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29.1 INTRODUCTION

Present media developments are described as rapid and fundamental changes with deep impacts on our daily lives. Topics raised in media discourse and political discourse about the media concern issues related to media production as well as to individual media habits in everyday life. The categorization of media into distinct sectors such as print, film, radio and television becomes increasingly blurred as media companies adopt a multimedia orientation, and a multiplicity of new receiving devices (computers, mobile phones) allow access to a wide range of media products almost everywhere and at any time. The traditional distinction between different genres such as news, entertainment, documentary, fiction, etc., cannot be maintained. New - often interactive and hybrid - formats emerge regularly with constantly changing labels and definitions such as infotainment, reality shows, private news blogs, etc. These formats make the identification of sources, the differentiation between fact and fiction, and the awareness of transitions between real and virtual worlds increasingly difficult (Busch, 2004: 299ff). Equally, the distinction between (public) mass media communication, characterized as a one-to-many process, and (private) interpersonal mediated communication, characterized as a one-to-one process, is being called into question, for instance by new forms of internet communication, characterized as network communication. The notion of a dominant national public sphere which was conceived - through multiple exclusions on the basis of gender, race, class and language - as homogeneous and monolingual is being challenged by a fragmentation into a complex configuration of sometimes overlapping and sometimes mutually exclusive spaces of communication with their particular policies of representation (Wodak and Koller, 2008). The dominance of media industries in a globalized market and the commodification of media communication create new exclusions in terms of access and representations which are subsumed under the notion of the "digital divide". Such developments prompt a need for research into the interconnections between linguistic practices and the media. This chapter gives, in its first part (Section 29.2), an overview of approaches to media communication, media texts and the connection between language and the media within linguistics. In its second part (Section 29.3) it introduces the reader to a framework for the analysis of media communication that combines elements from sociolinguistics, discourse analysis and media studies.

29.2 APPROACHES TO THE MEDIA IN LINGUISTICS

Within media studies, linguistics, and more particularly sociolinguistics, there has been a variety of scientific approaches to the interconnections between language and the media.

**Language policy, language planning and the media**

In language policy and language planning research, the media were for a long time neglected as a factor. Joshua Fishman even warned in his early sociolinguistic work against overemphasis on the media in the context of language policy and language planning, and against media fetishism in language policy (Fishman, 1991: 374). Under the more traditional paradigm in the field, which saw language policy mainly as a top-down strategy, the potential role of the media was by definition limited as they had been, to a large extent, exempted from direct state control ever since the Declaration of Human Rights in the course of the French Revolution. Nevertheless, state authorities have always exercised a certain amount of control and intervention in this domain via media laws, licensing procedures, frequency and paper allocations, subsidies, etc. (Busch, 2006). Also, after World War II, in most Western European countries, public service audio and audio-visual media - for which direct regulating measures are possible - were protected by state monopolies that persisted for almost 50 years. National laws and regulations outline the confines of media production and also intervene on the level of language use in the media. An example of this kind of intervention is the French legislation on the limitation of anglicisms in the public domain, which was carried to a number of Eastern European countries in the 1990s (Busch, 2004: 151). The role of the media in the formation and implementation of standard and national languages has been a concern of substantial research (Anderson, 1983; Imwinkelried, 1993; Pfisterer, 2000).

Since the beginning of the twenty-first century a new interest in language policy can be noted. In these approaches, language policy is seen rather as a process of negotiation between top-down measures enacted by macro-level institutional agents and bottom-up initiatives and practices by communities and speakers (Ricento, 2006; Shohamy, 2006). The focus on social, economic and political effects of language contact which sees linguistic practices as social practices allows a new take on the media in the field. Under the condition of present media developments, language policy is challenged from a double perspective: from the micro perspective of globalization and supranational regulatory bodies as well as from the micro perspective of changing individual Lebenswelten (life-worlds) in which multilingualism has become a salient feature of everyday life. On the macro level the debate about the influence of the media on the spread of languages and especially on the dominance of English has been a concern (Crystal, 2001). It has been observed that language plays an important part in the process of reconfiguration of media spaces, in reconfiguring larger regional areas beyond nation-state boundaries as well as in linking dispersed diasporas (Robins, 1997). Thussu (2000: 197 ff.) explains the example of a TV channel that picked up the urban jargons Honglish² for news programmes to develop markets beyond the Hindi-speaking area on the Indian subcontinent and in the British diaspora. In the debate on minority media three main approaches can be distinguished (Busch, 1999):

