Preface

INTRODUCTION

Rhetoric as a discipline has existed for at least 2500 years, if not longer. Aristotle defined it as the ability to persuade an audience under various circumstances. Rhetoric informs various disciplines and is useful in grounding technological processes by asking valid questions about purpose, context, and audience. Current digital technologies, such as Web 2.0, social networks, cloud computing, mobile apps, video games, and virtual worlds, use rhetorical principles to engage, inform, instruct, persuade, and (inter)act in novel ways. These expressions of new digital modes and practices form a new digital rhetoric that extends traditional ancient rhetoric.

Rather than persuasion, digital rhetoric uses information processes that require different modalities and practices that happen across global contexts and create novel literacies. The inspiration for this book came from two different important developments, namely 1) the New London Group’s (2000) call to see English studies as a global pedagogy and increasingly mediated by technology and 2) the call to investigate the “multiliteracies” required as a result of the changed nature of how knowledge, information, and communication are mediated through digital technologies (Hawisher & Selfe, 2000).

Digital rhetoric is different from traditional rhetoric because it emphasizes information and interaction in human-computer-human and human-computer interaction contexts. In so positioning digital rhetoric, we are informed by the theories of Winograd and Flores, who defined human-computer interaction as based on facilitating “communication and interaction” in interface environments (Rogers, Preece, & Sharp, 2007). Scholarship in computers and composition has highlighted how the “strange bedfellows” of composition, rhetoric, and human-computer interaction share similar traits in that both are directed towards an audience and end-user in making decisions or taking actions (Cummins, 2006; Rosinski & Squire, 2009). Similarly, next to this disciplinary merging, we have witnessed a “convergence” on multiple levels, such as the merging of previously separate media into multimedia, the increased integration of technology in life spheres, the collective production of information through “smart mobs” wherein technology and social action converge (Jenkins, 2006).

Given this convergence of media, social processes, and social behavior, we think digital rhetoric can help expand our understanding of the new communication modes and practices, which have slowly been integrated over the last 20 years or so through networked communication. As originally invented by Lord Byron’s cousin, Ada Lovelace, through her idea for optimizing weaving processes, computer science has grown tremendously in the last few decades. Networks and the augmenting of human intelligence by offsetting human cognitive processes and creating a way to learn from past mistakes through computation was developed through the visionary work and organizational efforts of Department of
Defense (DoD) researchers Vannevar Bush, Theodore Nelson, Douglas Engelbart, and Ivan Sutherland. After World War II, these researchers had grown tired of the use of technology to destroy human lives and wanted to avoid mistakes from the past by creating ways of augmenting human intelligence (commonly known as Intelligence Augmentation [or IA] as distinct from the later idea of Artificial Intelligence [AI], which was developed by brilliant mathematician and cryptographer Alan Turing at Bletchley Park in the United Kingdom).

Next to these researchers working under the direction of DoD, it was not until Rand Corporation researcher Paul Baran came up with the innovative packet switching network technology that differed from AT&T’s direct line network that the Internet came to be built (Lessig, 2001, p. 31). Along with packet switching came another radical idea by network architects David Saltzer, Jerome Clark, and Reed in 1981 in the form of the “end-to-end argument” or E2E argument (cf. Saltzer, Clark, & Reed, 1984). Their idea was simple – essentially push the content to the edges of the network at the user end, while keeping the network based on the simple task of transmitting information efficiently. The changes in creating this type of network can only be seen in retrospect as an enormous change in how information was distributed, consumed, and produced through a network that encouraged innovations in software design, collaborative interaction, and deflected control and centralization of information sharing. Through the principle of network neutrality and prioritizing the users at the end by protecting them with unique dynamic session-based network addresses that changed after each session, the E2E principle has created ripples in our media landscape and created an information culture where information sharing, media convergence, and human innovation are characteristics of an ever-changing media environment based on platforms, networks, and ever-evolving media ecologies.

Combined together, packet switching and the E2E argument prevent a centralized control system for content, since the network carries the information but the end-user can innovate and use the programs to exchange information, as opposed to being constrained by a provider’s decision to put limitation on a network (cf. Lessig, 1999, 2001). The end-to-end principle has had a tremendous effect ever since Tim Berner Lee’s proposal for CERN to create various protocols (such as ftp, http, etc.) of communication for the World Wide Web has changed from its tentative start of researchers exchanging information over phone lines into wireless networks guided by newer wireless protocols and packet switching and various encryption protocols. Together with the principle of Moore’s law (every couple of years a doubling of processing speed), computing has become smaller and faster.

