Hassan, Mohamed ElSawi. "Reshaping Social Practice in Post–Arab Spring Egypt: Expression of Identity and Affiliation in New Media." *Cultural Production and Social Movements after the Arab Spring: Nationalism, Politics, and Transnational Identity*. Ed. Eid Mohamed. Ed. Ayman A. El-Desouky. London,: I.B. Tauris, 2021. 151–161. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9780755634217.ch-008>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 14:04 UTC.

Copyright © Eid Mohamed and Ayman A. El-Desouky 2021. Released under a CC BY licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). You may share, re-use or adapt this work, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

Reshaping Social Practice in Post–Arab Spring Egypt: Expression of Identity and Affiliation in New Media

Mohamed ElSawi Hassan

Introduction

This chapter analyzes the construction of a virtual community for social action through the discursive practices of the Egyptian Facebook group *AlMawkef AlMasry* (MM; the Egyptian Stance) that communicates through the new media across traditional geographic, social, institutional, and linguistic boundaries and in so doing negotiates communal identity and expressions of transcultural communication in the post–Arab Spring world. Social media—*AlMawkef AlMasry* notable among them—had an undeniable effect on the promotion of written dialect, particularly during the events that led to, accompanied, and followed the Arab Spring in 2010, 2011, and the following years. The study argues that the type of code-mixing or code-switching of Arabic that the group uses, mainly dialectal elements of Egyptian Arabic (EA) with features of Standard Arabic (SA), is an intermediate register that represents a form of “crossing” or “styling” (Rampton 2009) that enabled the group members to ideologically reference their commitments, position themselves, and build their own community across the Arab world with respect to group identity through the functional use of language that represents its own type of social action in a culturally and linguistically diverse Arab world. Cohen (1985) maintains that people construct community symbolically, making it a resource and repository of meaning and a referent of their identity (118). The use of EA establishes the group as locally Egyptian, while the employment of SA features that are made to appear “natural” establishes the wider ties to all Arab recipients with which the SA forms are associated. The MM text is to be analyzed for the way it draws on and transforms social practice by creating a collectivizing mode of verbal expression. A critical discourse analysis (CDA) approach (van Leeuwen 1995, 1996, 2008; Fairclough 2003, 2013) will be used to bring these elements together in a descriptive framework for critically analyzing this mode of social practice in post–Arab Spring Egypt and examining how transcultural it can be.

The activism of the Facebook group represents a decentralization of cultural and social practice that transcends dialect borders and serves as a collectivizing mode of verbal expression and discursive action of online writing and circulation in a global system. AlMawkef AlMasry aims to shape a post-Arab Spring social perception of pertinent democracy-related issues in the Arab world through linguistic choices that form a social and political bond among Arab readers. The online group is therefore discursively empowered through social media as an agent of change with the purpose of constructing social action, and possibly a new more democratic reality, as a conscious motive or intention. This dynamic is emphasized by van Leeuwen who states that “the discursive distribution of purposefulness has everything to do with the distribution of power in concrete social practices” (135). In a connection between online and offline practices, the localized posts of the group that uses Facebook as a catalyst explore and intertwine present-day modalities of writing practices and activism and are interwoven with delocalized social-practice purpose of raising awareness of, and criticizing, the bill under discussion. As indicated in utterances 40 and 41 in the analyzed text below, all Arab readers as recipients of the posts constitute a wider transcultural epistemic community that can be motivated to further intercommunicate, to act, and to speak out against the bill and against any similar practices in their own local contexts in any possible way after they have collectively shared this knowledge and its attendant power.

Comparing it to the “linguistics of community” that is built on the idealization of the nation-state, Rampton and Charalambous (2012) provide an empirical illustration of the relevance of Mary Louise Pratt’s (1987) concept of “linguistics of contact” as a field of research in sociolinguistics that investigates the impact of media culture—not just the impact of home socialization—and looks beyond intragroup language to the use of language across social boundaries (Rampton and Charalambous 2012, 842). They maintain that as a concept, “crossing” is tightly linked to boundaries and the renegotiation of traditional interethnic relations (Rampton and Charalambous 2012, 494). They continue to add that in “crossing,” people foreground the socio-symbolic connotations/indexical values of particular linguistic forms, implying that they have special relevance to some aspect of interaction in the here and now. As defined by Rampton (2009), “stylization” involves “reflexive communicative action in which speakers produce specially marked and often exaggerated representations of languages, dialects, and styles that lie outside their own habitual repertoire Crossing ... involves a stronger sense of social or ethnic boundary transgression” (149). Crossing can be mocking, admiring, an end in itself, or the first step in a longer journey, and it may strengthen boundaries, undermine them, or assert their irrelevance (Rampton and Charalambous 2012, 486).

