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ABSTRACT

In a growlingly digital world, scholars must understand the changes in textuality and communication associated with Web 2.0 technologies to incorporate potential pedagogical benefits to language curricula. For example, with the affordance of these technologies, language learners (LL) are increasingly exposed to language contact zones found both on and offline. A practice that could potentially support the communicative practices of LL within these multilingual spaces is translanguaging, or the use of strategies employed by LL when engaging with diverse codes by utilizing the resources of their semiotic repertoire as well as their language(s). Previous research has focused principally on contexts of bilingual education and identity formation vis-à-vis translanguaging. Therefore, the present study is the first to examine the actual translanguaging practices of second language (n=5) and heritage language learners (n=5) of Spanish in a digital language contact zone: Facebook affinity spaces, or common interest spaces. The dynamic data gathered from screen capture recordings of the participants’ interactions and think-aloud protocols in the affinity spaces, stimulated recall interviews, and written reflections were analyzed using content analysis and critical discourse analysis.

This analysis revealed key findings in the data that focused on translanguaging practices, negotiation strategies, and performative competence - or the procedural knowledge which focuses on how learners communicate rather than what they communicate. First, the participants displayed a preference toward the separation of languages in written output, adhering to the ideals of linguistic purism, while simultaneously engaging in translanguaging practices via non-linguistic semiotic
resources, such as the use of emojis, in their communication. Second, the participants’ self-reported proficiency levels for their writing abilities in Spanish correlated with their use of outside digital resources as a mediation tool. The findings show that, theoretically, the conceptualization of communicative competence must be expanded in order to incorporate the languaging practices of interlocutors in digital contexts. Pedagogically, educators need to support the development of LLs’ digital literacies, or communicative practices that are facilitated by technology, and address the bias toward linguistic purism to help students reap the cognitive benefits offered by translanguage practices.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In the mid 1990s, 36 million people had access to the internet across the globe. By 2012, that number had exploded to an astonishing 2.2 billion users. As of December, 2017, the number of world-wide internet users reached 4.15 billion (internetworldstats, 2018). In conjunction with this rapidly expanding number of internet users, the presence of computer-assisted language learning (CALL) in second language (L2) classrooms has been on the rise; this has taken the form of technology integration in the classroom, hybrid learning environments, distance and online L2 courses, and supplemental language learning platforms. In order to most effectively adjust to this quickly changing digital environment in conjunction with education, it is paramount that multilingualism and the development of digital literacies (DL), or the communicative practices that are facilitated by technology (Hafner, Chik, & Jones, 2015), take a central role in language education.

As technologies form an ever more ubiquitous part of daily life for many, communication in the digital realm has undergone significant changes, moving from the “single-authored, static documents” (Herring, 2013, p. 2) typical of Web 1.0 technologies, to the collaborative and ever-changing media present in Web 2.0. The type of communication present in these Web 2.0 technologies differs radically from previous computer-mediated communication (CMC), moving away from the original human-computer interactions that were fostered by these technologies to human-human interactions by means of technology (Blake, 2013); communication has shifted from independent, stand-alone sources such as email or online encyclopedias, to a merging of
these mediums with others, such as video chat platforms, FaceTime and Skype, or wiki-style encyclopedias like Wikipedia. For instance, this merger can be evidenced by the ability to include photos, sound, and video through messaging services or the ability to leave textual comments on photos or other posts within digital media platforms, such as online news sources. These semiotic resources and communicative changes have great potential for language learning as they allow learners to be “...able to produce as well as merely consume content and learning materials” (Thomas, Reinders, & Warschauer, 2013, p. 4). Canagarajah (2013) wisely observed the effects that the digital age has had on modern communication when he noted, “The social and technological changes of late modernity compel us to relate to texts differently. Internet has introduced new forms of textuality and brought out our capacity to read and write differently” (p. 129).