Our desktops slowly have given way to tablets and mobile phones capable of processing information just as fast, connecting us to our loved ones, colleagues, and the world in one technological network. Along with this has come an ideology of “the wisdom of crowds” (or “Smart Mobs,” as Howard Rheingold [2003] would have it), where socializing, intellectual property, and information sharing has created an ideology of Peer-to-Peer (P2P) networks, new collaborative forms of working, playing, and socializing through technological networks (Johnson-Eilola, 2005). Indeed, illustrative of this collective “smart mob” ideology are various political upheavals in various countries where people have used mobile technologies to gather and protest against oppressive regimes.

At the same time, not all of the above should be interpreted from a naïve, instrumentalist perspective as technology creating “progress” (Selfe, 1999). Rather, we have seen a proliferation of information and the prediction by Alvin Toffler (1970) that we would suffer from “information overload” (sometimes referred to as “information glut”), an increase in forms of electronic discourse and genres (such as SMS-ing, social networking, using message boards, etc.), but we have not seen a Habermasian (1981) increase in public, political discourse leading us toward greater democratization. Instead, we have seen a more
complex world where a greater need of information literacy is demanded of our students, as well as a
deskill and reskilling asked of us by constant technological updates, interfaces, new software, hard-
ware, and practices of computing as interaction and communication, along with ubiquitous monitoring,
privacy issues questioning the role of government in such affairs.

We have seen a long line of dominant models of rhetoric characterized as broad epistemic shifts
from the Sophist tradition, Aristotle’s technical rhetoric, current-traditional rhetoric, cognitive rhetoric,
expressivist rhetoric, social-epistemic rhetoric, to our notion of digital rhetoric as integrating many new
literacies, modes, and practices and principles of communication and interaction in new ways (Daniell,
1999; Losh, 2009). Rather than insist that digital rhetoric (or “digital rhetorics,” for that matter, since
we see no solitary grounded definition) replaces these models, our aim in this collection is not to make
such a claim. We would rather not fall for a reductio ad absurdum of technology as equating progress
and greater prosperity.

Rather, we see digital rhetoric as another way of looking at the use of technology in critically informed
ways, whereby older definitions of rhetoric are still operational, but form part of a larger network of digital
rhetorics (Zappen, 2005). We use the word “network” here in the loosest sense possible—to indicate a
system of relations dependent upon each other, but not intrinsically hierarchical—in order to not ground
our definition of digital rhetoric in a static, non-dynamic form. Rather than be “blinded” by the newness
of technologies (Selfe, 1999), we want to understand how processes of computation in digital media
(and we use Janet Murray’s definition of digital medium versus “new media”) operate and can enrich
rhetoric as a discipline in dynamic ways. Briefly, Murray (2012) rejects the term “new media”—which
highlights “newness” as a dominant mode—in favor of “digital medium”—the principles of computation
underlying each mode—which she roughly divides into four guiding principles: 1) encyclopedic modes;
2) participatory modes; 3) spatial modes; and 4) procedural modes inherent in any medium or interface.
For instance, if we consider computation as underlying the Internet, we can see these four modes as part
of: 1) its ability to provide us with in-depth information on just about any topic; 2) allowing us to share
information and comment upon it, refine it using social interaction with other humans; 3) to inhabit
different roles of consumption and production, as well as literally traverse through spatial environments
via video games or virtual worlds; and 4) to adopt and interact with information and computer interfaces
in ways that are highly procedural.

