VOICE WITHOUT VISIBILITY: A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF ANONYMOUS ENGLISH DISCOURSE ON DIGITAL PLATFORMS

Uzma Fazal

Mphil Scholar, Department of English, Abdul Wali khan University Mardan

uzmafazal345@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: *
Uzma Fazal

Abstract
Anonymous English digital platforms discourse involves text-based communication whereby users communicate without expressing their own identities, and as a result, it redefines the traditional standards of voice, authority as well as social responsibility. This paper examines changes in meaning, identity, and ideology brought about by anonymity in online communication through a linguistic perspective, discursive practices, and social environment using the Critical Discourse Analysis by Fairclough (1995). Qualitative method is used based on the analysis of publicly available forums, comment sections, and the question-answer sites and are based on the language use, grammar structures, modality, evaluative language, and interactional strategies. The analysis shows that anonymity compounds use of language in affirming voice, negotiate position and asserting power, as well as facilitation of reproduction of dominant ideologies and development of counter-discourses. The discursive actions of intertextuality, recontextualization, and platform mechanisms of circulating texts further influence the norms of interaction and ideological location. The results show that the anonymity of discourse is a socially and ideologically embedded practice in terms of the coexistence of power and resistance and the linguistic decisions play the central role in the meaning mediation with no visible identity. The research is relevant to the knowledge on digital communication, sociolinguistics and online interaction providing insights into platform design, moderation, and responsible use of an anonymous space.

1.   Introduction
1.1. Background of the Study
The fast development of online services has, in essence, transformed the type of human interaction, especially the appearance of anonymous communication. The internet is becoming a place where people can engage through discussion groups, comment boxes on social media, and even through online messaging and chat platforms where they do not have to disclose their real-life identities. This anonymity does not only transform the conventional rules of engagement and interaction since it diminishes social responsibility and changes the dynamics of authority amongst the speakers. In absence of visible identity references like age, sex, ethnicity and social status, users are free to have more open, confrontational or experimental discourse compared to in-person communication. Anonymous English discourse thereby comes to be a place where language is employed strategically to build up authority, solidarity or

resistance without using physical presence. Sociolinguistically, anonymity allows speakers to overcome the social limits and at the same time it allows establishing new discursive practices that are controlled by the platform cultures. The basic work of Goffman in relation to self-presentation holds out how identity is regulated by the use of performance that implies that anonymity destroys traditional interactional frames and enables other linguistic identities to be expressed (Goffman, 1959).

Lack of visual identities in anonymous online communication has a very strong impact on the way language serves as a major identity construction mechanism. Online anonymous environments, users depend on linguistic options, including vocabulary, tone, pragmatics and discourse strategies, to provide cues of stance and compatibility. English as a lingua franca of digital communication is a part of the global community; yet, it is a adaptable resource with the help of which speakers discuss membership and power without having a material form. This invisibility can make social hierarchies less prominent but can make linguistic representations of power, including sarcasm, expertise claims, or aggression, more pronounced. Discourse analytical evidence demonstrates that identity is not lost with anonymity; it is just shifted to the language itself. According to Bucholtz and Hall, sociocultural linguistic model, identity is constantly constructed through the interaction, and this fact supports the notion that even in anonymous discourse, identity work still took place, but in linguistically mediated forms (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005).

The anonymous online spaces are commonly linked with the changes in communicative behavior, especially the so-called online disinhibition. The absence of visually recognizable users causes the social restraints to become less strong thus leading to more emotionally expressive, hateful or confessional language. This change has profound consequences to the patterns of discourse such as the emergence of trolling, hate speech, and extreme views, and supportive and intimate self-

disclosure. Anonymous English dialogues are therefore in between the constructive and the destructive. Psychological views of anonymity emphasize the role of a lack of visibility in self-observation and empathy in communication. The online disinhibition effect by Suler is the theory which can be used to describe how anonymity, invisibility, and asynchronicity enhance the linguistic expression and shape the structures of discourse that can be observed in online communication characterized by anonymity (Suler, 2004).

In a critical discourse approach, the English discourse on digital platforms anonymously is not only a personal expression but a social practice in the context of more extensive ideological and institutional factors. Anonymous use of language denotes power dynamics, culture, and social conflicts that are being propagated in digital societies. The form of platforms has its own effects on discourse, with moderation policies, affordances, and algorithmic visibility that control the types of voices of the anonymous that are amplified or muted. There is a need to consider micro-level linguistic features and macro-level social structures in the analysis of the anonymous discourse, however. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) offers a set of examining the language as a tool of creating social realities where the speaker remains unknown to the audience. Fairclough believes that discourse is a mirror of the social change and that the online anonymous communication is an important area where the power and ideology of the present day digital communication can be comprehended (Fairclough, 1995).

Recent research highlights how social media platforms are used to disseminate propagandistic content through persuasive language and rhetorical strategies (Abdullah, Nazim, & Nazim, 2025) English has a hegemonic role in the anonymous digital communication because of the global scope and symbolic capital. In global venues, English is frequently used as the default language of an anonymous presence, allowing cross-cultural communication and also giving preference to some linguistic conventions. This hegemony influences the ways of discourse, the

interactional norms, and visibility in the space of anonymity. Non-native speakers can also optimize the use of the English language to meet the expected standards, which affects discourse patterns and identity location. Anonymous English discourse study thus overlaps with globalization and linguistic inequality, as well as the digital power issue. Androutsopoulos emphasizes the fact that online discourse is also influenced by translocal practices in which the English language is the most significant resource of participation and identity formation in the Internet (Androutsopoulos, 2014).

