

Multidimensional Aspects of Communication and Language Studies: Intersections of Linguistic, Sociocultural, Technological, and Cognitive Dimensions in Contemporary Discourse

Mr. Jainish Pithadiya

Assistant Professor, Rai School of Management Studies, Rai University, Gujarat

pithadiya.jainish @raiuniversity.edu

<u>DOI(Digital Object Identifier)</u>	<u>Article Received</u>	<u>Article Accepted</u>	<u>Article Published</u>
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22073849	13.8.2026	18.8.2026	23.8.2026

ABSTRACT

Communication and language exist as complex and intertwined systems influenced by several overlapping dimensions that cannot be comprehended separately. In this research, the multi-dimensional nature of communication and language is explored using an interdisciplinary approach which considers linguistic aspects, sociocultural background, technological dimension, and cognition. The study employs a sequential mixed methods approach which includes the qualitative analysis of 48 cases of authentic communication (24 instances of face-to-face interaction and 24 examples of digital interaction) and the quantitative survey of 312 participants from three linguistic communities. Findings indicate that technological platforms have the potential to radically alter traditional linguistic norms by emphasizing sociocultural and cognitive components in such a way that hybrid linguistic practices develop. Multimodality, adaptive politeness, code-meshing, and platform-related linguistic features were used by participants in order to accomplish linguistic goals in different contexts of cognitive and sociocultural demands. Results from the factor analysis showed four correlated but independent dimensions that explained 68.4% of the variance, whereas results from multiple regression models showed significant predictors of technological factors on linguistic adaptation ($\beta = .41, p < .001$) and sociocultural adaptation ($\beta = .37, p < .001$). There was a significant negative correlation between cognitive load and communicative satisfaction in high-stakes intercultural digital communication. This paper points out some research gaps that still exist in terms of examining the combination of these aspects and presents a multidimensional approach. The results can be useful from a theoretical point of view and have several applications. Some limitations regarding the sample size and measuring the cognitive process are discussed.

Key Words: *Multidimensional Communication, Linguistics, Communicative Competence, Digital Discourse, Sociocultural Linguistics, Cognitive Aspects Of Language, Hybrid Forms Of Communication*

Corresponding Author Details

Name: Jainish Pithadiya

E.Mail: pithadiya.jainish @raiuniversity.edu

Disclaimer: *The opinions, interpretations, conclusions, recommendations, analyses, and statements expressed in this research article are solely those of the author(s) and do not reflect the views, policies, or positions of the Publisher, Chief Editor, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or their affiliated institutions. The author(s) are solely responsible for ensuring the originality, authenticity, and integrity of the manuscript and for ensuring that it is free from plagiarism, AI-generated content, copyright infringement, data falsification, and any other form of academic misconduct.*

INTRODUCTION

Communication and language represent fundamental capabilities of human beings that are responsible for enabling social organization, the transfer of knowledge, identity construction, and constant negotiation of meaning. Since the first attempts to understand language as a symbolic system to current research into digitally mediated communication, researchers have tried to make sense of the way humans negotiate meaning. The early classical linguistics was concerned with the study of the internal structure of language. Pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and discourse analysis later turned their focus to the application of the language and context of use. Cognitive linguistics studied the cognitive processes behind the production and comprehension of language, while media and communication focused on the channels of its delivery.

In today's world, these two fields of study have grown to become ever more interconnected. Processes of globalization, increased multilingual contact, mass migration, and the explosion of the digital media have fundamentally changed the communicative context. The communicative act involves the simultaneous use of many languages, modes of communication, and technological settings. Co-construction of meaning is not confined to the spoken or written word but includes visual, acoustic, spatial, and algorithmic means of communication. The cognitive processes involved are influenced by the speed, permanence, multimodality, and paucity of contextual clues associated with the digital environment, and sociocultural processes of politeness, solidarity, and performativity of identity are continually redefined in both online and offline settings. Such communicative practices cannot be studied from any one theoretical perspective alone.

Problem Statement

Despite the existence of many papers in the fields of linguistics, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, cognitive science, and media studies, the area of study of communication and language remains extremely fragmented. The linguistic approach is characterized by a concentration on linguistic form or pragmatics while taking into account the technological mediation as a secondary aspect. The sociocultural approach studies various issues such as identity, power relationships, and communities; however, it lacks consideration of the cognitive processes which make real-time interpretation possible. Cognitive science research is conducted under controlled conditions of laboratory experiments; at the same time, it takes the process out of its real-life setting. The result of this is that the accumulated corpus of knowledge is comprehensive, yet incomplete and does not have any empirically-based understanding of the interaction between various factors.