- a minority or human rights approach in which the question of access and participation of linguistic/ethnic minorities (in a national public sphere) dominates;
- an approach that is more oriented towards questions of language loss and language revitalization;
- and finally a more recent paradigm that takes a speaker-centred approach and focuses on questions of constructions of (multiple, hybrid) identities.

Early research in the field was often initiated and commissioned by international and European institutions to inform their language policies (Franchon and Vargaftig, 1995; Husbond, 1994; the publications of the European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages in the Mercator Media series). The European instruments to implement linguistic rights in the media field also to some extent mirror this change of paradigms: whereas the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (1992) (Article 11) is still mainly concerned with access to and recognition of (autonomous) minority languages as such, the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (1995) refrains from a definition of minorities and declares an obligation to foster intercultural dialogue in the media (Articles 6 and 19). The European Union (EU) increasingly includes questions of language and the media in its language policy action plans (European Commission, 2003).

**Multilingualism and the media**

There is also an extensive literature mapping the multiple intersections of minority media and their impact upon ethnic identities. In complementarity to literature on the representation of minorities in majority media, there is a body of research that has focused on the representation of minorities in majority entertain- ment (for an overview of research in the EU member states see ter Wal, 2002), a body of works that combines media studies and linguistics and addresses the significance of minority control and ownership of the media to guarantee self-representation and participation in a heterogeneous and diverse public sphere (see, for example; Busch, 1999, 2004; Cormack, 1998, 2004;
Husband, 2000). Cormack (2004: 4) suggests five types of minority media impact: (1) a symbolic role (signifying the full functionality of the community, reifying its language and connectedness to modernity); (2) an economic role (job creation, career prospects); (3) developing a public sphere within a community that can carry a distinct news agenda; (4) allowing the community to be represented within and towards the outside; and (5) acting as a key conveyor of culture and as a producer of cultural products. Moring and Husband (2007: 78) add two other aspects: the credibility of community leaders can prompt an opportunity for (minority) language use (as a reader or listener), and the role of the media in the reconstruction of language as well as in the development and diffusion of language innovation and of new vocabulary. The legitimacy and prestige of a language remain a topic of much research in minority and indigenous media (Moring and Husband, 2007), mainly, taking an approach based on the concept developed by Giles (1977) which offers a conceptual tool to analyse sociostructural variables that shape the strength of an ethnocultural community for language retention.

Beginning with the 1980s and 1990s, research into minority language became a central issue on the research agenda. Studies examining media policies and language policies directed at migrant communities found a striking correlation between media and migration policies. Whereas in the early days, language and migrant integration into Western Europe was a means to an end, in the 1980s and 1990s, a communication model was developed: media as a means to facilitate the integration of migrants. This model became more popular as the number of migrants increased and as integration policies changed. The relationship between language and migration is now seen as a two-way relationship: language is used by migrants to integrate into society, while society uses language policies to facilitate integration.

In the field of multilingualism, the concept of multilingualism was introduced in the 1980s. Multilingualism is defined as the ability of individuals to use multiple languages. The concept of multilingualism is closely linked to the idea of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism is the idea that people from different cultures should be able to live together in harmony. This concept is closely linked to the idea of multilingualism, as people from different cultures often use different languages.

A focus on the media text

In recent approaches to media texts, the 'text' as such has been somewhat 'de-centered' and the focus of interest has shifted to the (social, cultural, political) context and to the 'localization' of meaning. A move away from 'text' towards 'textual event' has occurred. One of the central issues in the study of multilingualism is the role of language in the media. However, the role of language in the media is not the same as the role of language in society. Language in the media is often used to create a specific image or impression of a group, rather than to reflect the diversity of the group. This can lead to a narrowing of perspectives and a lack of understanding of the diversity of languages and cultures.