The digital platforms are never a neutral space but they are spaces that through technological affordances influence the production and interpretation of the anonymous discourse. Such characteristics as name creation, commenting platforms, upvoting, and character restrictions affect linguistic preferences and communication patterns in anonymous communication in the English language. Such affordances may promote conciseness, irony, or extremity in the expression, and also define the hierarchy of visibility and participation between the unseen users. The anonymous discourse is therefore a result of human agency and technological design that leads to platform specific norms of language use. According to discourse analysts, linguistic practices in the online environment are to be studied in the context of material and technical conditions in which they are performed. The work of Herring on computer-mediated discourse analysis draws attention to the fact that the choice of technological features is a direct determinant of the discourse structure, interactions, and meaning-making, which occur in online communication, and platform design becomes a significant issue in the process of anonymous online communication (Herring, 2004).

The anonymous English discourse can be used as an arena to challenge hegemonic ideologies and can express resistance to the institutional or social authority. When there is no identifiable authorship, the speakers might defy political power, social conventions, or cultural demands with minimal fear of being punished. Such

freedom may lead to counter-discourses that may break up hegemonic narratives, especially in political and socially marginalized situations. Simultaneously, anonymity can also allow the proliferation of dangerous ideologies, such as misogyny, racism, or nationalism, by using language without restrain. The study of anonymous discourse must thus put into consideration how linguistic power is at work in conceivable or decentralized modes, and such that ideology influences how language is used, in such a way that discourse reproduces as well as upholds power relations even in cases where the speakers are anonymous (van Dijk, 2001).

Anonymous online communication is dependent on pragmatic and interactional strategies of meaning transmission as there is no material basis to it, including facial expressions and gestures. Sarcasm, irony, hedging, emojis, capitalization, and discourse markers are some of the forms used by users to control politeness, aggression and stance. These practical decisions recompense invisibility and assist speakers in navigating interpersonal relations via text-based space. Engrained in the English discourse, Anonymous is therefore full of distinct pragmatic patterns that are not similar to spoken interaction, or even recognizable online communication. Pragmatically, anonymity increases the textual density of face and decoding of intent. The theory of politeness offered by Brown and Levinson forms a background of the discussion on how speakers cope with face-threatening behaviour in an anonymous environment where traditional social cues are not available yet linguistic politeness can be strategically important (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

The examination of anonymous English discourse on online platform has to be addressed through methodological approaches that will take into consideration the fluid, fragmented and context-dependent character of online conversation. Corpus linguistics, discourse analysis and ethnography are frequently integrated to ensure that both the linguistic and social meanings of the interactions between anonymous people are captured. The researchers

should also discuss ethical issues, such as privacy, consent, and representation due to anonymity of the participants. Digital texts are dynamic and transient which makes data collection and interpretation even more difficult. The methodological scholarship focuses on the necessity of flexible analytical frameworks that will acknowledge digital discourse as a phenomenon with a dynamic nature. The discourse analytical approach of Gee emphasizes the significance of locating the language use in the wider social practice providing the means of scrutinizing the construction of meaning, identity and power in the case of anonymous online communication (Gee, 2011).

1.2.   Statement of the Research Problem

The main research question to be answered in the study is the difficulty of comprehending the process of creating voice, power, and ideological sense in anonymous English speech on online systems when there are no traditional identity markers present. The discussion showed that the textual elements including the use of lexical meanings, grammars, modality, and evaluative language are the core resources to the construction of presence, stance, and credibility. Simultaneously, the interactional norms and circulation of ideology are mediated through discursive practices; that is, production, distribution, consumption, intertextuality, and recontextualization. Although anonymity can provide the voice of the marginalized with the means to challenge the dominant discourse, it also makes it possible to recreate and amplify ideological stances without accountability, making the question of anonymity a complicated function of language simultaneously constituting and negotiating power, authority and social meaning (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 2001; Foucault, 1980). This is the duality of the urgent necessity to examine anonymous discourse not only as the single textual information but also as the socially and ideologically situated communicative practice.

1.3.   Research Objectives

1.   To examine the way that the linguistic characteristics of anonymous English communication on digital platforms can create meaning and voice without the speaker being visible in the textual space, the textual level of Critical Discourse Analysis created by Fairclough could be used.
2.   To study how interactional norms and communicative approaches on the online platform are reflected in discursive practices of production and consumption of anonymous English discourse.
3.   To examine how the anonymous English discourse replicates/subverts power relations and ideological stance in digital communication, as discussed by Fairclough in the context of discourse as social practice.

1.4.   Research Questions

2.   What are the linguistic dimensions of meaning and voice in anonymous English language that are formed in an online textual realm without the physical identity of the speaker?
3.   What is the role of discursive practices of the production and reception of the anonymous English discourse in influencing the formation of interactional norms on digital platforms?
4.   In what ways is the anonymous English discourse replicated or challenged by the power relations and ideological meanings in the digital context of communication?

1.4.   Significance of the Study

The research is important as it gives a critical analysis of how the concept of anonymity defines English discourse in online space, and sheds light on the linguistic and social processes which underlies the idea of online communication. Through the Critical Discourse Analysis developed by Fairclough (1995), the paper explains the interaction of textual attributes, discursive, and social contexts to form voice, identity and ideological meaning. These mechanisms are vital to sociolinguists, media scholars and communication researchers who would be interested in understanding the

dynamics of online interaction where visibility is eliminated. The results illustrate the maintenance of sophisticated social dynamics and ideological bargaining by language alone which it is crucial to study both the interplay of the linguistic form and social practice in digital discourse.