This changing interface between technologies, communication, and learning brings the development of DL to center stage. In order to remain in the forefront of the fields of instructed Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and language pedagogy, it is crucial that scholars understand these changes in textuality, and consequently, in communication and work to incorporate any potential pedagogical benefits they may bring to the table for language curricula. In order to best prepare language learners for the communicative demands of an increasingly digitized world, it is the responsibility of educators in all contexts, including K-12 and higher education, to foster DL in order “...to be able to work and collaborate in new contexts where the borders between the visual and the real and between the distant and the proximate are increasingly blurred” (Dooly & O'Dowd, 2012, p. 15). Ortega (2017) recognized that this blurring of previously distinct spaces and concepts is also present at the intersection of the fields of SLA and CALL.
She argues that the inclusion of multilingualism must be incorporated into the field of SLA to best and most equitably serve language learners in the digital age. Ortega (2017) noted “Technology, like multilingualism, should be normalized by now in our lives yet, like multilingualism, it adds to the complex picture of inequity” (p. 288). One way in which to include both multilingualism and the development of DL in language education is through the inclusion of *translanguaging*, or the use of learners’ entire communicative repertoire (García & Li Wei, 2014).

In these digital contexts --personal, professional, or educational -- the inclusion of the concept of multilingualism that Ortega (2017) argues for is evident. As Dooly and O’Dowd (2012) mention, these virtual borders are less concrete with the instantaneous communication afforded by digital technologies. This opens the opportunity for language contact in digital mediums that was previously not possible to learners at the click of a button. In order to harness the great learning potential of this digital language contact within SLA and CALL, a reconceptualization of how learners use language must be explored in the form of *translanguaging*, or the use of strategies employed by learners when engaging with diverse codes by utilizing the resources of their semiotic repertoire as well as their language(s) (Canagarajah, 2013). This approach allows learners to use all the tools at their disposal to make meaning in these multimodal, multilingual contexts. García and Li Wei (2014) offer up an example of this combination of semiotic resources and language: a heart shape filled in with the image of a Chinese flag is “read” as “I love China” although there is no actual written language involved in the content. The reader is able to piece together the symbols and transform it into something comprehensible to them.
While translanguaging itself has been widely explored in the context of bilingual education (e.g., Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García, 2011; García & Kleyn, 2016; Paulsrud et al., 2017), very little has explored these language practices and their development in digital contexts for L2 learners. This doctoral dissertation will take the form of a mixed-methods exploratory study that aims to understand how L2 learners of Spanish utilize translanguaging practices in digital affinity spaces within the social networking site (SNS) Facebook as well as comparing their practices to those of Heritage Language Learners (HLLs) of Spanish. These HLLs, a group of bi/multilingual students whose characteristics will be further explored in the following sections, closely mirror the multilingual language users that formed the basis of Canagarajah’s (2013) description of *performative competence*, the procedural knowledge that focuses on how interlocutors communicate, for multilinguals which is necessary in navigating these multilingual spaces. Due to the prevalence of mixed classrooms in today’s educational settings, or classrooms that have both L2 and HL learners (Carreira, 2016), it is imperative that both populations of learners and their languaging practices are understood in order to best facilitate language learning. Although other SNSs, such as Snapchat and Instagram, have risen in popularity with young adults over the past few years, Facebook was chosen as the platform for this research due to its multimodal features and the affordances of the platform that allow for translanguageing in areas of language contact. These features include the potential to include photos, videos, memes, GIFs, and emoticons in posts as well as the translation of texts feature and the ability to not only ‘like’ a post, but also to choose ‘love’, ‘angry’, ‘wow’, ‘sad’, or ‘haha’ as a “reaction” to the content. These affordances will be further explored in the *Digital Literacies, Social Media, and Affinity*
private section of this chapter. The use of Facebook as the platform for the present research also stemmed from the existing research on multilingual practices in Facebook and the tendency of this platform to promote translingual practices (Blyth & Dalola, 2016; Oliver & Nguyen, 2017).

