media/rep/

Repositorium für die Medienwissenschaft

DFG Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft

Philipps Universität Marburg

Introduction

Mobile Digital Practices.
Situating People, Things, and Data

Anna Lisa Ramella, Asko Lehmuskallio, Tristan Thielmann,
and Pablo Abend

Mobile. Digital. Practices. Three concepts that need to be disentangled. Let us start with the last one, since the term 'practices' denotes the unit of analysis in this volume. According to Nick Couldry, who argues for practice-based media research, a focus on practices entails investigation of 'what people do with media' (Couldry 2004; 2010: 38). While this seems like a simple call to look at the actual handling of technology and interaction with it, the theoretical and methodological consequences are far-reaching. Media in this regard can no longer be thought of as a unit of analysis in the form of a closed device, product, or text unit. Hence, a practice-based approach shifts the centre of media research, moving it away from studying devices and media text to examining an 'open set of practices relating to, or oriented around, media' (Couldry 2004: 117). This instructive claim leads to diverse difficulties and uncertainties. What constitutes a practice? How do practices differ from actions? Where and when do practices begin, and when and where do they end? On what scales do practices operate, and are there hierarchies of practices?

This uncertainty and openness extends to the other two words from the title also, which were added in an attempt to narrow the scope of practices dealt with here; 'digital', referring to a specific set of media that is not 'analogue', but also not necessarily online, and 'mobile', seeking to draw out differentiations in the way these digitalities move and are moved by practices of media use as well as their affordances. The frequent use of ideas such as digital age, digitalisation, and digitality notwithstanding, it is by no means clear in every instance what makes a practice 'digital'. What are the specifics of a digital practice? From what point onward is a practice digital, and when does it cease to be digital? And then there is the general mobility of practices, which is of particular concern here. Does mobility put practices 'in motion', or is it rather more a condition for stabilising practices? What is it that mobilises practices in the first place? Are mobile practices different in some way from immobile practices, or can a practice ever be immobile? What is the relation between a mobile device, a mobile practice and the mobility of data itself?

The lowest common denominator for research into practices seems to be a reliance on empirical analysis, with a tight focus on the material studied. Method-

ologically, particular interest is directed to *in situ* and *in actu* observations, mainly because of the public nature of the practices. The methodological claim is of observing and participating in real-world doings and sayings in the actual context and while they are executed. Therefore, the study of practices entails grounding theoretical statements in observations and following the actors and their work in the world. Couldry's call to study '[w]hat [...] people do with media' needs to be expanded if we wish to examine what people and media do together. Accordingly, we also have to take into account how humans and other humans, humans and non-humans, and non-humans and non-humans co-operate in various situations.

While the turn towards practices is relatively new for media studies, other disciplines have long focused on in-depth study of what people actually do with each other and with the artefacts, animals, and other – fictitious and spiritual – beings around them. Cultural anthropology, religious studies, science and technology studies, and the computer-supported co-operative work discipline are among the fields that have cultivated this kind of work, although often lacking explicit analytical use of concepts such as medium or media. Media studies again has turned its attention toward the role of media and mediations, especially with regard to how particular materialities and media infrastructures play a part in structuring what people do with, around, and through media.

While classical media theory (e.g., the work of Marshall McLuhan in Canada and Friedrich Kittler in Germany) is often cited in support of technological 'success stories' in which new technologies ultimately foster cognitive and social advances, or at times fail to do so (Schüttpelz 2018), social theories of media tend to see media mainly as a result of social interactions, taking supposedly unmediated face-to-face situations as a starting point. Placing focus on media practices is one way to take into account the roles played by technologies in situationally co-constructing social associations while allowing an emphasis on the importance of social circumstances in the formations of particular technologies. These technologies are often referred to as 'media', until, with time, they lose their 'medium-specificity'. Thus, practice-theoretical approaches invite one to consider the in-betweens of social and technological accounts. A key interest is in identifying, paying attention to, and describing what human and non-human actors do, then taking this as a basis for analysis (Schatzki 2001: 14). While some practice-theory scholars maintain that a focus on practices enables one to link these observations to larger social and cultural contexts, others posit that scale (i.e., 'micro', 'macro', 'local', or 'global') is created within practices and is not available for analysis outside them.