The work also has a practical implication on the platform designers, moderators and policymakers. The research can offer evidence-based principles of managing digital spaces by exposing the effects of anonymity on norms of interaction, how ideological content spreads, and how the users seek to create authority and credibility. In particular, it highlights that there is a necessity to strike a balance between the positive aspects of anonymity, namely, inclusive engagement, freedom of speech, and opposition to dominant systems of power, and the protection of the spread of dangerous, polarizing, or misleading information. Therefore, the paper also adds to the theoretical base of information regarding digital discourse, as well as to the creation of approaches towards the establishment of the online environment that will facilitate the establishment of the constructive and responsible nature of anonymous interaction.

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

This paper is limited to the examination of anonymous English discussions on publicly available online sources, including discussion boards, comment boards, and question-and-answer websites. It does not look at the discourse of smaller or closed groups, those that engage in more than one language or those where user identities are always confirmed. It focuses on textual communication and not on non-verbal or verbal communication of online interaction. Moreover, the analysis focuses on the linguistic and discursive characteristics interpreted in the form of Critical Discourse Analysis as developed by Fairclough (1995), and does not include quantitative indicators and psychological characterization of the users. These constraints permit a qualitative inquiry into the effects of anonymity on textual construction, interactional norms as well as ideological meaning in English online discourse.

2. Literature Review

Anonymity as a characteristic attribute of online communication and its role in discourse practices has been studied in a large amount of literature. The initial research focuses on the fact that anonymity distorts the principles of interaction by reducing social responsibility and transforming the speaker responsibility. According to Wallace (1999), anonymous space facilitates more open display of expression in the absence of any concern of judgment which has led to changes in the language behavior in the online world. In the same manner, Joinson (2001) shows that anonymity enhances self-disclosure and a change in the tone of communication especially in text-based interactions whereby identity codes are not evident. Christopherson (2007) also theorises the concept of anonymity as a state of communication that facilitates positive participation and antisocial use of language, depending on the contextual and social limitations. All these scholars collectively put in place anonymity as a key variable in online discourse, which affects the use of English to bargain participation, expression, and interpersonal boundaries in digital space.

2.1. Anonymous Language Use as the way of Identity Construction

Studies about identity of the anonymous digital discourse always emphasize the use of language as one of the main ways of self-representation. Devoid of any visual or biographical cues, users form identities based on lexical choice, discourse style and interactional positioning. Turkle (1995) perceives online anonymity as an experimentation of identity wherein language allows identity users to execute various selves without connection to real-life situations. Nakamura (2002) refutes this perception by showing that the racial and cultural identities will still exist linguistically even in anonymous settings, especially in terms of discourse patterns on English-dominated forums. According to Androutsopoulos (2006), identity settings on the web are not lost in anonymity but rather re-contextualized in a discourse practice governed by

communal standards. All these studies underscore the fact that the English discourse when it is anonymous is heavily involved in the formation of identity, though it is not physically visible.

2.2. Patterns of Discourse and Dynamics of Interaction on Anonymous Online Forums

Theorists of interaction within online, anonymous spaces have recognized some distinct patterns of discourse that are not subject to recognizable communication. Baym (2010) observes that anonymity transforms the rules of conversation and it may lead to exaggeration of disagreement, humour or emotional reactions in online conversations. Graham (2007) looks at discussions on politics online and concludes that anonymity leads to deliberative and antagonistic language use based on how the moderation and structure of the platform is. Papacharissi (2004) also discusses the impact of anonymity on civility and politeness in online civic discourse and argues that the notion of invisibility in participation by the participants is challenging the classical patterns of respectful engagement. Collectively, these scholars illustrate that the English anonymous discourse can be described as fluid interactional norms that are influenced by social context, platform affordances and communicative intent.

2.3. Anonymity, Power and Ideological Discourse

Anonymity is a problematic line of writing where its interaction with power and ideology in the digital discourse is examined. The fact that Foucault (1980) views discourse as a power site gives the conceptualization an opportunity to gain insight into how the anonymous language opposes and repeats dominant ideologies. Wodak (2001) uses critical discourse analysis to demonstrate how ideology can be propagated through hidden authorship. In the same way, KhosraviNik (2017) proves that online discussions, which are anonymous, tend to enhance polarizing and exclusionary ideologies especially in English-language online worlds. These works also emphasize the idea that the

anonymity does not neutralize the issue of power but rather shifts it through the discourse and thus, the site of anonymity is a crucial place where the ideological struggle ensues.

2.4. Technology Tools of Researching Anonymous Digital Discourse

The literature on the methods of study of anonymous online conversation insists on the necessity of interdisciplinary methods that provide both linguistic and social content with meaning. Kozinets (2010) proposes the concept of netnography as the technique to study online communities, including the ones that involve anonymous communication by placing discourse into the context of digital cultures. Baker (2006) recommends discourse analysis based on corpus to reveal regular patterns in linguistic information in large volumes of anonymous English literature. According to De Fina and Georgakopoulou (2012), it is necessary to employ narrative and interactional methods to comprehend the way meaning and stance are made on a moment-by-moment basis in anonymous discourse. All these scholars have a strong methodological basis to analyze anonymous English discourse as a socially grounded and multifaceted phenomenon.

