James, Allan. "The Communicative Event" in International English(es) as Social Practice: Adducing a Tricodal/Trimodal Theory of the Linguistic Structuring of Social Meaning." *Research Developments in World Englishes*. Ed. Alexander Onysko. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2021. 29–46. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350167087.ch-003>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 06:20 UTC.

Copyright © Alexander Onysko and Contributors 2021. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

“The Communicative Event” in International English(es) as Social Practice: Adducing a Tricodal/Trimodal Theory of the Linguistic Structuring of Social Meaning

Allan James

1. Introduction

Current research into world Englishes may be said to have effected a communicative turn in that the extensive analysis of anglophone lects around the globe focusing on their development and codification as (postcolonial) “varieties” (e.g., Schneider 2007) has been increasingly supplemented by attention to the communicative significance of anglophony as embedded in diverse types of multilingual discourses worldwide (e.g., Saraceni 2014), most prominently within a “translanguaging” conception of “code-meshing” (see, e.g., Li 2017). Such latter analysis of situated anglophony has been characterized as a “post-varieties approach” to language (Seargeant and Tagg 2011). However, most recently, a readiness has been signalled also within the varieties approach to world Englishes itself to engage with the linguistic realities of the “communicative space” (Mair 2018) or “communicative event” (Deshors and Gilquin 2018) in which English is co-present in new domains, e.g., with German as in pop culture and migrant discourses (Mair 2018) or as “modes of communication” (Deshors and Gilquin 2018), foremostly involving computer-mediated communication. From a more structural perspective, the Englishes manifested in such new “genres of expression” (Deshors and Gilquin 2018: 284) have been identified in particular for their hybridity (Schneider 2016).

In comparison, a post-varieties approach to world Englishes as situated anglophony and as practised in translanguaging research considers itself in the first place as “a practical theory of language” which moves beyond the construct of hybridity itself to see language as a holistic mix, i.e., as “a multilingual, multisemiotic, multisensory, and multimodal resource for sense- and meaning-making” (Li 2017: 14). The analysis of anglophony is then not so much oriented to its linguistic codal properties, but rather to its role as a signalling resource on a par with other semiotic resources present in a verbal exchange.

However, returning to the structural hybridity of English(es) worldwide, inasmuch as this is the product of language contact between such English(es) and other languages locally co-present and in actual verbal exchanges, then this hybridity can be analyzed further as the result of specific language contact phenomena. As Onysko (2019) expands, these in turn are the result of the “socio-pragmatic conditions” of the communication situation itself, which determine whether a mono- or multilingual (or “oscillating”) mode of production is activated (2019: 36–8). While the main expectation of the above communicative event-oriented approach to varieties is that it would provide “a window into the development of World Englishes” (Deshors and Gilquin 2018: 288), the aim of language contact research into situationally determined structural hybridity is to establish the cognitive basis of the well-established contact types (such as codeswitching) which characterize such hybridity (Onysko 2019: 38–44).

In sum, the purpose of paying attention to the contexts of world Englishes use in the three approaches considered is to establish the communication frameworks within which a refined typology of varieties (in the first approach), and of contact phenomena (in the third approach) is facilitated, and within which the specification of “translanguaging space” (in the second approach) can be concretized (see Li 2017: 15–16).

By comparison, the aim of the present approach to the analysis of communicatively contextualized international English(es) is to draw together formal and functional, structural and semiotic properties of language as discourse and to show how these are mutually specifying. It will be argued that in any linguistically driven communicative event the structural codes within which social meanings are consistently expressed are not those of language or variety, but rather of structurally and semiotically definable subsets of (a) language which manifest a unity of form and function. Such codes are familiar as “dialects,” “registers” and “genres” and have been previously theorized from a sociolinguistic perspective by Ferguson (1994), and from a social semiotic perspective by Fairclough (2003) as “styles,” “discourses” and “genres,” respectively, which as forms of “social practice” constitute “ways of being,” “ways of representing” and “ways of acting” (2003: 31). Developing the argument further, Fairclough proceeds to show that when these styles, discourses and genres are textualized as occurring social events they then express a social semiotics of, respectively, “identification of persons,” “representations of the world” and “actions and their social relations” (2003: 26). Given that these social events manifest both a structural linguistic identity (as constituting “dialects,” “registers” and “genres,” James 2008: 101–2) and a social semiotic identity (as expressing “identification,” “representation” and “action,” James 2008: 105–6), they may therefore equally be interpreted as codes of language use (the former) and modes of language use (the latter). It is the recognition of these structural-functional linguistic unities which enables the analysis of the formal structure of language to be directly combined with the analysis of its function as a (social) semiotic resource.

The interpretation of these codes as modes and vice-versa in the analysis of contextually embedded international English(es)—either in mono- or multilingual discourses—further an understanding of such linguistic practice as the deployment of selective structured anglophony (as codes) for selective social semiotic purposes (as

modes) characteristic of a myriad of such actually occurring communicative events as social events worldwide.

This bare outline of a tricodal/trimodal approach to world Englishes in context will now be further substantiated in the following and then applied in the analysis of communicatively situated anglophone data in Section 4 below.