To that end, the chapter attempts to examine and analyze how language and identity can be fruitfully conceptualized for the analysis of this aspect of Arabic transcultural communication of this Facebook group that draws on a common store of linguistic resources to achieve the goal of its social practice. It seeks to address several questions. Given the online nature of the group and its strategies to define its Egyptian and Arab identity through discursive practices, how was it able to communicate on a transcultural level to include collectives of people through a process of inclusion without a challenge?

When crossing recipients encounter such discourse, the interactional question “Why this linguistic choice?” is supplemented with more political questions, such as “In what capacity?” and “How am I included?” Such questions help align recipients from different Arab representations to interact with this special framing of the discourse that licenses the use of SA and EA in a written form that would otherwise seem unaccountable.

AlMawkef AlMasry is an online group with more than six hundred thousand followers (as of December 25, 2016) that defines itself as non-aligning with any particular political group. It utilizes language choices in its efforts to find solutions for recurrent societal needs after the Arab Spring through certain discursive structures. The group’s mission was stated on their Facebook page as “AlMawkef AlMasry: the opinion of every Egyptian who believes in a change for the better. With the support of experts, we will help formulate an opinion that reflects change to create a better ‘alternative’ and we will organize ourselves to make this alternative a reality” (AlMawkef AlMasry, “Timeline,” December 25, 2016). The linguistic resources that they have at their disposal here as politically determined have important identity functions. The group negotiates its own self-reference with respect to others and their virtual community. Auer (2006) argues that in code-switching, participants belong to one bilingual community in which a common repertoire of linguistic resources is shared. Crossing, he says, always implies three parties: a speaker who crosses, the owner of the language or variety into which the crossing is done, and a recipient in the bilingual encounter in which the crossing occurs (490). Crossing, in the case of MM’s discourse, is not a form of appropriation—as opposed to some definitions of crossing that emphasize “entitlement” as a factor. It is a strategy of building social borders with all Arabic-language speakers and readers as it makes the social and political issues discussed relevant to the interaction. Group boundaries are not usually a topic of talk in and of themselves. In this particular situation, speakers employ the mixed varieties as their own and at the same time enable the recipients to receive such linguistic resources also as owners. Identity factors are maintained through the EA choices while also being extended beyond the Egyptian context through SA crossing strategies. As members of the internet community, they position themselves with respect to group identity and cohesion through an examination of the uses of inclusive and exclusive linguistic resources to build a shared target culture. Data will be represented by a long post for the group on their Facebook page, dated November 16, 2016, that explains and comments on a bill to regulate Egyptian NGOs that had been recently approved by the Egyptian Parliament (AlMawkef AlMasry, “Timeline,” November 16, 2016).

Theoretical Framework

This section surveys the theoretical framework informing the analyses of the discourse of MM’s Facebook posts. Generally, discourses can be analyzed in combination with social theories to obtain a critical view on the relation between discourses and other aspects of social practice. Miller (2000) acknowledges that individuals belong to varied groups and so take on a variety of identities defined by their memberships in