In light of the premise that practices can be made visible and are therefore to a certain extent public, practice-theoretical approaches make a strong epistemological claim suggesting to refrain from internalism (Swidler 2001: 83 f.) and focusing on observable changes through "bodily doings and sayings" (Schatzki 2002: 72) within practices instead. Although speech acts within practices are important, a core focus in practice-theoretical studies is on the ways in which

bodies are connected to their surroundings – e. g., how human bodies and media technologies are used for participation in social situations. This entails focusing on skills and on tacit and embodied knowledge, which can be performed consistently until they become a routine and manifested in practice. Practice-theoretical approaches thus are concerned with the physical execution of practices in a material world. This emphasis on the materiality of encounters between actors is particularly visible in the influence of science and technology research on laboratories (Latour/Woolgar 1979), on the trading floor (Knorr Cetina/Preda 2004), and within the semiotic materialism of actor-network-theory (Latour 1991).

Being a 'field of practice' (Schatzki 2001: 11) itself, practice theory does not have a single set of clearly defined theoretical boundaries; rather, it is best understood as a bundle of theoretical positions with certain family resemblance (Reckwitz 2002: 244). Bourdieu's field theory, Goffman's interactionism, Garfinkel's ethnomethodology, and Latour's actor-network-theory all focus on practices, just as much as, for instance, Foucault's and Butler's work does. While all positions have their specific and distinct emphases, they do point towards a need to study 'how things get done'. One scholar with this in mind, Andrew Pickering, suggests: "All that one can do is register the visible and specific intertwinings of the human and the nonhuman. But this is enough; what more could one want or need?" (Pickering 2001: 176).

Practice theory initially was developed most strongly within social theory, which is why there is a certain emphasis on the (human) body and a tendency to privilege the doings and sayings of human actors even though its history could have encompassed greater focus on the 'doings and sayings' of specific technologies as well. Pickering, for instance, describes the laboratory equipment as a kind of counterpart imposing a "dialectic of resistance and accommodation" (Pickering 1995: 22) on human agency. In practice-theoretical studies it is usually the human subject who uses or utilises technical objects; an encounter that over time can shape practice. This overall focus on routines and ritual when one is examining interactions between humans and humans or humans and non-humans leaves aside much of the dynamics-rich landscape we particularly want to address in this volume. We wish to highlight practices' instability and the role of movement in possibly stabilising them, along with the assumption that practices are shaped first and foremost by the mutual movement of people, things, and data.

Practice-theoretical work on media has been developed in tandem with increasing focus on 'digital media'. While the computer has been posited to be a 'universal machine', or to constitute 'universal media', the difficulty of describing and delineating the boundaries of digitally networked computing has led various scholars to focus on how digital devices are constructed for and react to specific kinds of practices. Understood in this vein, digital devices are often only temporary media that need to be regularly updated and have limited life spans. Accordingly, the notion of a medium is more difficult to apply to forms of computing

if one does not understand the practices within which a device, software, or a specific algorithm performs its mediation.

With our explicit focus on (mobile digital) practices, we do not want to give the reader *ab initio* definitions of the three words in the volume's title. Instead, we believe that each author's work contributes to the ongoing discussions and definition efforts surrounding mobile digital practices, and each article is a step towards answering some of the questions posed above. Rather than provide a full review of the existing literature and build our specific theoretical framework, which we as editors have expounded on elsewhere from our individual perspectives (e. g., Thielmann/Schüttpelz 2013; Lehmuskallio/Gómez Cruz 2016; Ramella 2017; Abend 2018), we wish to devote the space below to giving the reader an overview of how each article tackles the question of what constitutes mobile digital practices. Rather than offering mere summaries of the contributions, we try to carve out the specificities of the practices involved, and how they address the relation between digital and mobile practices. As the articles span across an intertwined spectrum of digitality, mobility and diverse actors of practices, rather than picking them apart in clusters, we have implemented a dramaturgy along those figures into the order of the content: starting with digital, offline data, moved primarily by the mobility of people, we pass via parallelised movements of people and online data towards data mobilities that move people. This way, the three main threads of this issue – digitality, mobility and practices – are made visible regarding their particular emphases as they transgress each article.