2. A Tricodal/Trimodal Approach Elaborated

2.1 Basic Categories

An approach which aims to develop a co-specifying relation between linguistic codes as formal entities and social semiotic modes as functional entities in anglophone social events conflates in doing so context of language use as mode with structure of language use as code, obviating in the first instance recourse to situationally determining factors which go beyond the immediately linguistic structural or social semiotic. That is, conditioning factors such the new domains, genres of expression or even socio-pragmatic conditions of above inasmuch the details of these are not tied closely to a particular co-defining typology of linguistic structure, may be nonetheless regarded as constituting a valuable second level of contextual explanation for the communicative events that characterize the deployment of English in the world.

In a statement reflecting on the sociolinguistics of globalization and "super-diverse" contexts of language use commensurate with a translanguaging approach, Blommaert (2010) highlights the "truncated" nature of multilingual repertoires, that "constitute a complex of specific semiotic resources which are concrete accents, language varieties, registers, genres, modalities such as writing," as "ways of using language in particular settings and spheres of life" (2010: 102; original emphasis). This clearly acknowledges the co-presence and co-functionality of both linguistic codes and semiotic modes in such contexts of use – paradigmatic for the communicative events as social events involving anglophony worldwide.

However, further theorization is now required on the co-specifying nature of code and mode, as, e.g., developed in previous research on Lingua Franca English (James 2005, 2008), a typology of International Englishes and globalization theory (James 2009), and anglography in polylingual texts (James 2014). Concerning "identification," "representation" and "action" constituting the social semiotic modes, it might be noted that these closely correspond to Foucault's (1972) threefold "relations with oneself," "relations of control over things" and "relations of action upon others" of social theory. Concerning "dialect," "register" and "genre" constituting the linguistic structural codes, these also link to earlier research of Halliday (1978) on language as social semiotic, where he specifies dialect as "a variety according to user," and register as "a variety according to use" (1978: 35), to which James (2008) adds the "genre" of Fairclough (2003) and of McCarthy (1998) and as the "primary genre" of Bakhtin (1986) as "a variety according to using" (2005: 142). Crucially, Halliday notes that "dialect" is foremostly expressed via lexicophonological structure, and "register" via lexicosemantic structure, to which James (2005) adds "genre" as being expressed via lexicogrammatical structure (2005: 142).

These threefold hybrid layers of linguistic structure are seen as the norm or unmarked realizations as codes of the threefold social semiotic modes, respectively. In other words, this postulation allows a direct and mutually defining functional-structural link to be established between social meaning and linguistic form in social events as texts. At the same time, the modes, and with them the codes, exist in a relation of “interdiscursivity,” such that they compete, combine and interact in texts (Fairclough 2003: 218)—hardly any one text in reality exclusively manifesting a single mode/code. They may even in marked cases manifest a “dialectics of discourse” in that, e.g., representational meanings (= register) may be contextually enacted in genres (=actional meanings), identificational meanings (=dialect) in registers (=representational meanings), etc. (Fairclough 2003: 29). However, despite the tight interaction of modes and codes, considerable empirical evidence has been adduced from the close data analysis of various contexts of international English(es) use to suggest that these co-specifying functional-structural, modal-codal dualities can indeed be identified, thereby permitting a potentially robust typology of situational usage (cf., James 2008, 2014, 2016).

2.2 Codes and Modes Continued

Dialect as a code expressing identification as a mode is understood as providing the linguistic structure(s) most readily employed to realize social meanings of user specification. In sociolinguistic theory, user identity as such is ultimately emergent in interactive discourses and in the course of a communicative exchange can take on micro (temporary/restricted/local), meso (semi-temporary/-restricted/-local) and macro (non-temporary/-restricted/-local) dimensions of construction and display (cf., “the emergence principle” and “the partialness principle,” Bucholtz and Hall 2005). At the same time, as Bucholtz and Hall confirm, the “indexicality principle,” as “the mechanism whereby identity is constituted . . . involves the creation of semiotic links between linguistic forms and social meanings” (2005: 592). The identity relations that emerge in interaction via indexical processes include “the use of linguistic structures and systems that are ideologically associated with specific persons and groups” (2005: 594), while “entire linguistic systems such as languages and dialects may also be indexically tied to identity categories” (2005: 597). Dialect hence constitutes the structural linguistic baseline of a user in communicative events, which in an individual personal perspective constitutes his or her idiolect. The particular structural resources within the dialect which are activated for identity expression are lexical and phonological in combination, as they indeed characterize dialects in real life, while not denying a residue significance of grammatical structure.

Register as a code expressing representation as a mode is understood as providing the linguistic structure(s) most readily employed to realize social meanings of use specification. Representation is a concept widely used in sociocultural theory, in particular theories of social constructivism, and concerning language in theories of (critical) discourse analysis, intimately bound up with issues of social semiotics (Webb 2008). In a linguistic interpretation, it is tied in with relations of lexical semantics,

specifically of how signs signal the meaning of their referents. Connecting social semiotic and linguistic dimensions of meaning-making, representation in the present context expresses the semiotic framework within which a particular social event is to be understood as text. It frames and creates the particular “text-world” (Werth 1999) within which the communicative event is to be interpreted. Register itself denotes the particular use-type of language that signals specific meanings pertaining to a specific field of discourse (commonly seen as a special purpose variety, associated with particular professional fields of activity such as the law, medicine, business, etc. or of fields of leisure activity such as sports, gaming, etc.). In the present context, as conveying the social meaning of representation, register activates the lexical and semantic structures in combination, which signal the text or discourse type as “field of social action” (Halliday 1978) intended, not excluding a secondary influence of grammatical structure.