2.5. Anonymous Discourse Linguistic Politeness and Face Management

There is an emerging literature on the reshaping of politeness strategies and face management by anonymity in online English discourse. According to Locher and Watts (2005), politeness in online communication cannot be interpreted based on the traditional norms since anonymity changes the expectation of how people interact. In anonymous settings, users can either leave their traditional politeness strategies or can use them strategically to display either dominance or solidarity. Culpeper (2011) extends this discussion by pointing out how impoliteness is so common in the anonymous online conversation where there is no accountability to any language and thus no direct and aggressive language is used. In the meantime, as it is shown by Dynel (2015), anonymity promotes creative

pragmatic devices like mock politeness, irony, and trolling that are based on the application of specific linguistic cues instead of social identity indicators. Collectively, these scholars portray that anonymous English discourse necessitates reformulated paradigms of politeness that consider invisibility and less social restrictions.

2.6. Effection and Positive Stance in Anonymous Online Communication

Other researchers have also examined the effect of anonymity on expression of emotions and taking of positions in online communication. According to Kiesling (2009), stance is one of the interactional resources vital to the speaker to put themselves in an affective and ideological stance in a discourse, especially in case of lack of identity cues. Whenever there is anonymity, language will be the main tool of conveying the feelings of anger, empathy, or irony. Zappavigna (2012) demonstrates that the use of evaluative language and positioning indicators is an essential ingredient to generate congruence and community within the online context, even in the case of the anonymous user. Page (2014) also analyzes how narrative and evaluative practices allow the anonymous participants to express emotional participation and plausibility with the help of discourse only. All these studies serve to point out that anonymous English discourse is full of affective and evaluative meaning, and these assumptions as to the emotional detachment of anonymity are difficult to prove.

2.7. Anonymous Digital Discourse Multimodality and Semiotic Resources

Even though anonymous discourse can be text-based, researchers suppose that it is multimodal in its nature, because it has to make use of a variety of semiotic resources to cover the lack of physical presence. Kress and van Leeuwen (2001) posit that the meaning-making process is not restricted to verbal communication but rather visual and typographic messages, which are commonly applied in communication on the Internet anonymously. Tone and intent are imperative elements that can be conveyed through emojis, punctuations, capitalization and

formatting. As Thurlow and Mroczek (2011) point out, such semiotic decisions do not only have a social meaning, but also determine the ways in which the anonymous English discourse is understood. Jewitt (2014) also adds that digital discourse can only be analyzed through multimodal analysis, since users develop a strategic interplay between words and images in invisible communication. These views highlight how multimodal is anonymous discourse as a communicative practice.

2.8. Linguistic Inequality and Globalization in Anonymous English Discourse

A different key line of literature places the anonymous English discourse in the context of the larger processes of globalization and linguistic inequality. Blommaert (2010) contends that communication across the world is reflected as unequal in access to lingual resources where English acts as a dominant and unevenly distributed tool. This inequality is manifested in online anonymous spaces in the discourse patterns which favor either native speakers or English language proficient users. Pennycook (2007) criticizes the idea of the English language as neutral in the world that is global, with an emphasis placed on the power relations inherent in its usage on digital platforms. Similarly, Canagarajah (2013) proves that the strategy of multilingual users is to negotiate English standards in anonymous situations, and in many cases, they mix the linguistic resources to challenge the agency. Collectively, these authors demonstrate that anonymous English discourse is informed by global forces of power, linguistic relations of domination, and transnational communication activities.

3. Research Methodology

This paper uses qualitative research approach in order to explore how the construction and negotiation of anonymous English discourse takes place in online platforms. Since it concerns language, meaning, and social interaction, in the context, in which speaker and interlocutor cannot be seen, a qualitative approach would be especially appropriate in capturing the complex

and situation-specific character of anonymous communication. The study is interpretive in nature as it seeks to understand how language selections are a measure of identity creation, power dynamics, stance-taking, and interaction regulation in the anonymous online context. This methodology focuses on in-depth textual analysis in order to discover patterns, themes, and discursive strategies used by anonymous users and does not quantify language aspects. The methodology is based on the discourse analysis, which permits the systematic study of language as social practice to position the textual information within the wider context of the sociocultural and technological conditions.

3.1. Research Method

The qualitative research design applied in this study is the discourse analysis that pays attention to the close study of the naturally occurring language in use. The approach is especially suitable when considering the analysis of an anonymous online communication since it enables one to examine the role of the linguistic forms, patterns of interactions, and pragmatic strategies in digitally mediated settings. The analysis of discourse enables one to see that users create voice, bargain power, and also act identity only using language in the absence of visual and autobiographical information. The interpretive nature of this approach brings in flexibility with regard to interpretation as the researcher has an opportunity to immerse oneself in the information, as well as, to detect hidden meanings, ideological standpoints, and interactional patterns within an anonymous conversation. Through viewing language not as a neutral instrument, but as a socialized practice, this qualitative approach will offer an analytic formidable tool in understanding the influence of anonymity on the discourses of English across various digital environments. It is also a very practical approach in helping to promote reflexivity whereby the researcher would critically learn to interact with their analytical decisions and the situational issues that drive the interpretation.