these groups. These identities, however, are not fixed but rather are “multifaceted in complex and contradictory ways; tied to social practice and interaction as flexible and contextually contingent resources; and tied to processes of differentiation from other identified groups” (72). The discourse theories employed in the forthcoming analysis elucidate interrelationships between identity, language, and the media to determine to what extent the linguistic contributions are institutionally and transculturally determined. Theories in CDA have proven to be effective in taking up social scientific questions and claims about social and institutional change and exploring how these changes may be taking place at the micro level of texts and interactive events (Fairclough 2013, 418). Fairclough’s vision of CDA offers a way of conceptualizing social and institutional practices in terms of three dimensions: discourses, which are ways of representing the world from particular perspectives; genres, which are ways of acting and interacting with other people; and styles or voices, which are ways of identifying, constructing, or enunciating the self, including both social and institutional identities (Fairclough 2013, 218–20). These are designed deliberately to conceptualize the more sociological concepts of discourse, actions, and identity in terms that can be explored empirically through repertoires of linguistic analysis (Fairclough 2013, 220). In the CDA theoretical framework used in this chapter, discourse is seen as differentiated into discourse, genres, and styles. Following Fairclough (2003, 2013) and van Leeuwen (1995, 1996, 2008), the categories of discourse that represent elements of social practice are social actors, social action, and social circumstances. The interactional processes will be looked at as a type of communication where the special framing of the activity involves crossing and stylization strategies (Rampton 1999, 2009).

Social actors are people involved in the discursive practice who have roles, relative positions, and groupings. Van Leeuwen’s (1996, 2008) framework for the analysis of the representations of social actors in discourses is a network of abstract social and discursive categories into which social actors can be placed. The second element that gives similar advantages to the representation of social actors is the representation of social action (van Leeuwen 1996, 32). The framework of discourse as the recontextualization of social practice attempts to relate sociologically relevant categories of action to their grammatical and rhetorical realizations in discourse in what van Leeuwen refers to as a “sociological grammar or the representation of social action” (van Leeuwen 2008, 4–6). Fairclough (2003) describes social circumstances in terms of interconnected space, time, and the intersection of the two in different space-time. He expounds that space, time, and “space-times” are routinely constructed in texts through the chaining of texts and genre chains that contribute to linking different scales of social life—the local, national, regional, and global—which is currently a matter of linking different “space-times” (Fairclough 2003, 151). Furthermore, Coupland (2007) argues that variationist sociolinguistics has worked with a limited idea of social context—and styling is precisely the contextualization of social styles. The survey designs of variationist research, which have been remarkably successful in revealing broad patterns of linguistic diversity and change, have not encouraged us to understand what people meaningfully achieve through linguistic variation (Coupland 2007, 5).

Background

The debate about the Arabic language and its dialects as crucial factors in identity formation with deep sociocultural bearings has been going on for a long time. Given the extremely wide range and the whole set of mixed varieties that Middle Arabic may encompass, Kees Versteegh (2014) defines Middle Arabic as the collective name for all texts with deviations from classical grammar and generalizes the use of the term to literary texts with dialectal elements and to texts that are found as early as the seventh century and as late as the twenty-first century (155). Tracing the history of Middle Arabic, Versteegh states that in the archives of Aphrodito (present-day Kum Ishqaw in Upper Egypt), a large number of papyri have been found, dating from the end of the first to the third centuries of the Hijra and containing official correspondence with the governor of Egypt. Most of the papyri stem from Egypt, written by Muslims, and most of them contain nonliterary administrative or commercial texts. The significance of the papyri, in Versteegh's opinion, lies in the fact that their language exhibits more or less the same traits as later Middle Arabic texts, which confirms the fact that from the very beginning, these linguistic changes had been present in colloquial language (Versteegh 2014, 157). During the twentieth century, and in line with many intellectuals and authors at that time, in his 1938 *Mostaqbal Al-Thaqafa fi Misr* (The Future of Culture in Egypt), Taha Hussein argued that dialect is unworthy of being called a language and is unfit to fulfill the aims of intellectual life. He maintained that language is not only a means of communication among fellow citizens but also a vital part of national identity (Hussein 2013, 193). On the other hand, writers like Salama Musa, Luwis Awad, and Mustafa Musharrafa tried to challenge the then existing canon by introducing the Egyptian dialect as an accepted form of expression in literature. Musa opined that efforts should be made to give splendor to the Egyptian dialect. Since the vernacular language is the commonly used living language, it represents the only idiom that can be functional for the nation's progress (De Angelis 2016, 197). After such attempts, the shift toward pan-Arabic nationalism in the sixties rendered the use of the colloquial in literature controversial once more.