Genre as a code expressing action as a mode is understood as providing the linguistic structure/s most readily employed to realize social meanings of a using specification. Action constitutes the verbalization of a social relation between interlocutors, the relation itself being formulatable broadly as one of “interaction” or “transaction” (Fairclough 2003: 26–7). In a more detailed taxonomy in his theory of genre, McCarthy (1998: 8–9) postulates that “action” can be categorized in terms of the fivefold “transactional-professional-pedagogical-socializing-intimate” types. Such a framework would at the same time offer a social situational framework for establishing the more specific “ways of acting” that “social practice” allows for (Fairclough 2003: 26), possibly in terms of a speech act typology.

However, returning to the co-defining link between “action” as social semiotics and “genre” as linguistic structure, Thompson and Couper-Kuhlen (2005) state unambiguously that “the routinized patterns that we call grammar exist because speakers need routinized ways to implement actions” (2005: 482, original emphasis). They then proceed to investigate “grammatical formats as interactional practices” (2005: 483), in which they confirm by a detailed analysis of English and Japanese data that there is incontrovertible evidence that the clause functions as the main structural locus of interaction (2005: 489ff.). Hence the present genre as constituting the code via which action as mode is expressed activates grammatical structure(s) for its realization, which together with the accompanying lexical structures effectuates its social semiotic impact, not denying accompanying semantic effects.

Table 3.1 summarizes the categories of analysis established so far:

Table 3.1 Categories of Analysis

Codes as social practice and linguistic structure	dialect	register	genre
Modes as social event and social semiotics/text	identification	representation	action
Linguistic realization	lexicophonology	lexicosemantics	lexicogrammar

Table 3.2 Corollaries of the Categories of Analysis

Variety characterizing	user	use	using
Orientation as social practice	speaker/writer	message	listener/reader
Function fulfilled in social event	display	discourse	dialogue
Structural linguistic function	contrastive	culminative	concatenative
Language realization function	materiality	significance	temporality/linearity

Further conceptual corollaries may be suggested of the basic analytical categories here presented. Whereas dialect has already been defined as a variety according to user, register according to use and genre according to using, as social practice dialect may equally be said to be speaker/writer-oriented, register as message-oriented and genre as listener/reader-oriented. As social event, identification serves a function of display, register that of discourse, and genre that of dialogue. Finally, from a structural linguistic point of view, lexicophonology may be said to constitute the structural layer availing a contrastive (distinguishing) function of patterning, lexicosemantics the layer availing a culminative (highlighting) function, and lexicogrammar the layer availing a concatenative (linking) function of patterning (after Trubetzkoy 1969). The reification of the varieties of dialect, register and genre in actual linguistic use, i.e., as a dialect, a register and a genre may be termed *lects*. Ultimately the lexico-phonological/-graphological layer of linguistic structure provides the materiality (i.e., substance) of language in spoken and written form, the lexicosemantic layer its significance, and the lexicogrammatical its temporality (speech) or linearity (writing). Table 3.2 summarizes these further points.

As already stated, this present tricodal/trimodal theory of the linguistic structuring of social meaning will be applied further below to the analysis of co-lingually situated English(es) in a number of representative communicative events worldwide. However, its full relevance for the understanding of globally situated anglophony must first be clarified in the framework of multilingualism/multilectalism, i.e., heteroglossia, in general.

3. Heteroglossia

3.1 The Social Meanings of Heteroglossic English

As Tagg (2015: 207) observes in a discussion of translanguaging and a superdiverse internet, “most people have resources from more than one language in ways that reflect the repertoires of ‘multilinguals’,” i.e., “everyone moves between registers, styles and/or dialects.” Heteroglossia, she suggests, “encompasses diversity in all its forms, including multilingual, multimodal and multi-authored practices and which therefore best capture the kind of hybrid language practices that take place in many digital contexts” (2015: 208). It is this conception of heteroglossia that is shared here, in the first instance as a superordinate term covering both multilingualism (more than one language) and

multilectalism (here, more than one code), reflecting on the one hand the linguistic "glossodiversity" present in the world, and on the other the equally present "semiodiversity" within language(s) globally (Halliday 2007). It might be noted that the term "heteroglossia" or "double-voicing" originally derives from Bakhtin (1981), who with it designates the fact that "our speech, i.e., all our utterances ... is filled with the words of others" (1981: 89). In a general sense with relation to the present model one could concur that our speech is indeed shared, repeated and therefore routinised within the affordances and constraints of codes/modes.

An ever-increasing number of studies—too numerous to list—have in recent years analyzed language-mixing scenarios involving English(es) and co-present other, predominantly local, languages. Such studies employ the various frameworks of code-switching, hybridity and translanguaging and examine situated anglophony/anglography in various sound and/or visual media (radio, TV, film) and oral conversation, print media (the press, advertising) and digital (social) media such as Facebook in particular, but also fan-fiction and multiplayer online gaming. Dependent on the framework adopted, researchers point to the particular social meanings that the English serves to express in the context of its co-present language(s), as generally in code-switching and hybridity approaches, or, as in a translanguaging perspective, pointing to the sociocultural capacities of users, foremostly of creativity and criticality, that emerge as they "move dynamically between the so-called languages, language varieties, styles, registers, and writing systems, to fulfil a variety of strategic and communicative functions" (Li 2017: 18).