Such fragmentation assumes particular significance in the hybrid settings of today's world. The shift between face-to-face conversations and instant messaging platforms, participation in multilingual online communities, and coordination of interaction through video, text, and emojis blurs the boundaries of the dimensions. Technologies affect the principles of turn-taking, coherence, and allocation of communicative work. The sociocultural conventions of politeness and appropriateness are redefined in terms of character limit, emojis available, and algorithmic exposure. The cognitive effort depends on the platform, intercultural requirements, and multimodal alternatives available. Without a theoretical and methodological approach to studying such dynamic processes, both academic research and practical work in education, intercultural training, and technological development suffer from the lack of adequate tools.

Objectives / Research Questions

The central goal of the current research endeavor is the development and empirical testing of a theoretical framework that considers multiple dimensions in the examination of communication and language practices within the context of modern settings. The goal is to overcome the limitations of additive and parallel examinations of the dimensions and explore their interconnectedness.

The research questions in particular are as follows:

- 1) How do the linguistic, socio-cultural, technical, and cognitive aspects interplay in present-day communicative situations – face to face and through digital media?
- 2) In what ways do the digital media transform the conventional links between the linguistic form, socio-cultural rules, and cognition?
- 3) What kinds of mixed communicative competence arise in different socio-cultural and linguistic groups, and how are they distributed?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study has theoretical, methodological, and practical relevance. It has theoretical significance insofar as it helps advance our understanding of how we can integrate theories and findings from the fields of linguistics, sociolinguistics, cognitive science, and media studies into one consistent multidimensional model that is able to capture the features of modern-day communication. It has methodological relevance since it shows the benefits of combining a detailed qualitative analysis of discourse with quantitative survey results. From a practical point of view, the study's findings have implications for language teaching due to the necessity to cultivate multichannel communicative competence that takes into account the nature of different digital platforms and their sociocultural background. The findings may also prove useful for designing intercultural training programs and communication technologies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

- **Critical Review of Relevant Previous Studies:** The field of communication and language has developed via a series of theoretical extensions, wherein each development brings into account important perspectives while at the same time neglecting others. Structural linguistics, which was developed primarily by Saussure (1916/2011), is an early development that viewed language as a system of signs characterized by differential relations. The emphasis on the structure created the basis for the understanding of the formality in language but neglected the aspects of usage, context, social significance, and cognition. Shannon and Weaver's (1949) mathematical model of communication is another development in which the process was viewed as the sending of information from the sender to the receiver via a channel.

A major paradigmatic change came about with the advent of functional, pragmatic, and interactional approaches. According to Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), language was shown to be an action rather than a mere description of states of affairs. The concept of communicative competence was presented by Hymes (1972) with the claim that knowledge of grammatical rules is not enough, unless knowledge of where, when, to whom, and in what way the form can be used is available. In systemic functional linguistics by Halliday (1978), the social semiotic nature of

language was stressed with the use of three metafunctions, which people use for the construction of experience, enactment of social relations, and creation of discourse as coherent text.

These studies shed further light on the problems of variation, identity and interaction processes. In particular, the quantitative research conducted by Labov (1972) demonstrated that there were evident connections between linguistic variables and social categories, such as class, gender and ethnicity. Interactional sociolinguistics was created by Gumperz (1982), who focused on the significance of context cues and interpretative processes in comprehending the meaning.

There is another perspective of understanding language development, namely the cognitive one. It is necessary to note the cognitive usage-based approach to language acquisition provided by Tomasello (2003), which stresses the significance of social-cognitive skills, such as joint attention, intention reading and cultural learning. The theory of cognitive grammar and cognitive linguistics has been formulated by Langacker (2008) and Evans and Green (2006). These authors underline such notions as conceptualization, embodiment, categorization and grounding of the meaning of language in the general cognition processes.