By means of an online ethnographic approach this study will be the first to explore the intersection of language learners, translanguage practices, and affinity spaces within SNSs. The goal of this research is to better understand language learners’ performative competence as evidenced by their use of translanguaging negotiation strategies (Canagarajah, 2013) to navigate multilingual digital environments and how L2 learners’ use of these strategies compares to HLLs. The findings will serve to inform pedagogical practices in order to best serve these language learners and to add to the debate about the role of translanguaging practices in language pedagogy. In order to best understand these concepts, explore the data, and delve into the results and implications, this doctoral dissertation will take the shape of seven chapters: (i) an introduction which will include an exploration and definition of the key constructs for this study: translingual practices, code-switching and translanguage, DL and SNSs, and HLLs vs. L2 learners; (ii) a review of relevant literature to the present study, justification for the study and research questions; (iii) a breakdown of the methodology including a description of participants, instruments, procedures, and data analysis methods; (iv) data analysis of the HLL participants; (v) data analysis of the L2 participants; (vi) a discussion of the results and potential pedagogical implications of these findings; and finally (vii) a conclusion.

This introductory chapter will explore the key concepts that are crucial in understanding the themes present in the current research. Four sections will be broken
down into greater detail here: (i) translingual practices, (ii) code switching and translanguaging, (iii) digital literacies, social media, and affinity spaces, and finally (iv) HLLs vs. L2 learners.

**Key Constructs**

**Translingual Practices**

As more language contact is evident in digital spaces in conjunction with the prevalence of multilingualism, a reconceptualization of languages as a practice must be considered. Viewing language(s) as a practice rather than as a set system is not a new perspective; terms such as *crossing* (Rampton, 1995), *transidiomatic practice* (Jacquemet, 2005), *polylingualism* (Jørgensen, 2008), *metrolingualism* (Otsuji & Pennycook, 2010), *multivocality* (Higgins, 2009), *codemeshing* (Canagarajah, 2011a), and *bilianguaging* (Mignolo, 2000), to name a few, have surfaced in an attempt to explain the practice of multiple language use. Although Ortega (2017) speaks frequently of multilingualism in her discussion of the intersection of SLA and CALL, *translanguaging* is perhaps a more appropriate construct in working toward the inclusion of multilingual individuals in L2 education. While multilingualism may be seen as an additive term that positions each language as its own separate system and unintentionally reinforces a monolingual ideology, *translingual practices* or *translanguaging*, originally born from the field of bilingual education, conceptualizes language as a “series of social practices and actions by speakers that are embedded in a web of social and cognitive relations” (García & Wei, 2014, p. 9). These relations then take into account the dynamic interactions of languages, communities, and contexts (Canagarajah, 2013). This conceptualization of language use as interconnected is vital in combating the prevalent
monolingual ideology. This ideology, or “beliefs, or feelings, about language as used in their social worlds” (Kroskrity, 2004, p. 498), views multilingualism as a consequence of immigration and is often manifested in the United States as an English-only ideology (Wiley & Lukes, 2014). Previous constructs associated with monolingual ideologies have painted multilingual individuals as non-native speakers. The viewpoint that one is only capable of having one native language takes ownership of the speaker’s language(s) away from them and often regards the minority language as deficient or as a variety that is riddled with interference from the dominant language (Canagarajah, 2011b). However, Grosjean (1982) points out that, rather than two monolingual individuals in one, a bilingual is a unique language user whose experiences are reflected in their language use.