Research on the understanding of multilingual interactions, power relations and hierarchizations between languages. Based on research in a multilingual context, it is clear that the media play a significant role in constructing identity and community. The media are used to create and reinforce stereotypes, and to construct a shared understanding of the world. This can have a significant impact on the way that people from different cultures interact with each other.

In conclusion, the study of multilingualism in the media is an important area of research. It is clear that the media play a significant role in the construction and understanding of identity and community. The media are used to create and reinforce stereotypes, and to construct a shared understanding of the world. This can have a significant impact on the way that people from different cultures interact with each other. It is important to continue to study these issues in order to better understand the role of language in the media and in society.
Adopting this stance means to conceive media communication as a process of textual transformations in which the analysis of reception and production requires specific attention because the text as an artefact constitutes only a moment within a chain of recontextualizations (see also Section 29.3 of this chapter).

Critical discours analysis (CDA)

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) represents a methodological advancement toward an interdisciplinarity (Clayman and Heritage, 1995; van Dijk, 1988, 1991; Wodak and Meyer, 2000). The roots of CDA lie in classical rhetoric, text linguistics and sociolinguistics as well as in applied linguistics and pragmatics. The notions of ideology, power, hierarchy and gender, together with sociological variables, are all seen as relevant for an interpretation or explanation of text. The term 'CDA' is used nowadays to refer more specifically to the critical linguistic approach of scholars who find the larger discursive contexts to be the basic unit of communication. CDA is concerned with 'language as social practice' and considers the context of language use to be crucial (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997: 258).

In CDA, discourse is seen as a form of knowledge and memory, whereas text illustrates concrete oral utterances or written documents (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001). The aim is to illuminate the ways texts represent their social reality and has been one of the core concerns of CDA. A key concern in CDA is the question of how texts draw on different textual traditions and are situated with respect to the 'order of discourse' (Fairclough, 1995). This means that we understand the production of discourse and the way people talk, and they in turn influence social and cultural realities. The linguistic and discursive choices are made and are dependent on power dimensions. Analytical tools of CDA are most useful to identify such linguistic choices. They are analytical instruments to identify the complexity of language and to describe the social reality as it is socially constructed; news is conceived of as a social practice, a discourse.
Dealing with the question of authenticity in broadcasting talk, Montgomery (2001) - following Goffman (1981: 401) - argues that a conversational tone, sometimes adopted in media communication, may be more scripted than it seems, and may be simulated, although it is currently designed to approximate as much as possible to 'naturally occurring' talk. Although broadcasting media communication to many, broadcasters have evolved or borrowed techniques associated with small-scale interaction. Montgomery distinguishes between three different (overlapping) types of authenticity: (1) 'talk that projects and contributes something more or less than talk itself'; (2) talk that is true to the event/experience; (3) talk that is true to the self/person (2001: 404).

In post-variationist contexts there is a shift from processes of authentication and from linguistic features representing social stratifications to the impact of style and stylized features on the negotiation of social positions (Coupland, 2001).

In connection with media communication, research that engages with the concept of style and stylistics is presently very influential. Variationist linguistics treated style as an interesting but relatively marginal dimension of language variation, Coupland (2007b) distinguishes contexts of media with three waves of style research. The idea of stylistic variation was first used in sociolinguistics by Labov (1972) to refer to intra-individual speech variation, variants of the speech of a single person (Coupland, 2007b: 71). The concept of stylistics in sociolinguistics, in particular the ethnography of speech (Gumperz and Hymes, 1972: Hymes, 1962) were already, from the very beginning, interested in contextualization processes and social styles. Coupland (2007a: 219) identifies a second wave in style research which was concerned with the search for patterns of style shift (for example the shift of pronunciation towards prestige variants in new media and in interviews). Influential with regards to media communication is Giles’ accommodation theory (1973) and Bell’s audience design (1999) - the idea of converging to non-participant moments in stylistic adaptation. Both approaches posit a more social basis of style shift (accommodating a listener, designing one’s speech for an audience).

A move away from Labov’s linear concept of contextual style, from styles as objects, represents also the conceptualization of social styles and stylization as processes (Hinnekamp and Selting, 1989).