In 'Small Village, Big Data', Geoffrey Hobbis describes the sharing of digital media files in the Solomon Islands. Especially in rural areas, smartphones are not used primarily to go online at any time, anywhere. Internet connections' high cost and frequent unavailability have led to their use predominantly as mobile (offline) multimedia-players. Equipped with MicroSD cards, they are being used to store, transport, and consume films and photographs that, after being downloaded in urban areas, are brought to remote villages, mostly by temporary-labour migrants. The article traces how such files are downloaded on stationary devices or directly bought on MicroSDs in urban areas before the smartphone is used as a vehicle to transport them further. Thus, the mobility of the data depends on the physical movement of the workers as they transport the memory cards to the offline smartphone users in the isolated villages. Instead of being constantly online, the mobile phones' users 'bring the Internet to the village'. The author shows that the data thus transported can spark controversy, since, for example, data rendered on mobile-phone screens as foreign visual media get associated again with urban life; viewers connect the onscreen content with morally ambivalent lifestyles. Moreover, since mobile devices form a pathway to highly privatised forms of consumption and half of the islands' smartphones are owned by women, media consumption cannot be controlled by the male-dominated village elite any longer (p. 32). This situation challenges traditional gender hierarchies. Hobbis

highlights the intertwining of physical movement with the mobility of data, which often goes less studied and explored. Instead of directly sharing digital content via a communications network, the islanders share files via a sequence of online and offline practices in and along movements of labourers. While digitality affords the transportation of large multimedia files and collections, the conveying of these files from urban to rural areas is dependent on the physical movement of the migrant workers travelling back and forth. Focusing on moral controversies, Hobbis provides insights into the impact of micro-level sharing practices on the larger social structure of the villages.

The paper 'In the Footsteps of Smartphone Users', by Anne Ganzert et al., examines the specific forms of spatio-temporal sociality brought about by practices of playing augmented-reality games such as Pokémon Go and Ingress. The authors are able to analyse these by referring to theoretical approaches based on the work of media-studies scholars such as Sybille Krämer (1998, 2007) on 'traces' and Michaela Ott (2015) on 'dividuation' to inform the model they develop of 'deferred communities'. Differences in emphasis between AR games in their central motivation with regard to the postulation 'I was here' serve as a guide throughout the paper: the authors employ analytical separation among 'I' (the player-subject), 'was' (the temporality of the traces and marks), and 'here' (the spatiality of the game). With the games, GPS tracking is used to open the door to a 'deferred community' where virtual traces of players both absent and present are combined with one's own physical path. This results in an understanding of digital mobility as something at the threshold of where human user, smartphone, and app used meet.

Donald Anderson's article 'Spatial Labour, Mobile Digital Platforms, and Soft Cabs' offers reflection on the development of e-hailing services as digital labour platforms, still in their infancy, and how the practices tied in with these transform mobile work through digital mediations between customers and workers. Anderson directs special attention to the conflict that arises from digital labour platforms interfering with social space, thereby underscoring the spatial character of the work that digital platforms are used to target. Here, mobility becomes visible as a constitutive aspect of the development and expansion of smartphone use, creating affordances for broadening the range of online services offered by digital labour platforms. By choosing to call these services 'soft cabs', Anderson takes into account the software-based meter that the workers use and differentiates these cabs from taxicabs, which took their name from the taximeter used to measure the cost of a trip. By characterising the digital labour platforms as mediators in a Latourian sense (Latour 2005) and not as intermediaries – because of the controlling qualities implemented and used by the platforms to mediate the information shared between customer and worker – he articulates how these platforms must be viewed as work of social reproduction in a digital context, made possible by the mobility of the smartphone.