This damaging monolingual bias is seen even in publications associated with the North American branch of the Academy for Spanish Language (Academia Norteamericana de la Lengua Espanola) which compares the use of “non standard” features of a language, such as the “mistaken” use of words born of English influence, with the variety spoken in Spain to Tarzan-type speak that, while understood, is a “less adequate” method of communication: “Tarzán, el hombre-mono, podia comunicarse con Jane a la manera tarzanesca: ‘Yo ser fuerte’. Y no faltará quien argumente que basta que uno comprenda el mensaje para que resulte suficiente. Sin embargo el lenguage primitivo y balbuceante no es el vehículo más adecuado para la comunicación”/ [Tarzan, the man-ape, could communicate with Jane by means of Tarzanesque speak: ‘I be strong’. And no one would argue that this is enough to understand his message. However, this primitive and babbling language is not the most adequate vehicle for communication] (Piña-Rosales et al., 2010, p. 1-2). This book, which encourages speakers to speak “well,”
reminds its readers that borrowings from other languages that have risen from language contact, such as the use of the English word *look* by speakers of Spanish in the United States, should be avoided when “standard” Spanish words such as *imagen* or *aspecto* are available to the learner/speaker (Piña-Rosales et al., 2010). These suggestions have such a weak theoretical foundation that the authors go so far as to erroneously suggest that some words born of a monolingual Spanish influence are calques or borrowings from English; publications such as this offer no sociolinguistic research or theoretical background to support their suggestion (Lynch & Potowski, 2014) that these translingual practices should be eliminated. The research to date on translanguaging has shown positive cognitive benefits for students who draw upon semiotic resources that go beyond linguistic systems for communicating ideas (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012; Oliver & Nguyen, 2017), a finding that is clearly ignored in publications that favor a monolingual ideology.

Several terms have been proposed to define the concept of translanguaging within the fields of bilingualism and SLA (Canagarajah, 2013; García & Li Wei, 2014; Ortega, 2017). The pioneering term comes from the Welsh word *trawsieithu* (Williams, 1994, 1996) which was used to describe the pedagogical practice of alternating languages by part of the students. This alternation between languages was meant to foster a more profound understanding of both languages by serving the students’ receptive and/or productive use of the language (Garcia & Kleyn, 2016; García & Li Wei, 2014).

As previously mentioned, the present study bases the definition of translingual practices on the ideas put forth by Canagarajah (2013) as the use of strategies employed by learners when engaging with diverse codes by utilizing the resources of their semiotic
repertoire, which includes their language(s) as well as other forms of communication (e.g., the use of graphics, emoticons). While these translingual practices were originally conceptualized in the field of bilingualism, they are also crucial in the language development of L2 learners, as well as bi/multilingual HLLs, at all levels; Ortega (2017) points out that “languaging is translanguaging, even for monolinguals” (p. 291). All users of language, whether they are monolingual, multilingual, or emergent bilinguals display multilingual competencies. For example, although a monolingual English speaker may not include the use of Spanish or Farsi in their languaging practices, they still incorporate the use of multiple registers and discourses within the language that they possess (Canagarajah, 2011b): an informal register of English to speak with close friends, abbreviations and emojis when sending text messages, or a more formal, standardized register when sending emails at work.

L2 learners may be seen as emergent bilinguals, or “...those who are developing an additional language” (Celic & Seltzer, 2011, p. 5). Viewing these L2 learners as emergent bilinguals is a reminder that they are not simply adding a second, or third or fourth, language that is a separate entity from their L1; they are continuing to develop the system of languages at their disposal which all work together in communication (Celic & Seltzer, 2011). Also key to the concept of emergent bilinguals is the idea that one does not have to have perfect command of an L2 to be considered an emergent bilingual. Rather, “In translingual practice, one can adopt language resources from different communities without ‘full’ or ‘perfect’ competence in them (as traditionally defined)...”(Canagarajah, 2013, p. 10). Therefore, L2 students who may not have an
extremely advanced ability with the L2 are still able to incorporate the parts of the language that they do know into their languaging practices.

This conceptualization of emergent bilinguals applies to HLLs as well, owing to the development of more formal registers of their heritage language (HL) that this population experiences. The concept of translanguaging is not an attempt to replace bilingualism --rather it seeks to transform its conceptualization in order to include the extensive repertoire of semiotic practices that multilinguals possess that serve to help speakers adapt to globalized situations, whether face-to-face or digital (García & Li Wei, 2014).