Rather than focus on some idea of writing “the” definition of digital rhetoric and so ground the
discipline, we are inspired by Richard Rorty’s (1979) notion of pragmatism in philosophical inquiry –
rather than attempt to define digital rhetoric once and for all, we simply want to change the questions
we ask of ourselves as a discipline. Instead of asking ourselves about what these new media “mean” to
our discipline (a question which is loaded with assumptions about the function of rhetoric as a mode of
making sense of the world and rooted in protecting existing models of rhetoric as a discipline) and how
we can best study them, we simply accept digital media as modes and practices that create global and
local human-computer-interaction and human-to-human interactions that sometimes approximate, but
are also different from our prior distinctions of orality, literacy, and print culture. We continue to practice
orality and literacy and utilize print culture, but our relationship to them has been changed, as has the
role of digital technology in our lives, as so often happens when new technologies “remediate” (Bolter
& Grusin, 1999; Ong, 1982; Zappen, 2005) our relations to older technology. Herein lies another reason
why we are reluctant to adopt a “replacement” model of “digital rhetoric” – old and new media still exist
and are used, but our relationships and attitudes toward them have changed as we come to understand
some of the older technologies as prototypes for newer technologies or, in some cases, as requiring new modes of production and consumption, information creation, and global/local literacies.

Therefore, it is important to understand these new digital modes and practices. In the fields of rhetoric, technical and intercultural communication, information science, human-computer interaction, systems theory, and computer science, there is a need for an edited collection of articles focusing on theories, modes, practices, and emerging areas for professionals, scholars, researchers, and educators, who have been grappling with this change and are not so much worried about how to integrate technology in existing frameworks, but rather want to study them as part of larger cultural patterns that are perceived in society.

**OBJECTIVE OF THE BOOK**

This book will aim to provide relevant theoretical frameworks, current practical applications, and emerging practices of digital rhetoric. As mentioned above, we do not intend to provide an ultimate definition of “digital rhetoric,” but rather we see an interesting trend and need to study technology beyond the interface level. Though some may equate this with the work of computer science, we hope to create the understanding that next to end-users and audiences, built-in modes and practices, operating systems, or to use Benkler’s (2006) distinctions between physical, code, and contact network layers, these are all part of a rhetorical process of design, use, and architecture wherein structures influence human behavior, decision-making, and actions. The purview of digital rhetoric, hence, is to look beyond the surface and at the semiotic modes of communication from a perspective wherein the user and computation can either or both be studied.

This book will do so by developing new key principles and understandings of the underlying modes, practices, and literacies of communication brought about by digital technologies. Its aim is to provide a robust framework of digital rhetoric, a historical grounding of some of these technologies, theoretical/practical approaches, and studies of emerging practices from a medialogical perspective as forming newer global literacies. In addition, the book aims to strengthen the basis for digital rhetoric research by encouraging multi-disciplinary discussions between rhetoricians, educators, programmers, information developers, game theorists, virtual reality designers, and other practitioners with media and information in general. The importance of this book lies in its ability to clarify, synthesize, and prepare useful strategies, modes, and ideas, and so bring forth a solid understanding of digital rhetoric as an important developing discipline.

**TARGET AUDIENCE**

The target audience of this book will be composed of professionals, scholars, researchers, and educators working in rhetoric, technical/professional and intercultural communication, information science, human-computer interaction, systems theory, and computer science. In bringing together such diverse perspectives, it aims to show that interdisciplinary perspectives will help inform, clarify, and enrich this burgeoning area of research in digital rhetoric.
As the title indicates, our interest is two-fold in that we are looking at the intersection of digital rhetoric and global literacies. We hope to clarify the two elements as part of a continuum rather than two static entities. For convenience’s sake, we provide two working definitions as adopted within this book for these concepts. As mentioned above, we have no desire to anchor our research or that of others down to these definitions, as we realize to do so would be to arbitrarily set up borders and boundaries that are counter-productive in our current undertaking.

Digital Rhetoric

Digital rhetoric studies the increasing convergence of human life and computer technology with a focus on their communication and interaction. Since digital rhetoric is uncharted territory to a degree, our contributors come from diverse backgrounds but are people who are interested in Human-Computer Interaction (HCI), Interaction Design (ID), Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC), Interface Design, Computer Programming, Virtual and Augmented Reality, Computer Code, Algorithms, and Interactive Narratives. As such, this book seeks to investigate how the above may enrich our understanding of rhetorical (communicative) modes, given or emerging communication practices, and underlying human or computer efforts to interact, inform, instruct, persuade, or simply act upon information.

Global Literacies

Global literacies involve how meaning and knowledge is produced, disseminated, and consumed across cultures in various domains utilizing digital technologies (cf. Hawisher & Selfe, 2000). In compiling the book, we were specifically interested in what contributors saw as the key underlying communication and meaning-making practices behind global communication processes. Yet, as is so often the case when attempting to cover a specific area, we quickly recognized that digital rhetoric and global literacies were connected in intricate ways that made for a challenging tension between technologies, local and global contexts, and varying literacies. The below section will provide a brief overview of the topics that will be discussed in each chapter per section.