By addressing Sinophone digital practices, Jamie Coates, with his piece 'So Hot Right Now: Reflections on Virality and Sociality from Transnational Digital China', reminds us that in researching any kind of media practices, we must always consider local contexts. His article deftly sheds light on how alterity becomes apparent when one looks more closely at the terms used to describe digital phenomena and how these limits are demarcated by specific mobilities between specific localities and socialities. Thereby, the article combines reflections on the digital and the mobile in a way that makes explicit how the digital is understood differently through the mobile: his interlocutors, already in a state of mobility by virtue of leading transnational lives as members of a Sinophone community in Japan, describe the virality of a digital phenomenon precisely by the way it moves – it is the circulation of a digital image via digital platforms that constitutes its virality, thereby bringing together digitality and mobility under a single term. It is important to point out at the same time, however, that the idea *re* or *huo*, translated as 'fever' or 'heat', does not proceed from description of digital phenomena; it must be seen rather as a 'digital amplification of a pre-existing social practice' (p. 82). Coates carefully analyses how phenomena emerging from digital and mobile practices are perceived in terms of 'sociothermic affects' (Chau 2008) in the Sinophone world, while in Anglo-European discourse they are translated with terms derived from biological processes, such as 'viral' or 'meme'. Yet, as Coates points out, both seem to transplant a notion of 'contagiousness' into understandings of media practices. He therefore recommends an etic distinction between the terms 'viral' and 'virality', the latter pointing to the importance of affective qualities for spreading of media content.

In the article by Samuel Collins, 'Twitter in Place: Examining Seoul's Gwanghwamun Plaza through Social Media Activism', practices of claiming urban space through mobile social-media practices, particularly via Twitter, are given the focus. In this case, digital mobile practices are involved in site-specific redefinition of the Gwanghwamun Plaza, framing this square in Seoul as a space of protest. Pointing to the connection between social-media practices and place, Collins shows how, even when geolocation is not enabled, tweets always are posted in a certain time and space. Drawing together data visualisation of Twitter traffic during the protests at the Gwanghwamun Plaza in 2016, he analyses how the particular practices involved as diverse participants tweeted at the plaza – protesters, conservative groups, tourists, merchants, commuters, and bots – together have shaped the many meaning of this public space. Creating what he calls a 'networked representation of Gwanghwamun Plaza' (p. 99), Collins renders the digitality and mobility of their social practice visible. Thereby, the article provides a thoughtful analysis of the relationship between social media and urban space.

In 'Screen Screen Tourism', Marion Schulze points out that a practice turn in media studies also corresponds to a changing perspective on analysis of the activities of fans of television series. In addition to well-researched online participatory practices such as blogging or writing fan fiction, her practice-based approach

highlights how media content such as films and television series engenders and encourages actual physical mobilities. Discussed under the umbrella term 'media tourism' or 'screen tourism', this line of research shows that 'people who engaged heavily with media texts became highly mobile in visiting actual filming locations' (p. 124). But people also are growing increasingly mobile in browsing information online in order to find details about production sites and in virtually travelling to such locations on digital maps and virtual globes. Using the example of Korean drama series, Schulze reveals the complex ways in which digitally mediated mobilities intersect with physical travel to the sites of production. Moreover, Schulze shows how physical travel gets mediated again when fans use digital maps and globes to engage in practices of what she terms 'screen screen tourism'. Fans engage in onscreen travels to gain information on physical locations, which they then virtually navigate. The article makes clear that travels encouraged by media-related text transcend the boundary between 'physical' and 'virtual' mobility when online and offline navigation constantly inform each other. For the fans of Korean drama series, primary importance is accorded not to getting a glimpse of the physical set but to finding the place bearing the closest resemblance to the location shown in the series. The 'geographic familiarity' can be found either online or offline.