In very broad terms, and increasingly to the extent that English is societally perceived as a foreign as opposed to a second or a (co-)native language, the social meanings that have been ascribed to its use in such informal contexts either by the language participants themselves or by the researchers range variously from affective empathy, "mateyness," group solidarity, a cultivated informality and general conviviality to modernity, enlightenment, cultural sophistication, global connectivity and general "cool"—all most prominently expressed in contexts of digital communication. These positive attributes manifest a well-observed local as well global dimension of sociolinguistic practice. Indeed the English here appears as a valued-added linguistic resource for positive social effect, as "anglographic enhancement" via the verbal and visual impact of its written form (James 2014: 34ff., 2016: 260ff.). Extrapolating further, one could almost conclude that anglophony/anglography in such co-lingual contexts provides an extra affective modality of expression, perhaps even comparable to tone of voice in oral communication, but also to the physical modalities of facial expression, gesture, posture and proximity—all absent in purely verbal digital communication (but available in multimedia communication).

Moving now to a consideration of the contextual conditions furthering or restricting translanguing (or intralingual/translectal) alternations in communicative events as social events beyond the kind of sociolinguistic-semiotic (semi-?) intentionality behind the incorporation of English just discussed, an attempt will be made to explore to what extent the situational deployment of one or the other code/mode might itself constitute such a condition and co-determine the linguistic forms produced.

3.2 Contextual Conditions on Heteroglossia: Contact Types

Not only by its perceived global presence, but also partly by analogy to intralingual style-shifting, translanguaging has been increasingly considered as an unmarked mode of communication, as translanguaging approaches assert (cf., e.g., Saraceni 2015), and the linguistic repertoires of language users are not only seen as multilectal but multilingual, whereby the multiple languages involved may only be partially internalized (Blommaert and Backus 2012). However, the actual contextual activation of the languages employed in multilingual discourses has been attributed in research to a wide array of sociocultural, psycholinguistic and discourse-functional factors (cf., e.g., Myslin and Levy 2015: 873–8), while structural linguistic approaches have resulted in extensive models of code-switching (e.g., Muysken 2000; Myers-Scotton 2002). In the latter, points of switch and types of switch correlate with lexicogrammatical properties of the ongoing utterance, and as such accept the structural unity of multilingual strings. Building on these approaches Onysko (2019) develops a cognitive processing model of language contact, specifically of the four phenotypes of borrowing, transfer/interference, code-switching and replication. It is to a consideration of this model in the light of the present tricodal/trimodal approach that the discussion now turns.

Whereas the proposed tricodal/trimodal model attempts a mutually defining synthesis between linguistic structuring as hybrid layers of lexicophonological, lexicosemantic and lexicogrammatical patterning and the social semiotic significances of identification, representation and action, Onysko's model attempts a mutually defining synthesis between linguistic structuring as types of language contact and the cognitive processing of language as unconscious/conscious activation determining the adoption of monolingual/multilingual/oscillating modes of realization. "[A]pproaching the notion of language contact from cognitive linguistics ... throws into relief the basic conceptualisation of language as a bounded entity" (Onysko 2019: 31), i.e., he questions the assumption that processing and production is individual language-specific, as does the present co-defining of linguistic codes from a social semiotic perspective, which thus far has been formulated in (specific) language-neutral terms. Indeed, without doing adequate justice to the full complexities of cognitive processing described by Onysko, a closer comparison of the two models nonetheless reveals further compatible points of connection in the form of the proposed contact phenotypes which may permit a complementarity of explanation for heteroglossic linguistic structuring from cognitive and social semiotic perspectives.

The phenotype borrowing, as "the use of form-meaning units of La in Lb," which in the monolingual mode of production "engages selection from the lexical knowledge base" of the recipient code" (2019: 38), i.e., is seen in the first instance as a word-level phenomenon, that in the present approach employs lexicosemantic structure(s) to express the representation of a particular socially relevant meaning in a heteroglossic discourse (see also the culminative (highlighting) function in 2.2 above). Similarly, calquing as "the replication of La meaning in Lb with the help of linguistic forms of Lb," i.e., as the predominant form of the phenotype "replication" (2019: 42), is primarily a lexicosemantic structuring, again, expressing the representation of a socially

Table 3.3 Codes/Modes and Contact Phenotypes

Contact types	transfer/interference	borrowing+replication	codeswitching
Social semiotic effects	identification	representation	action
Structural realization	lexicophonological	lexicosemantic	lexicogrammatical
Code types	dialect	register	genre

relevant meaning in discourse (cf., also the culminative (highlighting) function in 2.2 above).

Codeswitching (with code here designating language code), as a form of borrowing, involves the use of form-units from La in Lb, but where the selection from the knowledge base is not of the recipient language. “As a socio-pragmatically adequate conversational tool in a multilingual mode, CS [codeswitching] occurs spontaneously, coheres with the contextually conditioned discourse strategies, and carries out multiple functions” (2019: 40). In terms of the present model, the phenotype codeswitching is primarily a lexicogrammatical structuring promoting a social semiotics of action (cf., the concatenative (linking) function in 2.2 above).