In his work *Language and Symbolic Power* (1991), Pierre Bourdieu analyzes the production and reproduction of legitimate language and maintains that language is not merely a tool of communication but also a medium of power. Legitimate language, according to Bourdieu, is the dominant language that assumes official status through asserting its legitimate competence in the linguistic market. He maintains that "speakers lacking the legitimate competence are de facto excluded from the social domains in which this competence is required, or are condemned to silence" (Bourdieu and Thompson 1991, 55). Acquiring the necessary legitimate competence in the conversation with the official language confers upon one a capital, a cultural capital of knowledge, skill, and other cultural acquisitions and a symbolic capital of accumulated prestige or honor that optimizes the standing of the individual or group in the commonly shared and coveted market or field (Bourdieu and Thompson 1991, 60–2). The field here is the cultural-political space of Facebook posts, where different groups enter into trade exchange with the aim of sharing information with a wide range of readers and inviting them to participate in the discussion.

De Angelis (2016) maintains that a democratic language context should guarantee each member of the speakers' community the right to speak up. In Egypt in particular, a democratic language context should guarantee citizens the right to write, in the face of the grievous issue of diglossia (199). The use of the Ammiya, or local dialect, is in direct response to social needs. De Angelis continues to pose the question, If everything in Egypt is written in a language that is not accessible to the majority of the community, or in a language that only few can master, how could we claim that contemporary Egypt lives in a context of linguistic democracy? (2016, 199). As an advocate of vernacularization, Safouan states that writing in vernacular does not mean reproducing the language of the street but creating new language from literature, a possibility that exists in any language (2007, 62–3). The data in this chapter represent a different register, however, since it utilizes features from SA in a written-dialect form. Research in premodern Middle Arabic focused on how much the texts deviated from the “correct” form of SA, or overcorrections, pseudo-corrections. The text here is one that deviates from both EA and SA norms to reach out and highlight a form of activism across the Arab world. According to Lentin (2016), forms of Arabic language that do not belong to classical, dialect, or mixed spoken Arabic, like “hybrid” and “symbiotic” forms, position Middle Arabic as a separate variety. Lentin further adds that “Middle Arabic has taken upon itself the glorious and obscure task of pragmatically dealing with Arabic diglossia, by filling the space of the linguistic continuum between both polar varieties, thus preventing it from becoming a ‘no language’s land’ with all the consequences of such a situation” (2016, 216). Comparing spoken contemporary mixed Arabic and modern and premodern written Middle Arabic, Mejdell (2012) notes that the Arabic colloquial-oriented style in print is here to stay and concludes, “Above all, the new electronic media provide arenas for new written practices—unedited and uncontrolled by language authorities, literary as well as purely communicative” (244–5).

Analysis

The generic structure of the post provides some evidence of what the group is trying to achieve with this recontextualization (van Leeuwen 2008, 11). The social actions represented and performed here are as follows:

1. MM states the problem of the initial approval of the law and possible ramifications and consequences (utterances 1–5).
2. MM expounds some articles of the proposed law and its dire effects (utterances 6–4).
3. MM compares the new law to the existing one (utterances 25–27).
4. The Egyptian Parliament passes a bill (utterances 28–30).
5. MM comments on the procedures of passing the law (utterances 31–37).
6. MM counsels an alternative framework for cooperation between the state and NGOs (utterances 38–39).
7. MM invites readers to spread the news and respond by sharing their opinion or personal experience (utterances 40–41).

Social circumstances reflect a pattern of inclusion and exclusion. To discuss this pattern, it is necessary to bring the various ways in which each category of social actors is represented under a common denominator—for example, those who impose the law and those who oppose the law (we)—as representations rearrange the social relations between the participants. Discursive strategies of crossing establish the association practice.

Activation occurs when social actors are represented by the active, dynamic forces in an activity, passive when they are represented as undergoing the activity or as being “at the receiving end of it” (van Leeuwen 2008, 33). Utterances 40 and 41 (40: “If you like what you read on our page, tell your family and friends about it and come and participate with your reactions”; 41: “If you have any experience or information about corruption in Egypt, or international initiatives to fight it, write to us in the comments section, post it on our page or email us ... and we will publish whatever is useful for our members”) clearly foreground the active role of the readers in the social action. EA is the register used in the two utterances. Hence, the choice between generic and specific reference is another important factor in the representation of social actors; the generalized class of citizens addressed here constitutes the real, in which specific participants are “specimens” of these classes (van Leeuwen 2008, 35).