3.2. Data Collection Method

The data to be used in the research is based on publicly available online resources, which permit or promote anonymous attendance, including online forums, comments, and question-answer websites. The data sources are determined by the appropriateness of the sites in terms of anonymous English conversation and their suitability as an interaction site. By going on purposive sampling the textual data is collected in such a way that a variety of communicative intent is represented in the selected discourse, such as an opinion statement, argument, emotional revelation; interpersonal communication. This is done by only gathering naturally occurring texts and no researcher interferes in the creation of the discourse thus maintaining the authenticity of communication. Ethical issues are also taken into account with the avoidance of private or restricted contents and anonymization of any possibly identifiable information even when usernames themselves are already pseudonymous. The results obtained are processed into a set of textual extracts, which undergo a complex coding and analysis procedure to determine the recurrent discursive patterns and themes applicable to the research purpose.

3.3. Theoretical Framework

The current research is based on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) based on the theorized work of Norman Fairclough (1995) that theorizes discourse as a particular type of social practice that constitutes and constructs social realities. The three-dimensional model of discourse analysis discussed by Fairclough: text, discursive practice, social practice offers a detailed construction of the analysis of the functioning of language in the context of a larger sociocultural and ideological environment. At the textual level, CDA is based on linguistic peculiarities, which include vocabulary, grammar, and cohesion as the key elements to analyze the way in which meaning is structured by the anonymous participants of the English digital discourse. The theory looks at the production, distribution, and consumption processes of text at the discursive practice level, allowing studying how the

anonymous discourse is informed by platform affordances and interactional norms. At the social practice level, CDA challenges the relations of power and ideological processes that are fixed in discourse, and it therefore becomes quite applicable in the study of anonymous communication where there are no visibility and responsibility. When applied to this study, the CDA developed by Fairclough will permit conducting a systematic exploration of how the voice of anonymous English discourse is constructed, how power is negotiated, and how resistance and domination are made possible on the digital platforms. The connection between micro-level linguistic decisions and macro-level social organization, this theoretical framework offers a sound analytical prism through which one can explain the role of anonymity in altering discourses practices and social interaction in the context of online space.

4. Analysis

The present section is a qualitative analysis of English discourse on digital platforms in the form of a qualitative discourse analysis of anonymous English discourse on digital platforms based on the Critical Discourse Analysis framework provided by Fairclough (1995). It considers the ways in which linguistic characteristics at the textual level are structuring meaning and voice when they are not accompanied by the presence of a speaker. Fairclough explains that textual analysis is analyzing the vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, text structure as some of the places where social meaning is made (Fairclough, 1995, p. 57). These aspects of linguistics are the main resource of presence, authority, and position of the users in anonymous online spaces where physical identity indicators cannot be used. How lexical decisions, grammatical constructions, modality, and evaluative language can be treated as voice construction mechanisms in anonymous English discourse is discussed in the following paragraphs in the miscellany of micro-level textual features to more extensive social meanings, as stressed in CDA.

4.1. The Lexical Choices and Construction of Anonymous Voice

The lexical choice is also an important phenomenon in the construction of voice in the English discourse of anonymity when words are the main elements of position, disposition, and power. According to Fairclough (1995), no vocabulary is neutral, taking the position that the concept of wording, always deals with specific classifications of reality (p. 104). In online, anonymity, users employ evaluative and emotionally charged lexis in a premeditated way, where invisibility is compensated and the user places themselves in a discussion. The words truth, fact, corruption or freedom are often used in anonymous writing in order to claim the epistemic authority and moral compass. According to Thesesmo (2018), speakers who are not known tend to use exaggerated lexical options to sound believable or pressing when they do not have any social identifiers. These lexical patterns may be understood through the approach of CDA as the efforts to create a recognizable and convincing voice and, therefore, illustrate how the issue of anonymity redistributes the load in the process of identity creation to linguistic means alone.

4.2. Discourse in Grammatical Structures and Agency of Anonymous

The grammatical decisions, especially the agency and transitivity are the main focus of comprehending the role of the anonymous voices in the terms of place when it comes to actions and responsibilities. Fairclough (1995) believes that grammar captures the formula of who does what to whom and therefore is central to the representation of social relations (p. 135). Passive constructions like mistakes were made or people are being silenced are a common aspect of the anonymous English discourse which tends to obscure agents, which is a sign of the larger state of anonymity. In contrast, active forms such as they control everything or we demand change enable the anonymous user to affirm his collective agency and solidarity. According to van Leeuwen (2008), the way the responsibility and power are assigned in the discourse depends on

grammatical representation of the actors in the society. The implementation of CDA demonstrates that people who are not identified with the accounts prevent or reinforce grammatical structures to either distribute the blame or strengthen collective voice in accordance with the social circumstances of invisibility.

4.3. Modality and the Realization of the Certainty without Appearances

Modality is one of the important textual characteristics by which speakers who are anonymous convey certainty, obligation or possibility thus building authoritative voice. According to Fairclough (1995), modality represents the degree of truth or need that the speaker has committed to and in that regard, it is especially important in those situations where people speak anonymously, and thus, they have to create credibility through the language. The high-modality phrases like must, clearly, undeniably, and there is no doubt are also commonly employed in anonymous English speech with a goal to demonstrate confidence and superiority. According to Hyland (2005), powerful modal commitment is commonly used in order to counter the lack of social status or recognizable expertise. Such modal patterns can be viewed through the prism of CDA as discursive practices that allow the anonymous users to establish a sense of certainty and power and strengthen the voice by language belief as opposed to individual identity.