Finally, the phenotype transfer/interference as “an analogically stimulated activation of language units in code La that influences the production of a formally/semantically related language unit in code Lb” (2019: 40) is predominantly a lexicophonological structuring in spoken language manifesting a social semiotics of identification (cf., the contrastive (distinguishing) function in 2.2. above). In other words, the contact phenotypes of borrowing and replication characterize in the main register code, codeswitching a genre code and transfer/interference a dialect code. At this point it must be stressed however that these are not relations of exclusivity, but of weighted orientation or default setting—for instance, lexicogrammatical structure(s) can also be borrowed or replicated, lexicophonological structure(s) co-codeswitched in speech and lexicosemantic structure(s) transferred. The relations as outlined are summarized in Table 3.3.

Having established these co-occurrences between contact phenotypes and the present triple linguistic codes and semiotic modes in communicative events as social events at a general level of analysis, it will now be shown how these elements of a tricodal/trimodal approach to the linguistic structuring of social meaning can account for the formal-functional regularities that characterize the use of English in locally constituted heteroglossic discourse worldwide.

4. Codes/Modes and Contact Types in Co-Present Anglophony/ Anglography: Data Analysis

4.1 Further Considerations

In subsequent analysis below, attention will also be given to a type of heteroglossic scenario where English functions as an overlay language to another which would

otherwise be the unmarked choice for general communication purposes, including the digital, in the contexts investigated. Findings indicate that in such circumstances its ancillary status stands for both a local “ambient affiliation” (Zappavigna 2012) and a global sophistication, in print and web advertising (e.g., Martin 2007, 2014), but particularly as employed in social communication in the digital media (see also 3.1. above). In contrast, the bulk of the substantial literature in both varieties and post-varieties research paradigms has until recently addressed the use of English as a co-language in multilingual contexts where it is one of societally sanctioned languages present such as, e.g., with users from Singapore, Malaysia and Hong Kong (i.e., Outer Circle locations) or the Philippines and Indonesia (Outer Circle-related locations), with only to a limited extent analyzing digital, as opposed to spoken or written communication. In such circumstances, the English is not so much a linguistic overlay, but a co-language providing its own semiotic resources to an ongoing discourse on a par with the other language(s) employed. However, its very material presence—particularly in informal digital communication and much as in its overlay role—can nonetheless achieve a value-added effect by complementing the material presence of the other language(s) and in doing so confirming and thereby intensifying, but, crucially, maintaining the nature of the code in operation and the social semiotics of its mode. Apart from in any case drawing attention to its own materiality, it evokes via homophoric reference and intertextuality its use and meanings in other codally and modally equivalent anglophone contexts (cf., James 2016: 267), i.e., in Bakhtin’s terms, reproducing the voices of others. From a language contact perspective, codeswitching, borrowing and “replication” denote the interlingual matching processes involved. In monolingual discourse this would be equivalent to a stylistic shift via intralingual codeswitching, borrowing or replication making meaning contextually more explicit (e.g., by switching the lexicophonological structure(s) of one dialect into another), while at the same time confirming the social semiotics of the mode present and the code in place in the discourse.

In the following section, data from informal heteroglossic digital communication involving English will be analyzed to illustrate the points being developed.

4.2 Three Data Scenario Types

The three scenario types analyzed are:

- i) where English is a fully integrated lingual component of a “fused lect” (Auer 1999) and is used as such in a communicative event
- ii) where English is one of two (or more) languages used alternately on a regular basis, and used as such in a communicative event
- iii) where English is used selectively within the frame of another language in a communicative event

All data are taken from published Facebook communications, both commentaries and chat, where in the present discussion particular attention will be drawn to scenario iii), as constituting, arguably, the most widely encountered social use of English globally, but as presently under-researched in comparison to scenarios i) and ii).

Where English has a societally sanctioned local co-presence with other languages, as in postcolonial Singapore, Hong Kong, Malaysia and India and therefore is employed as such in informal digital communication by users from these locations, its use varies mostly between scenarios i) and ii). Whereas in Singapore English as Singlish functions as a local anglophone variety in its own right with influences from Chinese (Hokkien), Malay and Tamil, in Malaysia a local variety of Malaysian English can be distinguished as well as *Rojak* (Malay for mixture) variously evidenced in use scenarios i) and ii) (Schneider 2016: 346–7). In Hong Kong, English alternates with Cantonese much as in use scenario ii), while in India apart from its co-presence with Hindi and other Indian languages as in scenario ii), English is also seen to be increasingly fusing with Hindi, as *Hinglish*, i.e., moving towards use scenario i) (Schneider 2016: 344–5). In the meantime, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that these patterns of English are reproduced if not intensified in social media use.

4.2.1 Scenario i)

Example 1: *Rojak* (Saraceni 2015: 121, Text 2, lines 1–8)

- A. ni yang hari tu korang nak dapat ^^ lol misai is shaved!
- B. Haha ... sound tu yg aku meniyirap tu aritu. . .nk tdo pon susah
- C. Haha shave jugakkk finally ^^
- D. hahahahahaha! made my day
- E. with or without the moustache, you look like snoop dog
- F. the sound of shaver klakar gile. siapboleh break2 tu last2
- G. meniyirap aku denga music background tu. . .
- H. hahaha. . .NICE!!