The post in general draws on the representation of the social practice of giving an opinion on social issues in Egypt and beyond. All of these practices involve specific sets of social actors or participants. Some actions are objectified through nominalization while others are spatialized. The text here will include some of these actors—bearing in mind that recontextualization into discourse may exclude some of the participants from the practice they recontextualize that can be retrieved by the reader or the writer. In van Leeuwen’s terms, the participants here can be realized as *a group of Egyptian activists* reporting to *all readers* of the Facebook community, the counsel of *expert analysts* regarding an action taken by *Egyptian legislators* (*whose nomination is realized by proper nouns*), and, in this way, indirectly counseling *all readers* across Arab communities who may also be concerned about NGOs and the future of its regulations in Egypt and the Arab world as *categorized* social actors. Hence, we notice a shift to SA in the two utterances that express the “counseling” act:

(٣٨) زي ما قلنا قبل كده الدولة الجادة هي اللي تستفيد من الجهد اللي ممكن تقدمه هذه المنظمات وتضع الأطر القانونية والإدارية العادلة.. الدولة محتاجة إعادة النظر في علاقتها بالمجتمع المدني، خصوصاً في ظل ظروف اقتصادية صعبة وزيادة سكانية متسارعة.

(٣٩) الحلول الأمنية دائماً سهلة ولكنها لها تكلفتها، والتي منها فعلاً الإساءة لسمعة مصر، بالإضافة الي فقدان مزايا وجهود كثيرة اقتصادية واجتماعية.

(AlMawkef AlMasry, “Timeline,” November 16, 2016)

Like we said before, the state that takes things seriously is the one that utilizes any effort of these organizations and introduces fair legislative and administrative frameworks. The state needs to reconsider its relation to the civic society, specially under the current economic hardships and the accelerated population rate. (38)

Security-based solutions are always the easier choice, but they come with a price—which may include smearing Egypt’s reputation in addition to the loss of a great deal of social and economic efforts and advantages. (39)

The combination of linguistic elements here is treated as unmarked. The move from one variety or style to another has significance in the moment-to-moment development of the talk itself. Arab readers as social participants share identities and functions with the group of Egyptian activists. The key participants (activists and readers) are not directly realized in and by the text. The text only realizes the group's action (analyzing/describing/commenting) while the other elements of the practice are seen as "context." Some participants are "particularized" and "nominated," like the speaker of the parliament and the parliament member who proposed the law, while others are "generalized" and "aggregated," like large numbers of NGO members in Egypt and beneficiaries of the social work who will be negatively affected. The most frequently included social actors are "legislators," who are invoked by quoted law articles as their social action, and "us" readers and citizens, also represented as active participants who are invited to share and react to the post.

Analyzing dialectal versus oral features, Doss (2014) observes that "oral features are not necessarily nor exclusively to be found in the written representation of the dialect. An author can proceed to write the dialect while adopting the constraints of writing and using its code, he can do so by making his text explicit ..., non-redundant and far from improvisation, or well-planned" (52). We have to note that the written dialect is not identical with the spoken variety as exemplified in this sequence in the beginning section of the post:

(٥) ياريت واحنا بنقرا كل الكلام الجاي منفكرش بس في منظمة حقوقية بتدافع عن مواطن اتعرض للتعذيب مثلاً، مع ان ده حق ضروري جداً طبعاً.. لكن نفكر مثلاً في جمعية تعليمية بتتلقى تبرعات لتعليم الأطفال، أو جمعية غرضها صحي زي أصدقاء مستشفى أبو الريش مثلاً، واللي وارد تلاقي جمعية خيرية طبية أجنبية من سويسرا مثلاً عايزة تتعاون معاه، أو مواطن عادي في قرية بأخر الصعيد جمع كام واحد يعرفهم من ويعملوا جمعية لمساعدة أهل البلد.