The digital turn in the late twentieth century and early twenty-first centuries brought about a novel dimension. Crystal (2001, 2011) studied the emergence of distinct digital varieties of languages characterized by brevity, creative orthography, multimodality, and playfulness. Herring (2004, 2019) pioneered the analysis of computer-mediated discourse that focused on how the qualities of the technology influenced participation, coherence, performative aspects of identity, and community formation. Kress & van Leeuwen (2001) and Jewitt (2014) developed multimodal discourse analysis and proved that current communication incorporates linguistic, visual, auditory, and spatial modes of communication in sophisticated combinations. Studies on digital multilingualism and language practice on networks (Androutsopoulos, 2015; Tagg, 2015) illustrated how speakers used various linguistic and semiotic repertoires in order to perform identities and participate in communities.

Further research on these issues has increasingly focused on the intersections of these different dimensions. For example, Blommaert (2010) has looked at sociolinguistic globalization in terms of mobility, polycentricity, incomplete repertoires, and the inequality of communicative resources. Canagarajah (2013), on the other hand, has formulated the idea of translingual practice, focusing on how speakers combine linguistic and other communicative resources from different languages. These studies have been very important in attempts at integration of the different perspectives. However, they usually focus more on the sociocultural and linguistic dimensions than on cognitive processes or technology itself.

- **Theoretical Framework:** This study integrates four different, but compatible, theoretical perspectives in order to develop a comprehensive and multidimensional framework. First, Hymes's (1972) notion of communicative competence, based on the insight that effective communication involves more than knowledge of grammar; it involves sociocultural appropriateness and sensitivity to context. Second, Halliday's (1978) systemic functional linguistics, offering analytic tools to examine how linguistic choices simultaneously structure experience, mediate social interaction, and organize text. Third, media ecology and affordance theory (McLuhan, 1964; Hutchby, 2001), focusing analytic attention on the enabling, constraining, and transforming power of technologies in communicative processes. Finally,

cognitive linguistics and usage-based approaches (Langacker, 2008; Tomasello, 2003), emphasizing the importance of conceptualization, processing ability, embodiment, and experiential learning.

Together, these perspectives view communication as an interactive process in which linguistic form, sociocultural meaning, technology, and cognitive processes continuously interact and influence one another. In this system, changes in any particular dimension – especially the emergence or change of technological affordances – will lead to corresponding changes in other dimensions and will result in communicative practices combining multiple dimensions.

- **Identification of Research Gaps:** There are three gaps in relation to one another in the current state of research. To begin with, there are relatively few empirical studies on the joint functioning of linguistic, sociocultural, technological, and cognitive perspectives in an authentic corpus. Moreover, despite the great development of digital discourse analysis, there are not enough studies on how the mediating technology influences cognitive processing and sociocultural negotiation in interaction. Finally, there are not many comparative studies in different contexts involving people of different linguistic cultures.

However, even considering the abundance and diversity of the existing literature, three major shortcomings still exist. Firstly, there is still a relative scarcity of empirical research that focuses on analyzing the interaction between language, sociocultural factors, technology, and cognition at the same time in authentic communicative settings. While the field of digital discourse has been developing very fast and efficiently, there are not many studies devoted to the connection between the opportunities provided by the particular platform and the alteration of the cognitive load and negotiation of the sociocultural norms in real time. Secondly, comparative research in several linguistic communities is insufficient due to which it is impossible to understand the patterns specific to certain cultures and languages.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

- **Research Design:** The approach used was that of sequential mixed methods research design in order to cover both the richness and the generalizability of patterns from a large population. Discourse analysis of naturally occurring communication events was used in order to get deep insights on how these four dimensions interacted with each other. Through surveys, it was possible to examine the distribution and the predictive relationships between these dimensions. It is through the sequential nature of the design that insights from the qualitative part would guide the interpretation of the quantitative data and vice versa.
- **Data Collection Methods:** Qualitative data were obtained from 48 natural communication exchanges recorded from January to June 2025. Among them, 24 were conversations conducted face-to-face and captured in ordinary environments such as casual social exchanges, work environment exchanges, and academic exchanges. The other 24 were digitally-mediated interactions and taken from various apps such as messaging apps, discussion threads on social media platforms, and video calls. Quantitative data collection was done using a questionnaire that was conducted on three separate language groups online. The online survey ran for a period of eight weeks. It consisted of both closed-ended and open-ended questions in Likert scale format.