SECTION 1: HISTORICAL, THEORETICAL, AND CONCEPTUAL PERSPECTIVES ON DIGITAL COMMUNICATION

Section 1 was originally set up as a theoretical framework from which to understand modes of rhetoric, technical communication, digital multimodal principles of communication, and various kinds of computer-mediated communication. Our initial principal goal was to establish a historical overview of the research on digital rhetoric and to come to a more accurate definition. Luckily, we realized that in order for us to approach it from the right perspective, we needed to see both digital rhetoric and globalization as part of the same equation.

In chapter 1, “Digital Rhetoric and Globalization: A Convergence-Continuum Model,” Gustav Verhulsdonck provides a brief historical overview of digital rhetoric’s emergence, before moving on to discussing Richard Lanham’s idea of spectrums of motivation and purposes and extending his ideas
to an over-arching convergence-continuum that combines digital and global rhetorical prosumption (production and consumption). Rather than try to define digital rhetoric, Verhulsdonck argues that it exists alongside other earlier definitions of rhetoric, but simply asks other questions regarding interfaces, platforms, networks, code, as co-constructing rhetorical contexts in a convergence continuum.

In chapter 2, “Engagement Design: Toward a Holistic Model for Digital Communication Design,” Curtis Newbold theorizes how digital communication can be facilitated by incorporating the idea of Russian psychologist Csikszentmihalyi’s “flow” – a heightened state of being “in the zone” where play, work, and design intermingle to create better digital communication. Borrowing from game theory, Newbold argues that we can develop more effective technologies that are more functional because they capitalize on the human need for engagement.

In chapter 3, “Toward an Algorithmic Rhetoric,” Chris Ingraham provides us with a fascinating and cogent argument as to why algorithms are inherently rhetorical by making us see human actions as based on procedural logic in the same way that algorithms formalize those human actions. Ingraham’s division of algorithms from macro-meso-micro perspectives provides a useful way of looking at the impact of these fascinating data structures that make many applications work, and creates an exciting direction for digital rhetoric to investigate how things work based on procedural (rules-based logic).

In chapter 4, “Decoding What Is Good in Code: Toward a Metaphysical Ethics of Unicode,” Jennifer Helene Maher continues her inquiry into the politics and morality of software. Noting the implicit and explicit political and moral quandaries of the Unicode standard, Maher problematizes any neat categorical ideas we might have about software standards in her rhetorical analysis of the political implications of Unicode, which makes for a problematic standard, which poses for Maher important ethical and metaphysical questions on the valorization of certain systems of standards that might at times be unquestioningly adopted by programming communities. Similar to Selfe and Selfe’s (1984) seminal article on “The Politics of the Interface,” Maher identifies the political, material, ideological, and moral quandaries that arise when certain assumptions are codified and used in computer programming.

In chapter 5, “The Data Machine: Identification in the Age of Data Mining,” Nicholas Hanford investigates the implications of data mining in light of rhetorician Kenneth Burke’s work on identification as well as adopts Paul Virilio’s idea of a Vision Machine to create a “Data Machine” that uses algorithms to make assumptions about its audience. As Hanford argues, such algorithms function to create an audience that is based on user actions, but also complicates the notion of audience for digital rhetoric by noting how such actions do not comprise a dialogue or conversation with that audience that is meaningful. Moreover, Hanford’s use of Burke’s concept of consubstantiation makes him question the function of data machines and code, which we may want to anthropomorphize, but which operate in completely different procedural ways. Most importantly, Hanford notes in this process how users become decontextualized points of data, while the task of gathering such data is becoming increasingly codified through practices of data mining. For this purpose, Hanford asks rhetoricians to be flexible in adopting new terminologies and approaches in studying digital rhetoric.