Whereas, according to Coupland (2007b), in the first and second wave of sociolinguistic research into style the emphasis was on style shift, studying linguistic deviation from a presumed norm, the focus is now on how style creates meaning in discursive operations. Stylistic operations are possible because of the socially-structured indexicalities that link ways of speaking to social groups or specific situations, and to ideological conditions that define these at particular times and places. Style becomes similar to lifestyle, described by Bourdieu (1979) as the surface correlate of habitus. Style is more than saying the same things in other ways; what can be said and what cannot be said is an integral part of communicative style (Auer, 2007: 12). The basic unit of analysis for a sociolinguistics of style is a single semiotic unit, and the analytical demand is to explain its meaning and to explain its negotiation of social meaning in a discourse (Coupland, 2007a: 220). According to Coupland, style is also social practice as its meaning potential is realized in the construction of social identities and relations.

Styling is part of the construction and deployment of a speaker’s and others’ social identities, which might be to invoke and to consolidate the values and attributes associated with a ‘speech community’... On the other hand it might involve establishing a particular stance vis-à-vis those community norms, where ownership becomes more or less central when it is not present one wants to subvert.

The concept of style was applied in a productive way in connection with media, among others by Bell’s relationship with his design framework and, recently, Ben Rampton’s work on sociolinguistic crossing and stylistic creativity in relation to ethnicity and social class, followed by other works usually linked theoretically to the work of Mikhail Bakhtin and Erving Goffman.

Recent media-related research that draws on concepts of style and stylistics focuses on a variety of topics such as youth culture and the media (e.g. in relation to migration and national identity), (e.g. Böse and Busch, 2007), advertising (e.g. Kelly-Holmes, 2005), computer mediated communication (e.g. Andreoupolous, 2007a, 2007b), escapism, presentation of self in digital media (e.g. Coupland, 2007a), and gender (Cameron, 2006).

29.3 A FRAMEWORK FOR THE ANALYSIS OF MEDIA COMMUNICATION

When analysing language in media interaction it is necessary to take into consideration the specific conditions under which media communication takes place. As in any other type of communicative interaction, media communication has a dialogic nature and cannot be conceived simply within a sender-receiver model. Furthermore, again in as any other type of communication, media communication is multimodal and multi-functional, i.e. every act of media communication encompasses a propositional, a social and a personal dimension: drawing on several semiotic modes it provides content and is involved in processes of meaning-making, it structures interpersonal relationships and it results in the production and reproduction of subject positions. Media communication mediates between the public and the private sphere; it can be seen as a form of organization of interactions framed by specific contexts. Media products are publicly available and media are, in their self-understanding, constitutive elements of the public sphere(s). Whereas the process of mediation takes mostly place in private surroundings. As discussed earlier in this chapter, present developments in media make traditional categorizations according to sectors, genres, etc., increasingly difficult. The following subsections of this contribution presents elements for an open and flexible framework for the analysis of language and the media. The framework shown in Figure 29.1 was first developed for and applied to the analysis of interaction in everyday life in media in multilingual environments (Busch, 2004).

Recontextualization and intertextuality

Media communication can be understood and analysed as a chain of recontextualizations. These transformations occur at any stage of the communication process, linking the sphere of media interaction to the situations of everyday practices in which media are present. From the perspective of media studies, linear models of communication that dissociate meaning from its context during process of reproduction were replaced by models that see communication as a circular process, comprising the totality of the means employed to collect, exploit, store, transmit and impart information (Mattelart, 2003: 51 referring to Pierre Bourdieu’s cybernetics approach). From the perspective of linguistics the process of media communication can best be captured by the notion of intertextuality, as developed by Julia Kristeva. Intertextuality is contextual style, with objects as objects, represents also the conceptualization of social styles and stylization as processes (Hinnekamp and Selting, 1989).