The emergence of the concept of translanguaging has not been without pushback in the academic community. One argument that calls into question the concept of translilingual practice is that several definitions have surfaced since the term’s beginnings in bilingual education in 1994 (Williams), which at times causes confusion about what exactly translanguaging consists of. As described by Jaspers (2018), “...translanguaging can apply to an innate instinct that includes monolinguals; to the performance of fluid language use that mostly pertains to bilinguals; to a bilingual pedagogy; to a theory or approach of language; and to a process of personal and social transformation” (p. 3). These various definitions may serve to represent translanguaging as the fluid use of language(s) in conjunction with semiotic resources, as a pedagogical approach, or as a natural instinct at the disposal of the speaker. MacSwan (2017) argues that clarification about the term is necessary to avoid contradictory uses of the term in linguistic and educational research. While varying definitions do exist to describe the phenomenon of translanguaging, it is important to note that not all scholars subscribe to all, or even to
more than one, of these meanings (Jaspers, 2018). By specifically prescribing to one definition of translanguaging, the potential confusion of terms or theoretical framing can be avoided.

Another criticism of translanguaging is the difficulty, from a pedagogical standpoint, of identifying errors, and consequently offering constructive or corrective feedback to learners, in learner output. As the theory of translanguaging does not recognize the concept of interference from other languages, but rather conceptualizes all of the learner’s language(s) as a unit that work together as an ecology, it could be argued that there is no such thing as an error in output that occurs during translingual practice (Canagarajah, 2011b). This viewpoint hinders the ability of practitioners to monitor progress and development. For the purposes of the present study, participants’ linguistic output and development of linguistic skills is not the focus of the research. Rather, this study focuses principally on the negotiation strategies, understood as conscious strategies employed by learners to overcome gaps in communication (Lafford, 2004), and performative competence, understood as procedural knowledge which focuses on how learners communicate rather than what they communicate (described in greater depth in chapter 2), demonstrated by the learners.

The transformative claims associated with a translingual pedagogy have also been the source of criticism from some scholars in the field. As Jaspers (2018) explains, “Translanguaging (as pedagogy and practice) is suggested to result in new subjectivities, to give back voice, transform cognitive structures, raise well-being and attainment levels, and eventually to transform an unequal society into a more just world” (p. 3). The author argues that this is a tall order to be filled by one pedagogical approach and/or language
practice. However, he also notes that there is a chasm of difference between arguing that translanguaging will produce these results and arguing that it is capable of producing them (Jaspers, 2018). The one-sided viewpoint that translanguaging produces exclusively positive outcomes is problematic to those concerned with language maintenance. For some languages, such as Native American languages, scholars voice concerns that this type of ecological linguistic approach may detract from the importance of maintaining these minority or heritage languages (Canagarajah, 2011b) or in some cases even cause negative effects or negative identities for the learners (Charalambous, P., Charalambous, C., & Zembylas, 2016).

In response to these criticisms the present research operationalizes translanguaging as a practice consisting of the use of strategies employed by learners/speakers when engaging with diverse codes by utilizing the resources of their semiotic repertoire as well as their language(s) (Canagarajah, 2013). Also, while I do not argue that every context is appropriate for multiple language use or the incorporation of all types of non-linguistic semiotic resources, I argue here that the use of translingual practices in a pedagogical setting, or other appropriate contexts such as SNSs, can support the acquisition of the L2, rather than diminish it. This conceptualization of translanguaging practices as a resource to scaffold the acquisition of a L2 supports Antón and DiCamilla’s (1999) research that demonstrated the effectiveness of incorporating L1 use as a tool to facilitate the acquisition of a L2.