In chapter 6, “The Persuasive Language of Action: Interaction in the Digital Age,” Martin van Velsen takes up Hanford’s call for using different terminologies and approaches by looking at the interactions generated by table-top role playing games. Seen as a precursor to today’s popular, turn-based Massively Multiplayer Role-Playing Games (MMORPGs), van Velsen deftly uses the concept of player choice, attention, and Csikszentmihalyi’s “flow” to investigate the action-reaction mode of narrative interaction in tabletop game mechanics. In introducing the cognitive schemas posited by gestalt theory and relating them to tabletop gameplay experiences such as narrative backfill, collaborative detail, inattentional
blindness, and asymmetric digital rhetorical gameplay dynamics that allow players to “fill” narrative
details as part of their experience during or after a table top game, van Velsen demonstrates how digital
rhetoric will need to reconsider its study frameworks and account for how such game elements, when
tied to ever-increasing interaction challenges, persuade people to engage in complex symbolic action-
reaction patterns.

SECTION 2: PRACTICES OF DIGITAL COMMUNICATION ACROSS
CULTURES IN DIGITAL AND GLOBAL CONTEXTS

Section 2 addresses practical issues that arise from practicing in digital and global contexts. Chapters
are a mix of theory and practice and are also comprised of qualitative (case studies, ethnographies) and
quantitative (experimental, controlled) studies and will use methodological or practical approaches to
investigate concerns in various contexts as described below.

In chapter 7, “Digital and Global Literacies in Networked Communities: Epistemic Shifts and Com-
munication Practices in the Cloud Era,” Marohang Limbu explores how the concept of literacy, digital
literacy, and global literacy is shifting over time; how technologies (YouTube, Facebook, Skype, blogs,
vlogs, and Google Hangouts) and digital literacies facilitate cross-cultural and intercultural communication
and global cultural understandings; how technologies engage global citizens to share, collaborate, coop-
erate, and create their narratives; and how people become able to address local and global socio-cultural
and political issues through various global digital engagements. Finally, Limbu’s chapter investigates
how knowledge is produced, disseminated, and consumed across global cultures in digital contexts.

Chapter 8, Rich Rice and Ben Lauren’s “Developing Intercultural Competence through Glocal Ac-
tivity Theory Using the Connect-Exchange Study Abroad App,” lays a theoretical foundation for the
development of an emerging model of studying intercultural communication through problem-based
pedagogy. Rice and Lauren’s emerging model facilitates transactional learning between users with
varying cultural backgrounds. Furthermore, by drawing upon activity theory, the authors explore how
different audiences use apps to guide their iterative design process to facilitate users’ deepening glocal
as well as intercultural competence.

In chapter 9, “Inviting Citizen Designers to Design Interface for the Democratization of Web Online
Environments,” Rajendra Panthee examines how online environments are supposed to create unifying
spaces, such as societies, cultures, languages, and literacies, and how they merge together as negotiated
space of neutral space. In his chapter, Panthee argues that these online environments are not culturally
neutral communication landscapes, but may alienate participants from marginal social, cultural, and
linguistic backgrounds because of their disregard for their social, cultural, and linguistics norms and
values in digital contact zones. In this chapter, the author proposes to invite citizen designers to design
interfaces that can transform online environments into democratic platforms.

In chapter 10, “Social Media in an Intercultural Writing Context: Creating Spaces for Student Nego-
tiations,” Maria Pilar-Milagros states that her current research study is part of a larger project that aims
to analyze ways in which first year intercultural writing students in Turkey understand and interpret the
impact of social media on their composition practices, critical thinking processes, and knowledge negotia-
tions processes. Pilar-Milagros’s chapter aims to understand how first year intercultural writing students
reflect and assess on how social media help them practice and acquire more critical thinking skills.
In chapter 11, “Digital Literacy Instruction in Afghanistan,” Mike Edwards sees the American military’s purchase of a $5.6 million contract to supply the National Military Academy of Afghanistan with laptop computers as the occasion to investigate the complex and over determined intersections of digital, administrative, and literacy technologies. These intersections and the challenges they produced for the author as a Western mentor working with Afghan postsecondary instructors in ESL and digital literacies reveal the problematic homogenizing Western economic and cultural assumptions and the intense naturalization of administrative technologies that accompany the denaturalized use of digital and textual technologies in global contexts. The connections of those challenges to recent scholarship in rhetoric and composition highlight the limitations of this scholarship’s conception of political economy in a global digital context. Furthermore, Edwards also offers new possibilities for imagining hybrid multilingual digital literacies on a global scale.