4.4. Anonymous Texts Evaluative Language and Stance-Taking

Stance-taking and voice construction in anonymous discourse largely rely on evaluative language to enable users to make judgments, feelings, and ideological stances. As Fairclough (1995) points out, one of the key mechanisms of how discourse contributes to the formation of values and social meaning is evaluation (p. 62). Disgusting, brilliant, dangerous, or unacceptable, etc.- in anonymous communication in the English language the adjectives and adverbs serve to explicitly demarcate the stance so that speakers

can place themselves in a moral and ideological position. Martin and White (2005) purport that evaluative resources play a crucial role in the building of alignment and persuasion in discourse. In the context of anonymous space, the process of evaluation can be used in place of visible identity so that users can get their voice heard by making their attitudinal positioning consistent across time. CDA shows that such evaluative patterns do not just exist as a personal opinion, but as discursive actions to create ideological senses and relations of power in the unnamed digital spaces.

4.5. Discursive Production and Conditions of Anonymity

In the discursive practice level, Fairclough (1995) highlights that the analysis should be done in relation to the way texts are produced subjecting to both the institutional and situational circumstances in which discourse is formed. The affordances of technology are determined through the production of discourse in anonymous electronic spaces: lack of profile information, pseudonymity, and low accountability. Such situations affect the way in which these users construct their messages and usually stimulate spontaneity, economy and an exaggerated expressiveness. According to Fairclough, discursive practice entails the production, distribution, and consumption of texts (1995, p. 74), and the concept of anonymity dramatically changes the processes by breaking social limitations on the use of language. This opinion is supported by the research of Herring (2004), who states that anonymity has an influence on turn-taking, topic development and style in computer-mediated communication. Consequently, the anonymous discourse in English is frequently characterized by informal structures, fragmented syntax, and direct address because of the production practices that are determined by the norms of speed, invisibility, and platform-specific interactional expectations.

4.6. Intertextuality and Recontextualization in a Discourse of Anonymous

The concept of intertextuality plays a central role in the discursive practice approach of Fairclough that can be understood as the way in which texts borrow and rework the existing discourses. According to Fairclough (1995), the texts are inherently intertextual since they repeat previous statements, ideologies, and genres (p. 84). In English anonymity, it is common to quote, paraphrase or refer to news media, political slogans, memes, or earlier comments without attribution. This practice indicates the anonymity of the participation whereby power is created by adhering to familiar discourses as opposed to identity. Wodak (2001) explains that intertextuality enables speakers to justify their arguments by placing them in more general discursive traditions. Recontextualization is a communicative practice that is strategic in anonymous digital spaces, as it allows the users to adopt a dominant or a counter-discourse to enhance their stand even when they are invisible. CDA shows that these intertextual practices are not random and are indicative of the rules of interaction of credibility and relevance in anonymous communities.

4.7. Distribution, Circulation, and Algorithmic Visibility

Upvoting, threading and algorithmic ranking are some of the mechanisms that have a great influence on the distribution of anonymous discourse on digital platforms and the circulation and visibility of texts. As Fairclough (1995) emphasizes, discursive practice encompasses the distribution and consumption of texts in certain social situations. On anonymous sites, some discursive forms, including offensive language, harsh judgments, or unsophisticated reasoning, will be more prone to being reinforced by active participation and the choice of algorithms. Gillespie (2014) states that platform algorithms take active part in the creation of discourse by favoring this or that type of expression. Thus, the anonymous English discourse tends to be created with the consideration of their circulation dynamics and provokes the communicative

strategies that will be appreciated and responded to. CDA enables this research to explain such trends as a discursive practice and show how technological mediation is able to affect not only the content of the statements but also their framing and distribution.

4.8. Consumption, Interpretation, and Interactional Norms

Anonymous discourse consumption is also important in the model proposed by Fairclough, meaning is constructed together with the readers through interpretation and response. Fairclough (1995) emphasizes that texts cannot be passively received rather they are interpreted within particular social and ideological contexts (p. 75). Anonymous online domains also make the reader interact with discourse without knowing who is speaking to him, so they trust only the language as a tool to provide meaning to intent, credibility, and position. According to Baym (2010), this condition promotes the norms of interaction in which disagreements, sarcasm, and quick response become the norms of interaction. Responses, quotes, and commentary chains demonstrate that anonymous discourse can be consumed dialogically, meaning that the meaning is created in the process of interaction. These patterns of interaction can be interpreted as socially governed practices determined by anonymity, culture of platforms, and the expectations shared by social actors through CDA, which demonstrates how discursive consumption strengthens specific standards of communicating in anonymity in English.

4.9. Anonymity and Reconfiguring of Relations of Power

In the context of Fairclough (1995) the discourse is perceived as a sort of social practice within which the relations of power are enacted, negotiated, and disputed. Power as defined by Fairclough is not simply exercised in overt authority but rather it is inculcated within routine and taken-for-granted systems of talking and acting (1995, p. 36). The traditional hierarchies of power linked to visible identity, including status in a particular profession,

gender, or institutional location, are to some extent destabilized in anonymous discourse on the Internet. Anonymity gives users the ability to engage in a conversation without showing credentials, thus reorganizing the authoritative figure. Nevertheless, CDA demonstrates that power is not extinguished but rather transferred with the use of language. Power is omnipresent as Foucault (1980) asserts since it exists through discourse itself (p. 93). The linguistic circulation of power thus becomes a place where some voices overpower with the persuasive rhetoric, assertive modalities or even adjustment to the mainstream ideologies, although no power is visible.