(AlMawkef AlMasry, "Timeline," November 16, 2016)

Hopefully, while reading all of the following account, we would not limit our scope to one human rights organization that defends a citizen subjected to torture for example—though this is of course an extremely necessary right. But we also need to think about an educational organization that receives donations to help educate children or an organization that works in the health sector, like "Friends of Abu-Errish Hospital" for instance, that may receive cooperation offers from a Swiss medical charity organization, for instance; or an ordinary citizen in a remote village in southern Egypt who united efforts with a number of his acquaintances to establish an organization to help his fellow villagers. (5)

The use of EA in this sequence is meant to represent not an oral thought but a written one that is meant to be widely read and identified as a specific type of social practice. A feature like subordination (as opposed to coordination) is an example of crossing to SA. Auer (2007) maintains that with code-mixing, the combination of words, phrases, and longer sequences from different lexico-grammatical codes is more conspicuous, making it easier for linguists to classify the speech involved as more than

just a subvariety of the national language, but the changes from one code to another do not reframe the ongoing interaction or impact on its unfolding (15). Doss (2014) summarizes Ong's (1982) account of the features of oral thought and expression and their difference from the written one by identifying the following features: exhibiting a larger number of subordinate elements, being more aggregative than analytic with a higher use of epithets and formulaic expressions, and being more redundant and repetitive than the written (Doss 2014, 49–50). As a form of stylization, the speakers here shift into varieties that are seen as lying beyond their normal range, beyond what participants ordinarily expect of them in terms of EA or SA. This type of disjunction of speaker and voice draws attention to the speakers themselves, temporarily positioning the recipient(s) as spectator(s) who participates in the social act and at least momentarily reframing the talk as nonroutine. The style is elaborate, analytic, and organized with discursive expressions of identity and affiliation.

Syntactically, crossing throughout the text saliently occurs in syntactic constructions like relative and subordinate clauses that follow the SA syntax, though EA vocabulary is being used. Tense and verb constructions and negative constructions are introduced in EA.

Discussion and Conclusion

Two processes could be observed taking place here. One is a process of constructivism, where SA features especially are adopted as one's own and at the same time used as a tool for crossing to all Arab readers who will associate with the activists' social practice, and by association, constructing a collective identity. The other is the preference for EA in the discourse, even while SA is recognized for its instrumental and functional benefits. Variation in the use of styles/codes in this case can be framed as constitutive of social life. As such, the language here is perceived as an embodiment of a collective social identity that is manifested in and supported by ideological beliefs and practices. Representational choices here play a key role as they form part of the affiliation discourse in rhetorical realizations. Bakhtin (1986) developed the concept of the inherent "dialogicality" of language; he describes talking as a dynamic reciprocal process that engages an active listener and a responsive speaker who codetermine each other. The speaker designs the utterance, including the choice of variety and discursive strategies as crossing or stylization as a dialogue with a listener in mind.

Farrrelly (2015) stresses that language is not the only social system and discourse is not the only element of social practice. Holding this distinction, one can ask critical questions about the relationship between the discourse associated with a social practice and the other elements of the social practice (43). Based on the work of Fairclough (2013), social structures such as language and the political structure constrain and enable a certain kind of action, but they do not determine action (210–12). Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) clearly mark out this position in confirming that neither CDA nor other forms of critical social science are in the business of "prescribing" alternative practices but rather helping to clear the ground for those engaged within a social practice to seek the changes they want. In this social practice, we need a set of

participants in certain roles—"instigator, agent, affected or beneficiary" (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999, 35). Eligibility conditions are the "qualifications" participants must have in order to be eligible to play a particular role in a particular social practice (van Leeuwen 2008, 10). The most obvious feature in this text is its variation and linguistic inconsistency between SA and EA. Throughout the text, the word order varies between the colloquial and the standard order and the agreement rules of CDA are applied in one sentence and not applied in another. The drive to maintain code-mixing is equally ideological in terms of working up within the social network. The strategic style shifting in this text creates and leads to a certain communicative effect and outcome that is achieved cross-culturally through the Arab world. Explorations of "crossing" and "stylization" features in the above text exemplified contextualization mechanisms by which AlMawkef AlMasry strategically reached out to commonly shared social meanings and meaning-making process among all Arab readers. This tenet was achieved through the post's linguistic choices and variation between the Egyptian Arabic dialect and the Standard Arabic variety in an example of the dynamic relationship between linguistic communication and culture. All Arab readers were here enabled to align themselves with this social group for different purposes at different times in acts of social construction within a linguistic frame of social meaning.