SECTION 3: EMERGING DIGITAL COMMUNICATION IN DIGITAL AND GLOBAL CONTEXTS

Section 3 addresses emerging technologies and uses of digital communication in multiple areas, and it also seeks to observe emerging development of digital communication and interaction beyond what we were/are practicing at present. The chapters concentrate on the current practices, potentials, and issues, as well as future possibilities/perspectives in newer ways by demonstrating novel ways of thinking about computer-mediated communication.

In chapter 12, “Considering Chronos and Kairos in Digital Media Rhetorics,” Ashley Rose Kelly, Meagan Kittle Autry, and Brad Mehlenbacher argue that the rhetoric of digital spaces should begin not with the provocation that rhetoric is impoverished and requires fresh import to account for new media technologies, but instead with a careful analysis of what is different about how digital technologies afford certain utterances, interactions, and actions. In so doing, these authors argue, we begin to articulate prospects of a digital rhetoric. Overall, their chapter examines the importance of time to understanding the rhetoric of digital spaces. The authors suggest that rhetorical notions of kairos and chronos provide an important reminder that it is the rhetorical situation, along with rhetorical actors at individual to institutional levels, that construct the discursive spaces within which we participate, even in digitally mediated environments.

In chapter 13, “A Match Made in ‘Outer Heaven’: The Digital Age Vis-à-Vis the Bomb in Guns of the Patriots,” Jorge Gomez analyzes the stealth-action videogame Metal Gear Solid 4: Guns of the Patriots, and delineates the rhetorical consequences not only of nuclear proliferation, but of mass (re)production in a digital age. In this chapter, Gomez draws upon Kenneth Burke’s rhetoric of rebirth, Slavoj Žižek’s ideological criticism along with several ludological frameworks that are adopted to show how various multiliteracies can be unearthed from a video game as an artifact of digital rhetoric.

In chapter 14, “‘A Genuine Moment of Liberation for Me’: Digital Introductions as Powerful Learning,” Julie Faulkner argues that participation in a digital self-presentation has the potential to challenge inscribed approaches to learning and teaching. It draws from a study of pre-service teachers at an Australian university, who were invited to create a digital introduction as part of their English teaching method course. Such a task offered students opportunities to experiment with shifting semiotic forms in ways unavailable to written introductions. Students were asked to critically reflect after the presentation on aspects of technology, representation, and learning that were brought into focus in and through
their presentations. A semiotic analysis offers insights into the potential of multimodality, as the digital introduction pushed the participants out of familiar territory, often producing creative and stimulating texts. Using Kress’s concept of synaesthesia, or the condition wherein sensory stimuli are equated with symbols, the chapter explores innovations possible in the creation of new possibilities in a multimodal space.

In chapter 15, “On the Condition of Anonymity: Disembodied Exhibitionism and Oblique Trolling Strategies,” Demetrios Lallas demonstrates that the ambiguity of identity in disembodied communities poses unique challenges in the flow of digital rhetoric. Online anonymity can lead to disinhibition, enabling the practice of trolling: the effort to derail discussion for attention, mischief, and abuse. This chapter examines this phenomenon in various social media contexts, exploring effective practices in recognizing and harnessing trolling, and provides interesting perspectives on how trolling can be taxonomized as strategic ways of approaching computer-mediated discourse from a performative (or perhaps, ludic) perspective.

In chapter 16, “Embodied Digital Rhetoric: Soft Selves, Plastic Presence, and the Nonfiction Narrative,” Nonny De La Peña, whose background as an award-winning journalist informs her approach to virtual reality as embodied digital experience, shows how virtual experiences are innately tied to emotional experiences that are lived and felt deeply. In her multimedia pieces, De La Peña shows how virtual experiences are somatic, immersive experiences that challenge Cartesian notions of mind/body division, from which “soft selves” and “plastic presence” emerge as examples of the ways in which virtual reality environments persuade or have effects on us in immediate, sensory ways. In ending our book on digital rhetoric with this essay, we hope to continue with the questions in which notions of virtual embodiment and disembodied experiences can still have a strong effect on us by way of virtual delivery. We see digital rhetoric as questioning these Cartesian divisions and asking us to rethink the way we see and experience ourselves, space, and technology. Rather than see the spectre of Donna Haraway’s Cyborg in which human identity is subsumed or merged with technology, we see networks and multiplicity creating new spaces and landscapes for exploring the ways in which interaction and communication take place in global, digital contexts.
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