Maria Schreiber focuses on the socio-technological specifics of mobile photo-sharing practices in her article 'Audiences, Aesthetics and Affordances: Analysing Practices of Visual Communication on Social Media'. She analyses examples of networked visual communication of a group of female teenagers in Vienna, Austria. The teenagers use platforms such as Snapchat and Instagram as they develop an 'interpersonal, mediated practice of communication that always takes place in regard to specific audiences by means of aesthetics and is embedded in technical affordances of platforms' (p. 144). The paper shows how new mobile visual communication styles emerge from the interplay of expectations surrounding the targeted audience, aesthetic decisions on what to show and how to show it, and the affordances of the apps and platforms. Through these, the material agency of a particular platform influences the styles of visual communication. Schreiber gives examples of decisions about a photo's value and 'beauty' that are based on the social network targeted and the respective audience. Since most platforms afford circulation of the image data beyond a user's immediate circle of friends and family, public and interpersonal communication intertwine. In networked environments, contexts collapse, audiences get renegotiated, and the act of sharing has to be considered anew. Established boundaries between interpersonal and public communication, alongside traditional practices of social inclusion and exclusion, undergo transformations as visual communication starts to take place across diverse social media platforms. Schreiber illustrates how these novel practices of visual communication emerge in relation to the social settings of production, with regard to the intended audience and in negotiation with the affordances of the mobile phone and software used.

In 'Mobile Mediated Visualities: An Empirical Study of Visual Practices on Instagram', Elisa Serafinelli and Mikko Villi speak to the benefits of studying mobile visual communication from a practice-based perspective. By focusing on the mediation of practices and the role that visual communication plays in it, they discuss four elements that play a significant role in the lives of their study participants. Firstly, the mobility of mobile phones used for photo-sharing allows 'on-the-go' capturing of images, which enables creation of spheres of connection between the photographer and his or her broader social network. The apps used for sharing these photos, such as Instagram, provide a framework, and at times a reason, for taking and sharing photos in the first place. Secondly, motivations for photo-sharing give orientation to specific photographic actions. Taking and sharing pictures yields feelings of personal satisfaction, calls for reciprocal inter-actions, and provides an avenue to experiencing new kinds of images. Thirdly, the sharing is carefully orchestrated, providing rhythms of photographic expressions, which may be followed very strictly, as some participants reported doing. Finally, the use of the devices evolves over time, changing as people become more expe-rienced in taking pictures, learning what kinds of images are liked, and hence providing an opportunity to incorporate digital devices, with a particular fit, into day-to-day life.

Stefan Werning takes a tack different from this by focusing his discussion of social-media platforms on the uses of Facebook's official API and on IFTTT, a service for app 'remixes' via Facebook. Collecting 490 IFTTT applets and 378 mash-ups on ProgrammableWeb, Werning proceeded to analyse the kinds of applets created for automating tasks performed via social media, such as sending birthday greetings, sharing Instagram photos, making Periscope broadcasts over Facebook, or sharing a random Wikipedia article every Wednesday. These auto-mated tasks are highly relevant for mobile digital practices, because they momen-tarily stabilise uncertain situations by allowing repetition of specific kinds of actions. Both the mobility of particular data flows and their automation are part of co-construction and joint maintenance of social norms. As the examples above show, the tasks automated are relatively simple and usually harmless (though automated repetition of certain actions may have undesired social consequences). With APIs tending to limit the kinds of applets that are actually supported on social-media platforms, Werning shows convincingly that automation of mobile digital practices is very much directed in specific ways. Not all kinds of acts may be repeated.

Julia Hildebrand's paper 'Situating Hobby Drone Practices' calls into question the concept of cybermobilities with regard to the heterogeneous assemblage of human and non-human actors in motion. From this standpoint, recreational drone practice is described not only in terms of mobilities but also with regard to immo-bilities, especially the unstable speed of the drone flight and the complementary steadiness of the pilot's body on the other side of the picture. At the same time, these mobile digital practices are characterised by the recordings and 'screen outs',

which recursively influence hobby drone practice itself. It is of particular significance that the article describes considerably different digital practice in offline vs. online environments. While drone hobbyists most often keep a 'low profile' in the physical space by adjusting their flight in respect for the presence of others or by manoeuvring the drone very carefully, pilots try to present a 'high profile' in the virtual sphere by sharing their images and demonstrating the visibility of their practical actions. Therefore, this mobile digital practice can be understood as a risk-and-return process that is characterised by greater 'social investment' within the online world.

