

## Chapter 4

# Negotiating Local Norms in Online Communication

**Jonathan R. White**  
Högskolan Dalarna, Sweden

### ABSTRACT

*This chapter investigates norms of English usage in a community of novice students on a net-based MA program. They communicated in academic seminars using textchat. They were found to develop their own norms for using reduced forms to speed up communication. Their teachers, who in the Vietnamese and Bangladeshi native cultures of the students should have been given great respect, did not have much influence on the norm-setting process, and even were addressed very informally in the discussions. The author argues that this is an affordance of net-based education that the discourse community sets its own norms of English usage, despite the members' lack of experience.*

### INTRODUCTION

This entry deals with norms of language use in online communication. Norms are a controversial issue for language learners, in particular when it comes to English usage. There are many varieties of English around the world, but they have different statuses. It is still the case that, for many learners, British and American English have the highest status, and are the only really “proper” varieties to learn; but for others the colonial and cultural hegemony associated with them makes them irrelevant, and even inappropriate, in local contexts.

The Internet has got the reputation of being very open regarding freedom of speech (cf. the Wikileaks scandals), and for being a place where very informal, speech-like language is used. Research has shown, though, that language use online can be a way for social minorities to find a voice, and for those with lower confidence levels to communicate more. Also, it has been demonstrated that non-native speakers contribute more in discussions online, especially with native speaker interlocutors, compared to face-to-face communication. Discourse communities in general have also been argued to develop their own language practices, through the act of using language. The issue under investigation here is what norms do Internet novices adopt in online communication with native speakers of English?

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-7601-3.ch004

Language production in online seminars by learners of English is analysed to see what norms they develop. The learners are studying on a net-based MA programme in English Linguistics. They were novice Internet users and had never taken a net-based course before this programme. Mostly they were native speakers of Vietnamese, apart from two speakers of Bangla, both cultures which value respect for teachers. The specific norm analysed are reduced forms, where users reduce either the form or formality of linguistic expressions, for example, writing *info* instead of *information*, or *yeah* instead of *yes*. Given this background, and given that it is an education context, we might predict that their language production will be more oriented towards the norms of their native English-speaking teachers, and be more formal. In fact, this was not the case, and there was evidence that the learners clearly developed their own norms of language use. Thus, this constitutes strong support for the idea that online communities develop their own local norms through using language.

The next section presents the theoretical background to these issues.

## **BACKGROUND**

### **English in the World**

The status of English as a global language is a phenomenon of a modern globalised world. However, the power of English is controversial, a controversy which for many has its roots in colonialism and cultural hegemony. While English is the premier lingua franca for international communication, many see using its norms, and particularly those of British and American English, as betrayals of their cultural identity.

Kachru (1985) described the classic three concentric circles of English in the world, moving from the minority Inner Circle of native speaker norms, to the Outer Circle of the (mostly colonial) countries where English is the institutional language of government and education, etc., to the Expanding Circle of the rest of the world where English is a second or foreign language. Out of this World Englishes movement has come the strong belief that all varieties of English should have equal status, especially as targets for learners of English.

However, Expanding Circle varieties have had an equally controversial status, just as British and American English have. While some varieties have come to be viewed by the local population as acceptable varieties to learn and use, others have been derided as examples of “bad English”. However, even such well-entrenched varieties such as Singapore English are not immune to criticism. Rubdy (2001) noted that the Singapore government had launched a “good English” campaign to clean up the use of Singapore English. In countries like China, there is even stronger criticism of the local variety, demeaningly named “Chinglish”. In their surveys of attitudes of Chinese learners and teachers of English, Jin (2005) and Hu (2005) reported that speakers were very negative towards Chinglish, and for them, American English in particular was preferable. However, the situation among teachers of English is somewhat mixed. Hu (2005) noted that half of all teachers surveyed preferred to teach China English, and two thirds of them thought that it would become the standard for teaching English in China (the same has also been reported by He & Li, 2009 and Xie, 2014). The same debate is ongoing concerning Korean English or Konglish (cf. Rüdiger, 2014, for example).

An alternative view comes from the English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) movement. Given the fact that the Expanding Circle is much bigger than the rest, with roughly two-thirds of English speakers being non-native speakers (cf. the SIL Ethnologue, [www.ethnologue.org](http://www.ethnologue.org)), learners should be taught explicitly

10 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

[www.igi-global.com/chapter/negotiating-local-norms-in-online-communication/214538](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/negotiating-local-norms-in-online-communication/214538)

## Related Content

---

### Perceptions of Social Media Impact on Social Behavior of Students: A Comparison between Students and Faculty

Khairuddin Hashim, Laila Al-Sharqiand Ibrahim Kutbi (2016). *International Journal of Virtual Communities and Social Networking* (pp. 1-11).

[www.irma-international.org/article/perceptions-of-social-media-impact-on-social-behavior-of-students/160081](http://www.irma-international.org/article/perceptions-of-social-media-impact-on-social-behavior-of-students/160081)

### Digital Social Media in Adolescents' Negotiating Real Virtual Romantic Relationships

Catherine Ann Cameronand Arantxa Mascarenas (2020). *The Psychology and Dynamics Behind Social Media Interactions* (pp. 1-24).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/digital-social-media-in-adolescents-negotiating-real-virtual-romantic-relationships/232560](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/digital-social-media-in-adolescents-negotiating-real-virtual-romantic-relationships/232560)

### Leading Virtual Teams, Globally: Virtual Leadership

Amanda S. Wickramasinghe (2022). *International Journal of Social Media and Online Communities* (pp. 1-18).

[www.irma-international.org/article/leading-virtual-teams-globally/305866](http://www.irma-international.org/article/leading-virtual-teams-globally/305866)

### Social Networking Sites and Critical Language Learning

Andy Halvorsen (2010). *Social Computing: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 1061-1082).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/social-networking-sites-critical-language/39774](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/social-networking-sites-critical-language/39774)

### Planning for the Worst, Bringing Out the Best? Lessons from Y2K

Kevin Quigley (2008). *Social Information Technology: Connecting Society and Cultural Issues* (pp. 68-85).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/planning-worst-bringing-out-best/29176](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/planning-worst-bringing-out-best/29176)