References

- AlMawkef AlMasry. 2016. "Timeline." Accessed December 25. <https://www.facebook.com/almawkef.almasry/posts/924303884336176>.
- Auer, P. 2006. "Sociolinguistic Crossing." In *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, edited by E. K. Brown, Anne Anderson, and R. E. Asher, Second edition. Boston: Elsevier.
- Auer, P. (Ed.) 2007. *Style and Social Identities: Alternative Approaches to Linguistic Heterogeneity*. Berlin, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bakhtin, M. M. 1986. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Edited by Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson. University of Texas Press Slavic Series: No. 8. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and John B. Thompson. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie, and Norman Fairclough. 1999. *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cohen, Anthony P. 1985. *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. Key Ideas; Variation: Key Ideas. Chichester: E. Horwood; London; New York: Tavistock Publications.
- Coupland, Nikolas. 2007. *Style: Language Variation and Identity*. Key Topics in Sociolinguistics. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- De Angelis, Francesco. 2016. "The Egyptian Dialect for a Democratic Form of Literature: Considerations for a Modern Language Policy." In *Arabic Varieties: Far and Wide. Proceedings of the 11th International Conference of AIDA, Bucharest 2015*. Ed. George Grigore and Gabriel Bițună, 193–201. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.
- Doss, Madiha. 2014. "Some Remarks on the Oral Factor in Arabic Linguistics." *Studia Orientalia Electronica* 75: 49–62.
- Hussein, Taha. 2013. *Mostaqbal Al-Thaqafa fi Misr*. Cairo: Supreme Council for Culture.

- Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, Norman. 2013. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Second edition. New York: Routledge.
- Farrelly, Michael. 2015. *Discourse and Democracy: Critical Analysis of the Language of Government*. Routledge Critical Studies in Discourse: 6. New York: Routledge.
- Lentin, Jerome. 2016. "Middle Arabic." In *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, edited by C. H. M. Versteegh, Mushira Eid, Lutz Edzard, and Rudolf Erik de Jong. Leiden: Brill. Accessed December 27. <http://ezproxy.amherst.edu/login?url=> and <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/encyclopedia-of-arabic-language-and-linguistics>.
- Mejdell, Gunvor. 2012. "Playing the Same Game? Notes on Comparing Spoken Contemporary Mixed Arabic and (Pre)modern Written Middle Arabic." In *Middle Arabic and Mixed Arabic: Diachrony and Synchrony*, edited by Liesbeth Zack and Arie Schippers. Leiden, NL: Brill.
- Miller, Jennifer M. 2000. "Language Use, Identity, and Social Interaction: Migrant Students in Australia." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 33 (1): 69–100.
- ONG, Walter J. 1982. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of The World*. London.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. 1987. "Linguistic Utopias." In *The Linguistics of Writing: Arguments between Language and Literature*, edited by Nigel Fabb, Derek Attridge, Alan Durant, and Colin MacCabe. New York: Methuen.
- Rampton, Ben. (Ed.) 1999. "Styling the 'Other'." Special issue of *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3 (4): 421–7.
- Rampton, Ben. 2009. "Interaction Ritual and Not Just Artful Performance in Crossing and Stylization." *Language in Society* 38(2): 149–76.
- Rampton, Ben, and Constadina Charalambous. 2012. "Crossing." In *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism*, edited by Marilyn Martin-Jones, Adrian Blackledge, Angela Creese. London; New York: Routledge.
- Safouan, Moustafa. 2007. *Why Are the Arabs Not Free?: The Politics of Writing*. Critical Quarterly; Variation: Critical Quarterly (Book Series). Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.
- Van Leeuwen, Theo. 1995. "Representing Social Action." *Discourse & Society* 6 (1): 81–106.
- Van Leeuwen, Theo. 1996. "The Representation of Social Actors." In *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard. London; New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Van Leeuwen, Theo. 2008. *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Oxford Studies in Sociolinguistics. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Versteegh, Kees. 2014. *The Arabic Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.