood
- Mailing list
- The 21st century outlook
Timeline of offline/online identity interfaces

1. Early 90s: Online identity as irrelevant
2. Late 90s: Online identity as alternative
3. Early 2000s: Online identity within offline virtualisation
4. Mid 2000s: User as a node
5. Today: Online identity / offline identity congruence
USER AS A NODE
Identity-related non-propositional effects

(A) Interface-related

1. **(Dis)satisfaction** from being (un)able to use the interface appropriately and obtain/produce the expected information and interpretations.

2. **Individuation / personalization vs. social connectedness**. Users expect information in a highly personalized way, adapted to personal profiles and preferences.

3. **Effects of dealing with information** processed: from information overload, from multi-tasking; psychological effects of dealing with “infoxication”, etc.
Identity-related non-propositional effects (B) User-related

1. Feeling of **connectedness**. Social awareness, feeling of being part of the interactions and friendships.
2. **Reduced loneliness**.
3. Feeling of **being noticed by others**, by the user’s community, feedback.
4. Feeling more willing for **self-disclosure**.
5. Generation of bridging and bonding **social capital**.
6. Feelings of **social isolation** and **dissatisfaction**.
7. Feeling of **well-being** through emotional display of one’s and other users’ feelings.
Identity-related non-propositional effects (B) User-related

7. Feeling of increased **mutuality of information**.
8. Feeling of **enhanced self-esteem** and generation of **positive emotions**.
9. Feeling of **reduced self-esteem** and generation of **negative emotions**.
10. Feeling of **control over privacy and disclosure**.
11. **Reduced feeling of inhibition** (plus increased **self-disclosure**).
12. Feeling of **community or group membership**. Feelings of belongingness, of being acknowledged by others.
13. Feeling of **being useful to the community** (e.g. via user-generated content) and increased trust.
## Correlation 1: General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRAINT</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>NON-PROP. EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need of connectedness; shyness / extroversion; to remind group of the user’s existence</td>
<td>Discourse-centred self-disclosure on mundane activities and events</td>
<td>Positive feedback from peers through comments, dialogues (audience validation)</td>
<td>Social capital (bridging / bonding), feelings of group membership, of being acknowledged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**personal identity** | **interactive identity** | **social identity** |
# Correlation 2: Interface-related

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRAINT</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>NON-PROP. EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of contextual cues provided</td>
<td>Intense Internet activity</td>
<td>Increased social presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by the interface (positive)</td>
<td>(uploading content, interactions, photo tagging)</td>
<td>Increased trustworthiness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tanis & Postmes (2007); Feng et al. (2016)
## Correlation 3: User-related, personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRAINT</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>NON-PROP. EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User’s personality (low self-esteem, shyness, introversion)</td>
<td>Active and intense Facebook use <em>(social compensation hypothesis: compensate by actively engaging in on-line activities)</em></td>
<td>Successful interactions and peer validation</td>
<td>Increased social capital Enhanced self-esteem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barker (2009); Lee, More & Park (2012); Tazghini & Siedlecki (2013); Shen et al. (2015)
Correlation 4: User-related, personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRAINT</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>AUDIENCE</th>
<th>NON-PROP. EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-concept (impression motivation)</td>
<td>Self-presentation through discourse (impression construction)</td>
<td>Different audiences evaluate discursive self-presentation (context collapse)</td>
<td>Positive / negative feelings on user (in)congruence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Krämer & Haferkamp (2011); Bazarova et al. (2013)
**Correlation 5: User-related, personality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRAINT</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>NON-PROP. EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narcissist personality</td>
<td>Intense discourse-centred activity (photos, textual updates, links...) as attention seeking strategies</td>
<td>Feedback from interactions on the content uploaded (audience validation)</td>
<td>Feelings of affirmation of self-image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced positive feelings on self-image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mehdizadeh (2010); Kapidzic (2013); Hawk et al. (2015)
Correlation 6: User-related, personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRAINT</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>NON-PROP. EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User’s insecure personality, shyness (e.g. adolescents)</td>
<td>Uploaded content matching the user’s “selective self”</td>
<td>Peer interactions which indicate audience approval and validation</td>
<td>Increased self-worth Feelings of group membership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stern (2008)
Correlation 7: User-related, social constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRAINT</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>NON-PROP. EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural stereotypes on beauty, attractiveness (stabilised from sources such as the media)</td>
<td>Photographic display matching cultural stereotypes (impression management)</td>
<td>Interactions from peers, e.g. from praising pics. Comments valuing collective action (audience validation)</td>
<td>Enhanced self-esteem, feelings of group membership and group approval, connectivity Enhanced in-group mutuality of information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salimkhan et al. (2010); Mascheroni et al. (2015); Mendelson & Papacharissi (2011)
## Correlation 8: User-related, personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRAINT</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>NON-PROP. EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor self-image, shyness, introversion</td>
<td>Selective self-presentation</td>
<td>Other users’ comments on uploaded content</td>
<td>Boosted self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced self-esteem, feeling of disconnection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Manago & Vaugh (2015); Winter et al. (2014)*
Correlation 9: User-related, social

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRAINT</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>NON-PROP. EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User’s self image</td>
<td>Text-based interactions with peers</td>
<td>Emotional closeness, disinhibition, intimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User’s feelings on group membership</td>
<td>Use of shared conventions for expressing content</td>
<td>Feelings of group membership and acceptance therein</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hu et al. (2015)
**Correlation 10: User-related, social**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRAINT</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>NON-PROP. EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of social norm adequacy and expectations of group conformity</td>
<td>Norm-fitting published content</td>
<td>Positive feedback from group of peers (sustained interactions)</td>
<td>Feeling of group membership and connectivity therein</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sibak (2010); Chatora (2010)
Correlation 11: User-related, social

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRAINT</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>NON-PROP. EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marginalised groups, minorities in offline scenarios</td>
<td>Interactions with like-minded (including use of markers of group membership such as jargons and specific vocabulary or mutuality of information)</td>
<td>Less isolation, better awareness of group membership and its specificity [positive]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased addiction to online interactions, need of non-stop connection to peers [negative]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manago (forthcoming); Manago & Vaugh (2015)
Conclusion

Online discourses are not simply uploaded and sent to other users... They are constrained by a number of factors, and their effects range way beyond their interpretation.

Online identity is also managed discursively, constrained by a number of factors, and produces a myriad of relevant effects on users.
Thanks!
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