4.10. Anonymous Discourse Ideological Reproduction

As it has been pointed out by Fairclough (1995), ideology works best when naturalized and embedded in daily discourse. According to him, ideologies represent representations of facets of the world that facilitate the creation and upholding of relations of power (p. 14). The presentation of ideological meanings in anonymous English discourse below in the form of common sense or objective truth is a common feature because positionality and accountability cannot be identified due to the lack of identifiable authorship. Discourses of nationalism, gender roles, or economic inequality are often represented in anonymous forums as being based on neutral opinion and not as an ideological stance and van Dijk (2001) describes how discourse works by regulating the subject matter, diction, and judgmental frames. The use of CDA to anonymous discourse shows the manner in which these ideological meanings are distributed and normalized and shows that anonymity can help to reproduce dominant ideologies by protecting the speaker against social repercussions and by permitting the free circulation of ideological language.

4.11. Counter-Discourse and Resistance in Anonymous Space

Although the anonymous discourse may reproduce the dominant power relations, it offers the resistance and counter-discourse possibilities

as well. Fairclough (1995) states that, discourse is a place of struggle and in discourse power relations are negotiable and subject to change (p. 45). The anonymity allows the voices of the marginalized or dissenting to confront power, political power or social conventions without fear of consequences. Anonymous English discourse can thus be a resistant discursive space in this sense, where other histories and critiques are created. This is the case held by Foucault (1980) who says that where there is power, there is resistance (p. 95). By means of CDA, one can detect instances of resistance within such linguistic practices as irony, satire, recontextualization, and denial of dominant framings. Such discursive practices reveal how anonymity can be used as a form of domination by anonymous users as well as a means of opposition as both domination and resistance are possible through anonymity.

4.12. The struggle of Discourse and Polarization of Ideology

Anonymous online sites tend to make ideological polarization severe, since anonymity lessens social responsibility and makes speech more radical or provoking. According to Fairclough (1995), discursive struggle happens when the rival ideologies are implemented in the communicative space (p. 56). Polarized representations of social actors, issues, and values are the consequences of this struggle in anonymous English, and Wodak (2015) states that polarizing discourse is a characteristic of modern digital communication, especially when it takes place anonymously and the norms of civility are less strict. These discursive polarities, as CDA discloses, help to reinforce ideological boundaries to influence the way social reality is comprehended and disputed. In such a way, it is possible to consider that anonymous English discourse can be considered the potent location of ideological struggle in which language is actively involved in the process of building, supporting, and breaking the force relations.

5.   Discussion

The results of this research reiterate the importance of language as a voice-building tool, identity negotiating tool, and power mediating tool in anonymous English conversations on digital spaces. At the textual level, lexical selections, grammatical formations, modality, and evaluative words all allow users to construct presence, credibility and stance even though there are no visual or biographical elements present. In line with the framework by Fairclough (1995), these linguistic characteristics are not neutral, but rather socially and ideologically located, and they convey more to do with communicative norms and social meanings in general. Instances of high-modality expressions, such as enable the assertion of authority by unknown users, whereas evaluative adjectives and adverbs can be used to express ideological alignment or opposition. In addition, the textual styles indicate that invisibility is actively compensated by the anonymous participants through reinforcing linguistic resources as it is explained by Hyland (2005) and Martin and White (2005) who observe that evaluative and modal resources play a significant role in building the relational and persuasive authority in the situation where the identity is unmarked. These observations suggest the complexity of interactions between language and social context and power, and they show that anonymity does not reduce the complexity of communicative practices but instead rearranges the processes by which discourse has attained social value.

In the discursive and social practice level, the research exposes that anonymity rearranges the norms of interaction and the perception of power in the online world. In her model, Fairclough (1995) focuses on the fact that the discourse production and consumption is embedded in social structures, and the results demonstrate that the anonymous English discourse recreates and challenges the dominant ideologies. Although invisibility gives marginalized voices a platform to speak out and challenge authority and build counter-narratives, it also gives dominant ideological standpoints a platform that circulates unquestioned and frequently supported through the affordances of platforms like upvotes, algorithmic visibility, and threaded replies. This duality also coincides with the concept of Foucault (1980) according to which power is everywhere and takes its effect through the very implementation of discourse, where opposition is created to any form of exercise of power. Also, the paper shows that discursive practices, such as intertextuality, recontextualization, and multimodal expression are strategic processes of attaining a visibility, credibility, and ideological conformity in anonymous communities. On the whole, this discussion points out that anonymous English discourse is a multifaceted point of negotiation, in which identity, authority, and ideology are constituted, challenged and mediated via language.

Conclusion

This paper offers strong reasons to believe that anonymous English discussion on digital platforms is a dynamic and socially relevant communicative practice. As seen through the prism of the Critical Discourse Analysis by Fairclough (1995), it becomes clear that such textual characteristics as lexical choice, grammar, modality, evaluative language, and similar, are used as the main instruments to create voice and presence in a situation when the latter cannot be physically seen. These linguistic resources are strategically utilized by the users to indicate the stance, power, and conformity to the social or ideological stance. Through the analysis, it is confirmed that anonymity does not reduce the communicative role and instead enhances the dependency on language to facilitate meaning and identity negotiation. The discovery is relevant to the overall knowledge about digital discourse because it illustrates that language per se might be used to support the intricate type of social relations and ideology in online settings where visibility is eliminated.