The comments are those of friends reacting to a user's posting that he has shaved his beard off.

Much could be remarked on regarding the—familiar—media-specific abbreviated word spellings (*tu* for too; *yg* for young, *gile* for Gillette), rebuses (2 for too), letter repetition for prominence (*jugakkk*), representation of emotions, also by syllable repetition (*hahahahahaha*), capitalisation for volume (*NICE!!*), acronym (*lol*) and laughter emoticon (^^). B and C capitalize their line-initial "Haha." Apart from D's clause-length codeswitch (*with or without. . .snoop dog*), the English is fully integrated with the Malay at word level (*sound, shave, finally, break, last*), phrase level (*the sound of shaver, music background*) and predicate level (*is shaved, made my day*).

This indeed indicates that the language displayed by the users is a fused lect, in which the combination of Malay and English is re-created in each communication anew. This speech act of declarative commentary manifests in modal terms a strong identificational function with its (digital bilingual) formal appearance, strongly projecting *Rojak* as dialect in codal terms, with its lexicographological uniqueness. The unity of the fused lect is promoted by the employment of the Roman alphabet as script, but still with different orthographies, the differences of which are partly neutralized via the use of conventional as well constructed digital short forms. The incidental

codeswitching of E via a well-formed extended lexicogrammatical string in standard English (complete with comma!) can perhaps be seen as actionally motivated in the context.

From a language contact point of view, since transfer/interference has been claimed above to be associated with dialect code and its lexicophonological—here lexicographological—structuring, one could note that fused lects are indeed formed via the massive mutual transfer/interference of the original languages involved.

4.2.2 Scenario ii)

Example 2: Taglish (Schneider 2016: 345, Text (1), original lines 1–12, English translations in square brackets)

- E. i wasn't online last weekend
 E. coz i went to batangas for the fiesta
 L. oo ng apala [oh yes, now i remember]
 L. bong aba uli [was it lavish/extravagant again]
 E. yes...mas bongga ngayon than before [...it was more lavish/extravagant now than before]
 L. boah
 E. kasi mas maraming tao [because there were more people], coz it was on a Saturday
 L. tamang tama [that was just the right timing]
 E. yup...B was asking about u
 L. padala naman ng pics [do send me pictures]

The transcript is of an online chat protocol, where the Taglish evidences considerable codeswitching between Tagalog and English as the language contact phenotype, each represented in their standard spellings apart from English *i*, *coz*, *u*, the onomatopoeic spellings of *boah* and *yup* and the use of lower-case for the first letter of line-/turn-initial words—being all minor concessions to social media usage. Certain key words such as Tagalog *batangas* (a placename with initial letter lower-case) and *bong aba*—*bongga* and English *pics* constitute lexical insertions (i.e., borrowing(s)), reflecting in modal terms a representation function expressed via codal lexicosemantic structure(s). Otherwise the English and the Tagalog are used alternately, mainly signalling turn-takes, with E using English more frequently and L Tagalog. The constructions alternating are well-formed, full clauses plus the minimal responses *boah*, *yes* and *yup* and contribute to a smooth dialogue. As such in codal/modal terms they evidence the lexicogrammatical structure(s) of genre realizing an actional (here, inter-actional) social semiotics.

Example 3: Denglish (Buschfeld, Kautzsch and Schneider 2018: 35, data (3)–(8))

- (3) Female, 35: Well, Nirvana halt, just kult!
 (4) Female, 35: [...] Und das Gitarrensolo-Thema finde ich suuuuper, let's keep that in mind for next week!

- (5) Female, 35 [about a posted song]: Ich leg einen nach [I'll add one more], gimme a minute.
- (6) Female, 35: Oh yesssss! (More comments later tonight, du hältst mich vom schweren Arbeiten ab [you're keeping me off from hard work]).
- (7) Male, 28: Mensch, da kriegt man so viele Geburtstagsgrüsse [Oh man, you get so many nice birthday greetings], but this knocks it out of the park [...]
- (8) Male, 47: Congrats, du Wahnsinniger [you crazy guy]!!! WOW!!!

These are again commentaries on a Facebook posting, but particularly noteworthy is the untypical standard spelling and punctuation of both German and English, apart from *gimme* emphatic *suuuuper* and *yesssss* and conventionally shortened *Congrats*. The hybrid label Denglish for *Deutsch* + *English*, which in common use refers to extensive lexical borrowing from English into German, is adopted here by analogy to the Taglish above.

The users are described as being "highly educated German speakers of English" (2018: 34) and gender and age of the users are included in the data. The education level of the network users is a likely indicator for the use of standard spelling and punctuation, but the style of the commentaries is in fact reminiscent of informal spoken language. However, the language alternations occur regularly at clause (including minor clause) boundaries, also within turns (as in "Well, Nirvana halt"), making prominent the succession of well-formed lexicogrammatical strings. These therefore in the present analysis constitute genre as code expressing the social semiotic action mode. In language contact terms, the data provide clear cases of the codeswitching phenotype. By juxtaposing data from Taglish and Denglish, the intention is also to confirm that it is the users' own deployment of their linguistic resources that defines the heteroglossic nature of the communication event and not the geographical context of their use as such.