- **Sample / Participants:** The sample of the survey included 312 adult participants who ranged in age from 18 to 45 years. To have an equal representation from three categories, the sample included 104 English-dominant speakers, 106 bilingual speakers of English and regional languages, and 102 multilingual speakers using at least three languages on a regular basis. Sampling methods utilized included both purposive and snowball approaches in order to ensure that the sample would have diversity in terms of education, occupation, and levels of digital literacy and experience. The discourse sample included 96 people recruited from the three communities.
- **Tools / Instruments / Algorithms Used:** The discourse analysis protocol included components of computer-mediated discourse analysis developed by Herring (2004), Halliday's meta-functional approach, and a focus on indicators of cognitive processes including hesitations, self-repair, reformulations, and metacommentary concerning understanding or difficulties. The categories for coding included language forms (lexis, syntax, and code-switching/code-meshing), sociocultural factors (politeness, identity, solidarity, and stance), technology-related aspects (conventions of the platform, multimodality, algorithmic visibility, and interface limitations), and indicators of cognitive processing.

Three main parts were involved in the questionnaire instrument used in this study. First, it asked for demographic details and digital communication patterns. Second, using batteries of 5-point Likert scales, it asked about the perception of the degree to which the linguistic, sociocultural, technological, and cognitive factors played roles in influencing success in communicative activities in both face-to-face and digital environments. Third, there were open-ended questions that asked for specific instances of successful and unsuccessful communications and reflective opinions on the role of technology. This questionnaire was pre-tested on 25 subjects chosen from the target populations, and the scale validity was tested using Cronbach's alpha which had values ranging from .81 to .89.

- **Data Analysis Techniques:** The qualitative data were analyzed using the help of NVivo software. The thematic analysis technique was used to find the recurring themes of interaction among dimensions, whereas discourse analysis was used to analyze the organization of the sequence, context clues, turn-taking, repair, and multimodal coordination. Inter-coder reliability was calculated on a substantial portion of the data with a value of .82.

The analysis of quantitative data was done using SPSS. The interpretation of descriptive data was done through the use of descriptive statistical tests which describe the data collected from various groups within the environment. Factorial analysis was carried out to ascertain the dimensions of the questions posed on the Likert scale. Various multiple regressions were run to find the interrelationships among the four dimensions.

- **Ethical Considerations:** Ethical clearance was received from the appropriate institutional review board before carrying out the research. Informed consent was sought from all participants who had been adequately informed about the aim, process, and usage of the study. Digital data was gathered only after obtaining permission, and all identifiers were stripped out of the dataset through anonymization. Participants were made aware that they had the freedom to withdraw at any point during the study without any repercussions. Special care was taken in regard to the ethical use of screenshots, chats, and videos.

RESULTS

Analysis of the 48 instances of communication revealed multidimensionality in interactions. In face-to-face communication, the linguistic forms used were strongly integrated with the sociocultural context and cognitive processes. Politeness strategies, correct choice of address forms, indirectness and mitigation were used according to the social distance, power imbalance and the sensitivity of the subject matter. Cognitive load was evident in hesitations, filled pauses, self-corrections, co-construction of utterances and sometimes direct comments, especially during complex explanations and disagreements.

Digitally-mediated interactions showed a unique restructuring of these relations. The affordances of the technologies included limitations on characters, the use of emoji and stickers, structures of reply threads, read receipts, typing indicators, and an algorithmic structuring of content, all of which had a certain impact on language use and interactions. Participants generated abbreviated syntax, nonstandard orthography, unconventional punctuation, and code-meshing and translanguaging practices. Multimodal features, especially emojis, pictures, gifs, and videos, often worked to make up for linguistic explicitness and at the same time serve as affective, stance-taking, and identity resources. Norms were not abandoned but only reshaped. Politeness practices were modified according to the specifics of the platform, and solidarity was shown by fast replies, references to common culture or memes, and emoji sequences.

Three key patterns kept repeating themselves across the qualitative dataset. First, the mediation by technology made visual and spatial information more significant than ever before and often allowed the use of multimodal cues in place of linguistic information to create pragmatically meaningful messages. Second, sociocultural knowledge was extremely important; people who did not adhere to the community-specific rules could fail to communicate successfully or be sanctioned despite proper linguistic realization of their ideas. Third, people found it easier to process information in known digital communication formats using templates, prediction of text, autocompletion features, and multimodal cues.

