Megan's Question(s): What happens when critical conversations in the room move to Twitter? What happens when there's no room at all?

- The presence of a third, online, public space complicates conversations – particularly critical or contentious ones – and expands conference conversations in ways that we can't always imagine and certainly can't control.
- Twitter (and live-tweeting, in particular) memorializes conversations in ways that may make some participants uncomfortable. But it also invites previously-excluded voices into conversations that impact their work and/or their communities.
- Jessica Vitak (2012), building on previous work by Alice Marwick and danah boyd (2010) defines context collapse this away: "the flattening out of multiple distinct audiences in one's social network, such that people from different contexts become part of a singular group of message recipients" (451).
- In the intervening decade, scholars from communication, linguistics, and sociology, in particular, have critiqued the notion of context collapse, in part because it doesn't account for the sophisticated ways that rhetors already account for multiple contexts and audiences when they make decisions about messages and self presentation (Georgakopoulou 2016).
- But live-tweeting further complicates questions of context, message, and audience in ways that may change the calculus for speakers, presenters, and in-room audiences. And it also opens up questions about how born-digital events and conferences further shift how we think about conference spaces as rhetorical contexts/situations.

Works Cited

Georgakopoulou, Alexandra. (2016). 'Whose context collapse?': Ethical clashes in the study of language and social media in context. *Applied Linguistics Review*. 8.

Marwick, Alice & danah boyd. (2010). I tweet honestly, I tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience. *New Media and Society* 13.1: 114-133.

Vitak, Jessica. (2012). The impact of context collapse and privacy on social network site disclosures. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media* 56.4: 451-470.