4.2.3 Scenario iii)

Example 4: Serblish/ Anglosrpski

The data for the present section are taken from a study of the Facebook communication of female Serbian users between the ages of 15 and 25 years (Palibrk and Tošić 2012). In the study, a self-assessment task i) required 150 subjects to list the English words and phrases as well English-based abbreviated forms that they used on a daily basis in correspondence with friends; and a data analysis ii) is undertaken of the 24 Facebook profiles (431 comments, 4,158 words) of 80 users, divided into equal-number groups of 15 to 20 year olds and of 20 to 25 year olds, with special attention to the employment of "English words, chunks or abbreviations," English-influenced Serbian orthography and English pattern abbreviations in Serbian (2012: 157). The terms Serblish and Anglosrpski are those in use to designate extensive lexical borrowing from English into Serbian (cf., e.g., Vasić, Prčić and Nejgebauer 2001). Findings from the data analysis ii) provide the basis for the present discussion.

Overall, while the younger group used almost double the percentage (12.58%) of the English and English-related lexical forms in their total vocabulary than the older group

(7.46%), the latter group used significantly more “whole phrases or chunks of language” (37% of all examples of English) than the former (18.4%) (2012: 158), a fact in the light of the present discussion perhaps indicating something more of a lexicogrammatically characterized actional semiotics of the English. However, in language contact terms, lexical borrowings and replications represent the most prominent anglophone/anglographic influences. Examples of lexical borrowings included are *refreshing*, *honey bunny*, *true love* and *teenage films*, whereas of particular prominence are the “arbitrary adaptation” forms constituting replications such as *prajvat parti* (‘private parts’), *sou long sakrz* (‘solong suckers’), *lajkjues* (‘like you’s’) and *very najs pikcr* (‘very nice picture’) (2012: 159). Further examples of orthographic creativity are the substitution of Serbian š, č and ć by *sh* and *ch*, and *ks* by *x* (2012: 161), while combinations of a replicated English stem combined with a Serbian inflection, above all with verb forms, are also common (but see also the nominal inflection in *parti* above).

In terms of the present model, English in these data constitutes an overlay language (cf., 4.1. above) and is adduced primarily in its lexicosemantic dimension, i.e., as register, to express a social semiotics of representation—literally, the representation of a Facebook community via a co-constructed group vocabulary. It thereby enhances the desired projection via its valued-added linguistic substance. Apart from the direct borrowing of anglophone lexical items in their original orthography, there are also frequent occurrences of replication, where the items are transliterated into Serbian orthography and in certain cases further truly nativized by adding Serbian inflections, as already pointed out. The substitution of certain letters and digraphs from English for their Serbian phonetic equivalents is, strictly, a case of transfer/interference in contact terms and as such a salient identification marker sociosemiotically as executed by the manipulation of lexicophonological/-graphological structure. The identification involved is one of situational bilingual as signalled via a particularly salient orthographic transfer/interference, indexing bi-graphic competence in the two languages involved. It might be relevant to note at this point that Serbian users are in any case bi-literate with the presence of complementary Roman and Cyrillic alphabets, a situation which might facilitate a certain flexibility in orthographic practice. However, the predominant social semiotics signalled remains that of representation in its lexicosemantic structural form.

5. Conclusion

The three scenario types serve to illustrate how English as employed as a co-language in heteroglossic informal digital communication, what social semiotics it expresses and via which general layer(s) of linguistic structure(s) this is achieved. It is argued that English in each scenario type not only contributes to and therefore confirms the dominant linguistic code and social semiotic mode in place at the time but in its very anglographic form and with its homophoric/intertextual associations serves to intensify them (see 4.1 above). As an extension of this structured referencing, the English can be assumed too in each scenario type to connote further positive meanings of a local and global dimension. Such connotations of, very broadly, local conviviality and global sophistication, respectively, will expectedly increase through

scenario types i) to ii) to iii) (see also 3.1 above). At the same time, it will be noticed that the data examined do not include any purely graphic representations such as emojis (which indeed were deliberately omitted in the original presentation of scenario iii)), and it will be a task of future research to further explore their semiotic significance in interplay with that of the linguistic as well as graphic impact of English (but, cf., Danesi 2017; James 2017).

Clearly, the actual four communicative events described are not comparable methodologically in that there are considerable variables involved not least concerning chat vs. commentary, age, education (and gender?) of the language users and in any case the practice of the original data collection. Nevertheless, it has been hoped to show that the analysis of such representative samples of empirical data evidencing English in international use in a globally much-frequented communication medium does seem to offer support for the present tricodal/trimodal theory of language as social practice. As such, it also offers a framework within which perspectives of varieties and post-varieties approaches to English(es) worldwide may be combined.