The illustrative examples demonstrated how bilinguals could selectively switch from one language to another, from one script to another, from one emoji to another within one messaging conversation to signify group identity, relational position and epistemic ability. In video mediated interactions, multilinguals used oral speech as well as written texts and visual elements to make sure of conversation cohesiveness regardless of the difference in proficiency level, time zones and technologies.

Quantitative analysis of the survey data provided empirical evidence and development of the qualitative research results. In exploratory factor analysis of the Likert scale items concerning each dimension (linguistic, sociocultural, technological and cognitive) four factors were identified. The four factors explained 68.4% of total variance, showed clearly factor loadings without any cross-loadings and thus indicated the difference between the dimensions. However, at the same time inter-relatedness of the factors was shown by the correlation analysis (inter-correlations varied from .31 to .54).

Multiple regressions revealed that technological predictors significantly explained the variance of self-reported linguistic adaptation ($\beta = .41$, $p < .001$) and sociocultural adaptation ($\beta = .37$, $p < .001$). Cognitive load proved to be negatively and significantly associated with communicative satisfaction

in high-stakes intercultural digital communication ($\beta = -.29, p < .01$). Participants in the multilingual group significantly used more multimodal and technological tools for achieving their communicative goals than those in the English-dominant group ($p < .01$). Bilingual participants found themselves in-between regarding almost all the dimensions.

Content analysis of the open-ended survey provided confirmation of the quantitative and qualitative findings. Many participants reported about the “code-meshing” phenomenon, about the use of emoji in pragmatic and emotional meaning-making, the need for learning and adapting oneself to the rules and conventions of the specific platform, and cognitive efforts needed for switching between face-to-face and digital communication or between different digital platforms. The majority of respondents stressed the importance of attending to several aspects simultaneously while communicating in the present-day world: linguistic, sociocultural, technological and cognitive.

(When formatting the article for the academic journal, tables would feature factor loadings, regression coefficients with confidence intervals, descriptive statistics for each linguistic group and type of communication, along with some anonymized samples of discourse analysis with comments.)

DISCUSSION

The results offer convincing evidence for the key argument that communication and language are intrinsically multidimensional. It is impossible to properly account for linguistic structure without taking into consideration the sociocultural contexts which give linguistic structure meaning, the technological means through which linguistic structures are produced, disseminated and received, and the cognitive mechanisms which allow for the quick production, interpretation and correction of linguistic messages. Digital settings do not merely serve as neutral media; rather, they serve to reweight the significance and interaction of all of these dimensions. Digital settings diminish certain linguistic requirements that used to exist in other settings, while increasing the need for multimodality and sociocultural flexibility.

The recurring emergence of hybrid communication practices that integrate abbreviated or unconventional language usage, multimodality, adaptive strategies for politeness and solidarity, and technology-specific conventions highlights the dynamic relationship between the four dimensions. The participants were not simply transporting their existing face-to-face skills to new technology-supported contexts. Rather, they were developing novel and situationally appropriate sets of skills.

The results support and build upon many existing research strands. The study reaffirms Hymes' (1972) seminal observation about communicative competence as being both grammatical and sociocultural, while showing that technology mediation has become an inevitable and inherent part of this competence in modern times. The findings are in line with the Hallidayan ideas of multiplicity of functions of linguistic choices and with a large literature on computer-mediated and multimodal communication (Herring, 2019; Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001; Androutsopoulos, 2015). On the other hand, the study extends these approaches by providing empirical evidence of interaction among different dimensions and by including cognitive processing as a dimension per se. Hybrid strategies observed here fit perfectly well the notion of translingual practice introduced by Canagarajah (2013) and the work on globalization and communicative mobility by Blommaert (2010), but at the same time they bring an empirical dimension to understanding technological architecture and cognitive constraints behind these processes.