Finally, there is often a misconception in the fields of applied linguistics and SLA that the concept of translanguaging is interchangeable with code switching. While both involve the use of more than one language system, it is vital to understand the
conceptualization of translanguaging and how it differs from other concepts that involve the use of multiple languages which have been introduced in the field. The following section will explore the concepts of code switching and translanguaging in order to delineate the similarities, differences, and relevance of each term for the fields of SLA and CALL.

**Code Switching and Translanguaging**

At first glance, the concept of translanguaging is often misconstrued as synonymous with *code switching*. Poplack (1980) famously brought the study of code switching into the limelight and defined the phenomenon as “...the alternation of two languages within a single discourse, sentence or constituent” (p. 583). Later, MacSwan (1999) described the phenomenon as ”... a speech style in which fluent bilinguals move in and out of two (or conceivably more) languages...” (p. 37). These definitions of code switching conceptualize each of the speaker’s language(s) as separate systems and infers that each “...could be used without reference to the other” (García, 2012, p. 1), as evidenced by the idea of a speaker being able to move out of one language and into another (MacSwan, 1999) without overlap. Consequently, García and Li Wei (2014) describe this key difference between the concepts, ”Translanguaging differs from the notion of code-switching in that it refers not simply to a shift or a shuttle between two languages, but to the speakers' construction and use of original and complex interrelated discursive practices that cannot be easily assigned to one or another traditional definition of a language, but that make up the speakers' complete language repertoire" (p. 22).

Aside from the linguistic features of the languages themselves, translanguaging also differs from code switching in that it takes into consideration the learner’s entire
The importance of the presence of semiotic resources in translanguaging is especially evident in digital mediums. Canagarajah (2013) further explains that, “Technological developments have facilitated interactions between language groups and offered new resources for meshing languages with other symbol systems (i.e., icons, emoticons, graphics) and modalities (i.e., images, video, audio) on the same ‘page’”(p. 2). Due to this striking presence of semiotic resources in the language use of modern multilinguals and emergent bilinguals, it is not possible to treat linguistic resources and semiotic resources as two independent systems; they work together in the process of meaning-making (Canagarajah, 2013). It is vital for pedagogues to understand this ecological perspective that incorporates the use of students’ linguistic, alongside semiotic, resources in order to best serve the language learning process of modern students. One such digital medium that experiences a meshing of language, symbol systems, and diverse modalities are SNSs and the affinity spaces housed within them.

**Digital Literacies, Social Media, and Affinity Spaces**

Countless technologies are now at the fingertips of L2 learners that have the potential to foster collaborative language learning. These include blogs, CMC chat tools, video conferencing, wikis, SNSs, and digital games, to name a few. Research in the fields of SLA and CALL have uncovered many benefits of students engaging in L2 learning by means of CMC. These benefits may be seen in the forms of greater written L2 output (Kern, 1995; Payne & Whitney, 2002; Warschauer, 1997), attention to linguistic form vis-à-vis written CMC (Gurzynski-Weiss & Baralt, 2015; C. Lee, 2013; Warschauer, 1995), lowered anxiety and affective filters in CMC environments (Baralt & Gurzynski-
Weiss; 2011; Chun, 1994, 1998), and an increased potential to form “global learning networks” (Cummins & Sayers, 1995; Gikas & Grant, 2013). In order to harness these potential benefits offered by digital mediums for L2 learners, it is integral to explain the important role that the development of DL play in these learners’ language acquisition journey.