Rashmi M. offers a conceptualisation of mobile phones as digital technologies rather than communication technologies, in his short article 'The Inchoate Field of Digital Offline: A Reflection on Studying Mobile Media Practices of Digital Subalterns in India'. While, as he points out, mobile phones have from their very beginnings been meant to be digital personal assistants rather than mere communication devices, they are appropriated in other ways. Here, he considers the offline digital practices of 'digital subalterns' in Bangalore, India. These 'low-end informal-sector urban working populations' (p. 221), often are unable to afford a mobile Internet connection and therefore use their mobile devices mostly offline for audio and video consumption. With large numbers of people there gaining access to digital technology through mobile-phone interfaces, Rashmi offers grounds for his argument that mobile phones may be better considered digital media complexes and infrastructure than communication devices. He uses his case study to introduce methodological considerations, which include the accountability of digital data not being a given, on account of the offline field. Much depends on offline data collection tied to inchoate yet patterned practices that are digitally invisible; unlike the structured practices afforded by such elements as social-media platforms, which media researchers in many other settings can benefit from.

Cherry Baylosis argues that the intersection of digital practices, mobility, and mad studies is useful for opening possibilities for research that delves into alternatives to asymmetrical accounts of experiences of madness. By focusing particularly on voice as the capacity to self-represent, she strives to question dominant power relations between those who are labelled 'mentally ill' and those who do the labelling. When one privileges expert voices, alternative readings of what counts as mad are not taken into account. For example, the Hearing Voices Network presents auditory hallucinations as meaningful forms of human experience, which the group argues do not need to be medicalised. The opportunity to create, publish, and share alternative voices digitally with ease allows a variety of actors, including those called mentally ill, to broaden our understandings of madness. In focusing on digital practices, Baylosis seeks to draw attention to the potential of voice by using relatively new technologies.

'Mobile Freelancers without a Stable Workplace', by Nadia Hakim Fernandez, is about a research project on mobile labour. Taking a reflexive methodological

approach, the author uses her experience as a mobile academic freelancer as a starting point. Recalling her struggle to find an adequate workplace while travelling between cities and moving about within the same city, Fernandez reflects on the epistemological conditions of fieldwork in today's mobile and precarious work arrangements. Her auto-ethnographic account recounts the struggle of an academic to find the right workplace. The methodological framework is extended with digital geolocalised data gathered via the participant's mobile devices. The mixed-methods approach allows for thick and contextualised description of nomadic freelance labour 'through the lens of the labourer's experience' (p. 238). The approach is well in line with constructivist practice-based thinking, which builds on the premise that a field is not a given that can easily be discovered but a phenomenon constructed by the researcher. The piece highlights that the 'technological landscape' (p. 239) inhabited by researcher and participants alike is part of the construction. In this context, Fernandez highlights that the terms 'online' and 'offline' do not refer to separate locations within a field; they are articulations of work practices and affordances of locations. Mobile freelancers cross geographical and political boundaries and can be described by a shared set of practices deployed to make a new workplace daily.

The contributions to the special issue provide numerous insights into the reciprocal relations among mobility, the digital, and practices. The various papers show how inherently unstable interactions are situationally stabilised with a directionality provided by movement, with the momentary inscriptions and renderings created by digital means. A property specific to digital mobility is its relational correspondence to physical movement in space (see the papers of Anderson, Collins, Fernandez, Ganzert et al., Hildebrand, Hobbis, and Schulze in this issue). For mobile digital practices, this implies that we are not dealing simply with parallelism and interdependency between online and offline practices. Frequently, there is sequentiality of practices, which shift from a digital space into a non-digital space, and vice versa.

Hence, 1) digitality is a condition of possibility for contemporary mobile practices. At the same time, 2) mobility is a condition of possibility for the emergence and formation of a digital practice – e. g., as photo-sharing practices are shaped by affordances in motion, as shown in this issue by Schreiber and by Serafinelli and Villi. Lastly, 3) digitality is not something that is present or absent *per se*; it must be practically accomplished at individual level and also in co-operation, as is demonstrated in the paper by Fernandez. We find that a triangular relation of reciprocal contingency emerges that characterises mobile digital practices.

From this perspective, it is not surprising that the part played by the digital in the authors' contributions pulls in several directions. For example, Coates sees the digital as leading to reinforcement of pre-existing social practices, and Collins distinguishes among digital, spatial, and social practices, while Rashmi describes digital technologies as rendering patterned practices invisible.