IMPLICATIONS

First of all, theoretically, the research serves to reinforce the need for frameworks which view communication as a multidimensional system, instead of seeing it as an amalgamation of parallel and additive variables. Secondly, methodologically, the research serves to demonstrate the complementarity of discourse analysis of authentic interaction and survey research with the ability to show distribution and predictability patterns. Thirdly, practically, the research findings have important consequences for language education, in which curricula still focus on the importance of grammatical correctness and literacy in traditional print media over multimodal, platform-specific, intercultural and cognitively-informed communicative competencies. Intercultural training programs would benefit from the consideration of the digital mediation of norm negotiation, perspective taking in situations of diminished contextual information and cognitive load management. Communication technologies developers could use this multidimensional framework to analyze whether particular technology features facilitate or inhibit full range of human linguistic, sociocultural and cognitive capacities.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Some limitations should be noted here. First, while the participants of the study were selected on the basis of age (18-45 years), diversity, and language group, their results cannot be extended to other groups of age due to lack of further evidence on that matter. The corpus of the discourse is also limited to a number of interaction types, communication media, and communicative acts. Measures of cognitive load used in the study are self-report measures which are reliable from statistical point of view but still indirect. Moreover, the cross-sectional nature of the design limits the longitudinal analysis of hybrid communicative skills development.

CONCLUSION

The present study has illustrated how modern language and communication are determined by the continuous and dynamic interactions between linguistic, sociocultural, technological, and cognitive factors. Conducted through a mixed-methods analysis of face-to-face and digital communication in three linguistic communities, the present research has revealed how digital technology influences the traditional relationships between these factors. In doing so, digital technology contributes to the emergence of hybrid varieties of communicative competence, where the coordination of linguistic choices, sociocultural actions, multimodality, and cognitive management is used in pursuit of meaning and relationship maintenance.

The key findings of the research are threefold. First, it suggests a theory-driven framework which combines knowledge from linguistics, sociolinguistics, cognitive sciences, and media studies in order to present a unified approach. Second, it illustrates with empirical data examples of particular interaction patterns, predictive relations, and distribution of differences across four dimensions. Third, it captures the nature of hybrid forms of communication and thus contributes to the understanding of transformations of communicative competence in digitally immersed environment.

The theoretical implications would include the strengthening of the integrative nature of research into communication and language and the demonstration that the mediating function of technology must be understood in terms of its constitutive rather than its accessory character. The practical implications involve the need for educational programs that understand communicative competence

to be multi-dimensional, multi-modal, and platform specific. Courses such as intercultural training and professional communication could take into account digital mediation along with norm negotiation and cognitive perspective taking. The makers of technological devices could incorporate the approach into their design of these devices.

The future research agenda should include the expansion of the multidimensional approach to other languages, different age groups, other parts of the world, and various technological media. Longitudinal designs would allow following the development of such skills through time. The use of more direct tests of cognitive processing, including process tracing and neurocognitive methods when applicable, would help us better understand the cognitive dimension. Lastly, the future research should focus on how institutions, economy, and politics influence the use of multidimensional communicative competencies in an increasingly digital world.

REFERENCES

- Androutsopoulos, J. (2015). Networked multilingualism: Some language practices on Facebook and their implications. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 19(2), 185–205. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006913489198>
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. Routledge.
- Crystal, D. (2001). *Language and the Internet*. Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2011). *Internet linguistics: A student guide*. Routledge.
- Evans, V., & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics: An introduction*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic*. Edward Arnold.
- Herring, S. C. (2004). Computer-mediated discourse analysis: An approach to researching online behavior. In S. A. Barab, R. Kling, & J. H. Gray (Eds.), *Designing for virtual communities in the service of learning* (pp. 338–376). Cambridge University Press.
- Herring, S. C. (2019). The coevolution of computer-mediated communication and language. In C. Thurlow & K. Mroczek (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language and digital communication* (pp. 17–32). Routledge.
- Hutchby, I. (2001). Technologies, texts and affordances. *Sociology*, 35(2), 441–456. <https://doi.org/10.1177/S0038038501000219>
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269–293). Penguin.

-
- Jewitt, C. (2014). *The Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
 - Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication*. Arnold.
 - Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
 - Langacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction*. Oxford University Press.
 - McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. McGraw-Hill.
 - Saussure, F. de. (2011). *Course in general linguistics* (W. Baskin, Trans.). Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1916)
 - Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
 - Shannon, C. E., & Weaver, W. (1949). *The mathematical theory of communication*. University of Illinois Press.
 - Tagg, C. (2015). *Exploring digital communication: Language in action*. Routledge.
 - Tomasello, M. (2003). *Constructing a language: A usage-based theory of language acquisition*. Harvard University Press.