Whereas, according to Coupland (2007b), in the first and second wave of sociolinguistic research into style the emphasis was on style shift, studying linguistic deviation from a presumed norm, the focus is now on how style creates meaning in discursive operations. Stylistic operations...
Figure 29.1 Analytical layers for the study of media communication with respect to language.
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<th>Inter-textuality</th>
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<tbody>
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<td>Media and everyday practices</td>
<td>Imagining the audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different ways of conceiving the producer-audience relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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Available for expressing a potential of meanings. For instance, in print media, layout and image are available in addition to the written word; in radio, language is present in its specific form, alongside music and various sounds; in television, all the aforementioned modes can be drawn upon in a context in which the moving image holds a central position. Similarly, in CMC a wide range of modes is available. Kress states:

A multimodal approach assumes that the message is 'spread across' all the modes of communication. If this is so, then each mode is a partial bearer of the overall meaning of the message. All modes, speech and writing included, are then seen as always partial bearers of meaning only. This is a fundamental challenge to hitherto current notions of 'language' as a full means of making meaning (2002: 6).

Walter Benjamin's writings, especially on 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction' (Benjamin, 1938), were extremely influential in media studies. Taking the example of a painting being transformed into a photograph, he showed that the media content of the original work is still pronounced in a way that reflects the interdependency between the medium and new meanings. Harold Innis underlined in the 1950s (1997) the importance of technical developments in communication, of ways of transmission of information and of means of transport for cultural developments. Marshall McLuhan (1964) developed this idea further by coining the aphorism 'the medium is the message'. Cultural studies caution against a technical determinism that postulates a simple causal relationship between the technical and the social (Mattelart, 2003). How different modes interact in the communication process is, from this point of view, not only a question of technical interactivity but also a question of social appropriation and convention, as Kress and van Leeuwen (2001) point out in their multimodal social semiotic theory.

The interplay between the different modes has undergone substantial changes in media history. Writing was considered in many cultural environments as the central mode for the transfer of canonical knowledge and authoritative discourse. This practice, of the predominance of the written text, influenced radio production so that practically all radio texts in the early days of the medium were produced first in written form and then read in the radio broadcast. Even in television for a long time news broadcasts were read without a transmission of the image of the speaker as it was considered that the moving image could distract attention. Gradually the image has moved into a central position. The 'conversationality' of (political) discourse in the media gained in momentum with the image and with television (Fairclough, 1995: 9f). The so-called new media can contribute through their interactive practices, to a further de-centering of standard languages and favour practices that draw on multiple stylistic and linguistic resources. Such practices in turn are taken up by traditional mass media and incorporated into their journalistic routines.

Imagining the audience

Present approaches exploring the relationship between language and the media generally draw on Mikhail Bakhtin's dialogic principle (1981) which assumes that in any utterance an interlocutor is present. Unlike in direct communication, in media communication, due to its specific spatially and temporally shifted conditions of reception, the interlocutor becomes an imagined, ideal counterpart. Bakhtin's work inspired Bell to develop his model of audience design. Observing a radio speaker who reads the news bulletin on different radio stations, he noticed a style shift on the micro level of pronunciation and concluded: 'style shifts occur (rather than other shifts) in the interplay between voice and audience' (Bell, 1997: 242). The audience design model differentiates between the 'addressees' who are directly addressed, the 'auditors' who are assumed to be the target audience of a particular medium, the 'overauditors' who might be interested in the medium but do not form part of the target audience, and the 'eavesdroppers' who the speaker does not think of (1997: 241ff). Bell's model, initially conceived for radio broadcasting, can be applied to other forms of media communication.

The notion of the target audience, which encompasses a spatial (local, regional, national, global) and/or a social (status, income, age, gender, social groups, hierarchies) definition of audience categories. Research on media coverage and definitions of target audiences are instruments of marketing research and correspond to criteria established by the advertising industry. Ang (1991) demonstrates that this approach is based on a discursive construct of audience that is unable to grasp the actual relationship between media and audiences or to conceive communication processes. She distinguishes between two main orientations: audience-as-public and audience-as-market. The first configuration of audience is generally associated with the public service media sector in which the addressee is seen as a citizen (of a country) who, like the audience-as-market, is paternal and aims at transmitting values, habits and tastes. It is linked to the so-called transmission model of communication, in which the transmission of a message and the ordered transfer

Modalities and meanings

Media communication is inherently multimodal communication; this means that language in written and spoken form is only one of several modes
of meaning is the intended consequence of the communication process.