References

- Auer, P. (1999), "From codeswitching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech," *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5 (4): 309–32.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981), *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986), *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, eds. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2010), *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. and A. Backus (2012), "Superdiverse repertoires and the individual," *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies*, 24.
- Bucholtz, M. and K. Hall (2005), "Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach," *Discourse Studies*, 7 (4–5): 585–614.
- Buschfeld, S., A. Kautzsch and E. W. Schneider (2018), "From colonial dynamisms to current transnationalism. A unified view on postcolonial and non-postcolonial Englishes," in S. C. Deshors (ed.), *Modeling World Englishes. Assessing the Interplay of Emancipation and Globalization of ESL Varieties*, 15–44, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Danesi, M. (2017), *The Semiotics of Emoji. The Rise of Visual Language in the Age of the Internet*, London: Bloomsbury.
- Deshors, S. C. and G. Gilquin (2018), "Modeling World Englishes in the 21st century. New reflections on model-making," in S. C. Deshors (ed.), *Modeling World Englishes. Assessing the Interplay of Emancipation and Globalization of ESL Varieties*, 281–94, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fairclough, N. (2003), *Analysing Discourse. Textual Analysis for Social Research*, London: Routledge.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1994), "Dialect, register, and genre: Working assumptions about conventionalization," in D. Biber and E. Finnegan (eds.), *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register*, 15–30, New York: Oxford University Press.

- Foucault, M. (1972), *The Architecture of Knowledge*, New York: Pantheon.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978), *Language as Social Semiotic. The Social Interpretation of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (2007), "Applied linguistics as an evolving theme," in James Webster (ed.), *Language and Education: Collected Works of M.A.K. Halliday*, 1–19, London: Continuum.
- James, A. (2005), "The challenges of the Lingua Franca: English in the world and types of variety," in C. Gnutzmann and F. Intenmann (eds.), *The Globalisation of English and the English Classroom*, 133–44, Tübingen: Narr.
- James, A. (2008), "New Englishes as post-geographic Englishes in lingua franca use. Genre, interdiscursivity and late modernity," *European Journal of English Studies*, 12 (1): 97–112.
- James, A. (2009), "Theorising English and globalisation: semiodiversity and linguistic structure in Global English, World Englishes and Lingua Franca English," *Apples—Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 3 (1): 79–92.
- James, A. (2014), "English as a visual language: theorising the social semiotics of anglography in polylingual texts," *English Text Construction*, 7 (1): 18–52.
- James, A. (2016), "From code-mixing to mode-mixing in the European context," *World Englishes*, 35 (2): 259–75.
- James, A. (2017), "Prosody and paralanguage in speech and the social media: The vocal and graphic realisation of affective meaning," *Linguistica*, 57 (1): 137–49.
- Li, W. (2017), "Translanguaging as a practical theory of language," *Applied Linguistics*, 39 (1): 1–22.
- Mair, C. (2018), "Stabilising domains of English-language use in Germany. Global English in a non-colonial languagescape," in S. C. Deshors (ed.), *Modeling World Englishes. Assessing the Interplay of Emancipation and Globalization of ESL Varieties*, 44–75, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Martin, E. (2007), "'Frenglish' for sale: Multilingual discourses for addressing today's global consumer," *World Englishes*, 28 (2): 170–90.
- Martin, E. (2014), "Linguistic and cultural hybridity in French web advertising," in R. Rubdy and L. Alsagoff (eds.), *The Global-Local Interface and Hybridity. Exploring Language and Identity*, 133–52, Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- McCarthy, M. (1998), *Spoken Language and Applied Linguistics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muysken, P. (2000), *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2002), *Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myslin, M. and R. Levy (2015), "Code-switching and predictability of meaning in discourse," *Language*, 91 (4): 871–905.
- Onysko, A. (2019), "Reconceptualizing language contact phenomena as cognitive processes," in E. Zenner, A. Backus and E. Winter-Froemel (eds.), *Cognitive Contact Linguistics. Placing Usage, Meaning and Mind at the Core of Contact-Induced Variation and Change*, 23–50, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Palibrk, I. and T. Tošić (2012), "Girl talk: English in modern means of communication," *Nasleđe*, 21: 151–64.
- Saraceni, M. (2014), "The language of Malaysian and Indonesian users of social networks: Practice vs system," in R. Rubdy and L. Alsagoff (eds.), *The Global-Local Interface and Hybridity. Exploring Language and Identity*, 191–204, Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- Saraceni, M. (2015), *World Englishes. A Critical Analysis*, London: Bloomsbury.
- Schneider, E. W. (2007), *Postcolonial English: Varieties Around the World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schneider, E. W. (2016), "Hybrid Englishes: An exploratory survey," *World Englishes*, 35 (3): 339–54.
- Sergeant, P. and C. Tagg (2011), "English in the internet and a "post-varieties" approach to language," *World Englishes*, 30 (4): 496–514.
- Tagg, C. (2015), *Exploring Digital Communication: Language in Action*, London: Routledge.
- Thompson, S. A. and E. Couper-Kuhlen (2005), "The clause as a locus of grammar and interaction," *Discourse Studies*, 7 (4–5): 481–505.
- Trubetzkoy, N. (1969), *Principles of Phonology*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Vasić, V., T. Prčić and G. Nejgebauer (2001), *Rečnik Novijih Anglizama. Du Yu Speak Anglosrpski?* Novi Sad: Zmaj.
- Webb, J. (2008), *Understanding Representation*, London: Sage.
- Werth, P. (1999), *Text Worlds: Representing Conceptual Space in Discourse*, London: Longman.
- Zappavigna, M. (2012), *Discourse of Twitter and Social Media*, London: Bloomsbury.