The study finds that anonymous discourse is both a copy and challenge to power and ideological systems. Through the investigation of the trends of production, distribution and consumption, it is clear that anonymity changes the traditional distribution of authority: traditional sources of

power including institutional membership or personal identity are neutralized to some degree whereas discursive means like high-modality statements, intertextual referencing and ideological framing become means of influence. Concurrently, the results indicate that anonymity supports resistance and counter-discourse wherein oppressed groups can express themselves with opposition to mainstream narratives without fear of being punished. These results correspond to the Foucaultian (1980) definition of power and resistance and the van Dijckian (2001) interpretation of ideology in the discourse. The post-real and anonymous essence of the participation highlights the significance of studying the enabling and the possibly divisive influences of invisibility in the online English discourse.

Lastly, this paper examines that the study of anonymous English discourse needs to be treated as a socially constructive phenomenon, in which the linguistic aspects and discursive activities intersect with technological, cultural, and ideological backgrounds. Placing the textual patterns into the context of CDA, the study reveals the language and power as a single entity: each of linguistic decisions, be it the lexical, grammatical, or evaluative one, is involved in the process of creating social meaning and ideological stance. The results confirm that digital platforms are spaces of conformity and challenge to social norms, and anonymity is the condition that promotes experimenting and being persuaded and criticized. Thereby, the presented research will help to develop a more subtle perspective on the influence of invisibility on discourse and provide significant information that will be useful not only in the field of sociolinguistics but also in media studies, digital communication, and the analysis of ideology in the online sphere.

Suggestions and Recommendations

Moreover, it is also suggested, based on the results, that the designers and moderators of digital platforms might want to consider introducing specific features that allow creating a compromise between the freedom of expression that may be anonymous and the need to prevent the spread of destructive ideologies or the discourse of a hostile nature. Context sensitive moderation, constructive interaction norms, and giving interactive options to responsible interpretation of anonymous content will not only positively affect the quality of the discourse, but it will also not sacrifice the advantages of anonymity, including the ability to engage and contribute in ways that are not dominated by particular power structures.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, Z. Nazim, & M. Nazim. (2025). *The rhetoric of deception: A critical analysis of propaganda language on social media.* Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 13(2), 265–276. https://doi.org/10.52131/pjhss.2025.v13i2.2850

Androutsopoulos, J. (2006). Introduction: Sociolinguistics and computer-mediated communication. Journal of Sociolinguistics, 10(4), 419–438. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2006.00286.x

Androutsopoulos, J. (2014). Mediatization and sociolinguistic change. Key Topics in Sociolinguistics, 3, 51–68. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110346831

Baker, P. (2006). Using corpora in discourse analysis. Continuum.

Baym, N. K. (2010). Personal connections in the digital age. Polity 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.

Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. Discourse Studies, 7(4–5), 585–614. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054407

Canagarajah, S. (2013). Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations. Routledge.

Christopherson, K. M. (2007). The positive and negative implications of anonymity in Internet social interactions. Computers in Human Behavior, 23(6), 3038–3056. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2006.09.001

Culpeper, J. (2011). Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence. Cambridge University Press.

De Fina, A., & Georgakopoulou, A. (2012). Analyzing narrative: Discourse and sociolinguistic perspectives. Cambridge University Press.

Dynel, M. (2015). The many faces of online impoliteness. Language and Dialogue, 5(3), 329–352. https://doi.org/10.1075/ld.5.3.01dyn

Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. Longman.

Foucault, M. (1980). Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977. Pantheon Books.

Gee, J. P. (2011). An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday life. Anchor Books.

Graham, T. (2007). Deliberative democracy and the Internet: Civic engagement online. New Media & Society, 9(2), 187–209. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444807075013

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.

Jewitt, C. (2014). The Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Joinson, A. N. (2001). Self-disclosure in computer-mediated communication. CyberPsychology & Behavior, 4(5), 587–596. https://doi.org/10.1089/109493101753235217

KhosraviNik, M. (2017). Right-wing populism in the West. Critical Discourse Studies, 14(4), 331–346. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2017.1334133

Kiesling, S. F. (2009). Style as stance. Journal of Sociolinguistics, 13(2), 171–194. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2009.00409.x

Kozinets, R. V. (2010). Netnography: Doing ethnographic research online. SAGE.

Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication. Arnold.

Locher, M. A., & Watts, R. J. (2005). Politeness theory and relational work. Journal of Politeness Research, 1(1), 9–33. https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.9

Nakamura, L. (2002). Cybertypes: Race, ethnicity, and identity on the Internet. Routledge.

Page, R. (2014). Narratives online: Shared stories and social media. Cambridge University Press.

Papacharissi, Z. (2004). Democracy online: Civility, politeness, and the democratic potential of online political discussion groups. New Media & Society, 6(2), 259–283. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444804041444

Pennycook, A. (2007). Global Englishes and transcultural flows. Routledge.

Suler, J. (2004). The online disinhibition effect. CyberPsychology & Behavior, 7(3), 321–326. https://doi.org/10.1089/1094931041291295

Thurlow, C., & Mroczek, K. (2011). Digital discourse: Language in the new media. Oxford University Press.

Turkle, S. (1995). Life on the screen: Identity in the age of the Internet. Simon & Schuster.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), The handbook of discourse analysis (pp. 352–371). Blackwell.

Wallace, P. (1999). The psychology of the Internet. Cambridge University Press.

Wodak, R. (2001). Methods of critical discourse analysis. SAGE.

Zappavigna, M. (2012). Discourse of Twitter and social media. Continuum.