On account of the heterogeneity of the phenomena described as mobile digital practices, a practice theory of digital media faces serious challenges. Couldry, for example, has listed various 'digital practices', connected to media in varying degrees. He starts with 1) 'acts aimed specifically at media', proceeds via 2) 'acts performed through media', and moves on to 3) 'acts whose preconditions are media' (Couldry 2012: 57). He includes among these basic digital practices 'searching and search-enabling', 'showing and being shown', 'presencing', and 'archiving' but also rather habitual practices of 'keeping up with the news', 'commentary', 'keeping all channels open', and 'screening out'. Even though these are rather general practices, they do show that particular media can condense and explicate practices. They are part of unifying and simplifying machinery, since media tend to transduce only certain elements of a complex and variation-rich practice – that is, they represent on one hand and transform on the other (see Kitchin/Dodge 2011: 71ff.). Therefore, practices can never be conceived of without their supporting or enabling media, something that is increasingly discussed by means of the notion of infrastructure (Gillespie/Boczkowski/Foot 2014).

Many of the theoretical media practice deliberations are focused on certain digital technologies, such as those of various social-media sites, that appear to provide a basis for 'digital practices'. Such an approach does have the disadvantage of not being able to explain the emergence of new practices, dysfunctional practices, or workarounds. Therefore, scholarship focusing on digital practices must address the multitude of ways in which the digital is played out, as the contributions in this issue show. Thereby, analysis of mobile digital practices can add to our understanding of the emergence of significant technological changes unfolding through the history, development, and genealogy of digital media.

The special-issue contributions show that especially 'searching and search-enabling' (see Schulze) but also 'showing and being shown' (see Schreiber and Serafinelli/Villi) are significant for mobile digital practices. Both are practical actions characterisable by ambiguity between closed/private and broadcast/public communication. 'Presencing' (see Baylosis), 'archiving' (see Ganzert et al.), and 'screening out' (see Hobbis) also play a significant role. At the same time, some practices may no longer be questioned, since they seem to have become a given part and background condition of all mobile digital practices for some, as in the case of 'keeping all channels open'.

This leads us back to the more fundamental question of what a 'media practice theory' in the future may be, beyond the initial focus on media or digital technologies. One possible path forward has been laid with the ethnomethodology of Garfinkel. Considering his praxeological approach, one can argue that mobile digital practices unfold a permanent switch back and forth between documentary and procedural aspects as demonstrated in Schulze's paper, where media text offers reasoned accounts for imaginable journeys that need not have anything to do with mobile practices carried out *in vivo*. In their procedural form, media are

much more resistant and addressed as a constituent 'embedded' detail of a spatial practice. As Garfinkel (1996) observed:

Under conditions of procedural description the map's [or, more generally, any mobile medium's] properties of order are unmediated, directly and immediately observed territorial objects. These territorial objects are observed in and as of a phenomenal field of ordered details of recurrence and generality – i. e. of structures.

The assortative properties of the media are linked chiastically and are inseparable from the spatial practices of a mobile human body. Hence, as many of the case studies here show, the production and distribution of media content takes place as a negotiation of the imagined addressee, specific aesthetics, and affordances, which all are in motion.

When we take a much more general view of media as practice, it can be argued that the future will see a need for analysing mobile digital practices such as 'searching and search-enabling', 'showing and being shown', 'presencing', 'archiving', and 'screening out' each in its specific documentary and procedural dimension. Future research based on the 'Lebenswelt Pair' of document + procedure might in this way bring a mobile digital praxeology into bloom.

References

Abend, Pablo (2018): "From map reading to geobrowsing: Methodological reconsiderations for Geomedia." In: Tilo Felgenhauer/Karsten Gabler (eds.), Geographies of Digital Culture, London/New York: Routledge, 97–111, (forthcoming).

Chau, Adam Yuet (2008): "The Sensorial Production of the Social." In: Ethnos: Journal of Anthropology 73, pp. 485–504.

Couldry, Nick (2010): "Theorising Media as Practice." In: Birgit Bräuchler/John Postill (eds.), Theorising Media and Practice, New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 35–54.