The second configuration of audience is associated with the private media sector. Audiences are addressed as consumers in a double sense: as consumers of the media product and as potential consumers of the products advertised in the programmes. In the attention model of communication (McQuail, 1987), communication is considered successful as soon as attention is actually raised in audiences. The transfer of meaning plays a secondary role. The scopo, the extraordinary and the scandalous gain in importance as means of awakening attention.

In the alternative media sector the conception of the audience is determined by the idea of an active public that participates in social action and media production. The intention is to overcome the division between producers and audiences, and to move closer to a situation in which the 'other' is able to represent itself, and in which the heterogeneity of 'authentic informants' is not reduced. Alternative or third-sector media are consequently closer to the ideal of representing the multiplicity of voice in society in all three dimensions which Balibar described: heterology (raznorazno), i.e. the diversity of language(s) (raznoglasnice), i.e. the diversity of language(s); and heterophony (raznorazno), i.e. the diversity of individual voices (Todorov, 1984: 56).

These different basic orientations in conceiving the producer-audience relationship result in preferences for particular media formats (e.g. authoritative information-centred programmes, infotainment programmes, dialogic forms as phone-in programmes), and in a choice of particular linguistic practices. They also determine the way in which discourses are being shaped, reproduced and transformed.

Media and everyday practices

The question of how language and discourse in media communication relate to everyday linguistic and discursive practices is also of concern in the exploration of sociolinguistic interactions. As discussed above, recent work in style and stylization shows that the traditional scepticism concerning the influence of the media on individual linguistic practices and on language shift is being challenged by empirical work investigating communication in style contexts.

Reception studies within the traditional quantitative media studies approaches, often setting out from a sender-receiver model of communication without taking into account the actual environment and conditions of media reception, are not suitable for a processual analysis of media and their role in everyday life. Whereas within the traditional paradigm it was somehow possible to differentiate between different media sectors (as print, TV and radio) and to measure their impact in individual reception habits in terms of time and intensity of contact, with present media developments and the diversification of receiving devices this seems virtually impossible. Under the conditions of a changing media landscape, the categories of producers and audiences blur as well as the demarcations between private mediated communication and public media communication. There is a claim for a new approach to the notion of audiences and everyday media practices which rejects models of passive media consumption (Gautrell, 2007).

The multiplication of the possibilities of media contact and of media-relevant habits has increased with recent technical developments. Print media such as daily newspapers can for instance not only be read in their paper version but also in a modified form as (interactive) online versions or adapted for mobile phones. This means that the ways in which media are being appropriated in daily life are subject to permanent change. New time-space articulations become salient. Whereas some decades ago relative stability could be assumed as bringing together audiences into national, ethnic or other social communities (Morley and Robins, 1996), present media reception is more characterized by individual practices, which become more ephemeral and deterritorialized. As in linguistics, in media studies and in media anthropology, everyday media practices, style and style communities have become an important focus (Kosnack, 2007). Such practices can also be understood as technologies of the self in a Foucauldian sense, as spaces for the production and reproduction of situated subject positions (Reckwitz, 2006).

In everyday life people participate in a range of different media spaces: besides the traditional national sphere, globalized spaces as well as localized media gain in importance, regional spaces beyond state borders emerge as broadcasting spaces, and transnational and translocal media link geographically-dispersed groups. Within these spaces, particular language regimes and linguistic practices develop. The development of such regimes and practices as well as the way in which they are related to other everyday language practices opens up a vast field of research.

NOTES

1 For the question of public sphere and its fragmentations see the discussions of Habermas's model which was developed in the 1960s and which was based on the assumption of a single unified (national) public sphere. Criticals of Habermas' model were formulated by feminist studies (e.g. Benhabib, 1992; Fraser, 1992) and also later by scholars asking questions of ethnicity, race and language as factors of exclusion (e.g. Husband, 2000; Morley, 2000). Habermas conceded, in a revision of his model, that he neglected the existence of counter publics and counter discourses (Habermas, 1990: 205).

Hinglish (a combination of the words Hindi and English) designates a blend of Hindi and English vernaculars in the urban areas of the states of India where Hindi is spoken.
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