Couldry, Nick (2012): Media, Society, World: Social Theory and Digital Media Practice, Malden: Polity.

Garfinkel, Harold (1996): Notes Comparing Two Analytic Formats of Occasion Maps and Way Finding Journeys: 'Documentary' and 'Essentially Procedural'. Unpublished manuscript. University of California at Los Angeles, 24 February.

Gillespie, Tarleton/Boczkowski, Pablo J./Foot, Kirsten A. (eds.) (2014): Media technologies. Essays on communication, materiality and society, Cambridge/London: The MIT Press.

Kitchin, Rob; Dodge, Martin (2011): Code/Space: Software and Everyday Life, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Knorr Cetina, Karin; Preda, Alex (eds.) (2004): The Sociology of Financial Markets, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krämer, Sybille (1998): "Das Medium als Spur und als Apparat." In: Sybille Krämer (ed.), Medien, Computer, Realität. Wirklichkeitsvorstellungen und Neue Medien, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, pp. 73–94.

Krämer, Sybille (2007): Was also ist eine Spur? Und worin besteht ihre epistemologische Rolle? Eine Bestandsaufnahme. In: Sybille Krämer/Werner Kogge/ Gernot Grube (eds.), Spur. Spurenlesen als Orientierungstechnik und Wissenskunst, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, pp. 11–33.

Latour, Bruno (1991): "Technology Is Society Made Durable." In: John Law (ed.), A Sociology of Monsters: Essays on Power, Technology, and Domination, London/New York: Routledge, pp. 103–132.

Latour, Bruno (2005): Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory, New York: Oxford University Press.

Latour, Bruno/Woolgar, Steve (1979): Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts, Beverly Hills, California: SAGE.

Lehmuskallio, Asko/Gómez Cruz, Edgar (2016): "Why Material Visual Practices?" In: Edgar Gómez Cruz/Asko Lehmuskallio (eds.), Digital Photography and Everyday Life: Empirical Studies on Material Visual Practices, London/New York: Routledge, pp. 1–16.

Ott, Michaela (2015): Dividuationen. Theorien der Teilhabe, Berlin: b.-books.

Pickering, Andrew (1995): The Mangle of Practice: Time, Agency, and Science, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pickering, Andrew (2001): "Practice and Posthumanism: Social Theory and a History of Agency." In: Theodore R. Schatzki, Karin Knorr Cetina, Eike von Savigny (eds.), The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory, London/New York: Routledge, pp. 172–183.

Ramella, Anna Lisa (2017): "Medienpraktiken 'on the road': Social Media im Kontext von Musikmarketing." In: Mark Dang-Anh, Simone Pfeifer, Clemens Reisner, Lisa Villioth, (eds.): Medienpraktiken: Situieren, erforschen, reflektieren. In: Navigationen: Zeitschrift für Medien- und Kulturwissenschaften, 17/1, pp. 37–54.

Reckwitz, Andreas (2002): "Toward a Theory of Social Practice: A Development in Culturalist Theorizing." In: European Journal of Social Theory 5/2, pp. 243–263.

Schatzki, Theodore R. (2001): "Introduction: Practice Theory." In: Theodore R. Schatzki/Karin Knorr Cetina/Eike von Savigny (eds.), The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory, London/New York: Routledge, pp. 10–23.

Schatzki, Theodore R. (2002): The Site of the Social: A Philosophical Account of the Constitution of Social Life and Change, University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Schüttpelz, Erhard (2018): "Epilogue: Media Theory before and after the Practice Turn." In: Ulrike Bergermann/Monika Dommann/Erhard Schüttpelz/Jeremy

Stolow/Nadine Taha (eds), Connect and Divide: The Practice Turn in Media Studies (proceedings of the 3rd DFG conference on media studies), Zürich/Berlin: Diaphanes; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, (forthcoming).

Swidler, Ann (2010): "What Anchors Cultural Practices?" In: Birgit Bräuchler/John Postill (eds.), Theorising Media and Practice, New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 83–101.

Thielmann, Tristan/Schüttpelz, Erhard (eds.) (2013): Akteur-Medien-Theorie, Bielefeld: transcript.