**Digital literacies.** Owing to the changing interactions and relationships built vis-à-vis technology in the personal and professional lives of modern students, the focus of language education must take into account the technology and social media which play a key role in the lives of these learners. In order to integrate these technologies into a language learning experience, the fomentation of DL must become a pedagogical goal. Specifically, DL are defined as “…the practices of reading, writing and communication made possible by digital media” (Hafner et al., 2015, p.1), in both learners’ first language (L1) as well as in their L2. Supporting the acquisition of DL goes hand in hand with language learning as it supports students’ access to “vital information, services and rights” (Ducate & Arnold, 2011, p.5) that are necessary for successful communication and in order to positively contribute to the “social and civic fabric of their communities” (Ducate & Arnold, 2011, p.5). A focus on DL will guide these students in their journey to “…gain the knowledge, skills, and motivation to become autonomous language learners and culturally responsible participants in local and online communities” (Godwin-Jones, 2015, p. 8). The development of DL is also integral in implementing translingual practices in L2 and HL classrooms in order to provide learners with the necessary digital skill set to navigate the technologies that experience high levels of language contact, such as SNSs. This may take the shape of helping learners to develop a digital skill set that
includes the ability to use outside digital resources, such as online dictionaries for vocabulary and grammar support, to help them understand content and create relevant output in multilingual contexts such as SNSs.

As the present study involves both HLL and L2 learners of Spanish, the “digital divide” between U.S. Latinxs and non-hispanic whites cannot be overlooked. In 2007, 56% of U.S. Latinxs used the internet, compared with 71% of non-hispanic whites (Fox & Livingston, 2007). However, the digital divide has narrowed; in 2015 84% of adult Latinxs reported that they use the internet compared with 89% of non-hispanic whites. Although the gap has narrowed considerably, other factors about Latinxs’ technology use should be noted. For example, Latinxs are less likely than non-Hispanic whites to have an internet connection at home, but rather are more likely to access the internet via a smartphone (Brown, López, & Lopez, 2016). In the present study participants utilized computers, rather than mobile devices, to access Facebook (see Chapter 3 for a more in depth discussion of the methodology).

**Social networking sites.** This ability to form “global learning networks” is visible in the use of SNSs for personal and pedagogical purposes; learners can connect with speakers of the target language at the click of a button, granting them access to a wealth of authentic input as well as creating the opportunity for contextualized output (Luke, 2006). Therefore, students who have the opportunity to involve digital, collaborative tools in their language learning experience also have greater access to authentic L2 materials. Blake (2013) goes so far as to posit that the internet “...may be the next best alternative to actually going abroad” (p. 4) due to the wealth of authentic cultural content and native speakers available to learners.
Another perceived benefit of digital tools is the tendency to promote learner autonomy. Autonomous learning encourages students to take responsibility for their own learning vis-à-vis continuous self-reflection (Blake, 2013; Little, 2004). This might take the form of students authoring a social media page during the course of the semester. Students must self-edit and publish for an audience, encouraging them to take responsibility and pride in their writing. In short, the incorporation of digital, collaborative tools to promote CMC in language learning contexts gives learners access to a wider range of L2 materials and allows for more authenticity throughout the learning process (Blake, 2013).

The effect that these platforms have had on communication and discourse in the digital age is also strikingly evident in the way that relationships are built and that communities are developed in CMC environments. One such digital space that demonstrates changes in digital discourse are online *affinity spaces*; these affinity spaces encompass a newfound sense of community and relationships as well as displaying many of the other previously mentioned characteristics of discourse change which will be explored in the following section.

**Affinity spaces.** With the constant development of the previously discussed digital and collaborative tools in conjunction with their mobile availability, these technologies have become daily fixtures in many language learners’ lives. One example of a collaborative digital tool that affords the inclusion of translanguaging while simultaneously fomenting the potential benefits of CMC are globalized digital *affinity spaces* (Hafner et al., 2015). With roots in the idea of *communities of practice* (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002), the concept of affinity spaces originated with Gee (2004)
who describes eleven components that make up these digital spaces. These components include a common endeavor, i.e., the uniting factor of its members, the inclusion of all types of knowledge and all ranks of members, and the existence of various routes to participation and status achievement within the group. Within these affinity spaces, or digital spaces where users can share common interests and distributed knowledge (Davies, 2006; Gee, 2004; Rama, Black, Van Es, & Warschauer, 2012), learners “have the potential to facilitate L2 development in ways that may complement and extend the learning that goes on in language classrooms” (Rama et al., 2012, p. 325). The communicative practices utilized in these affinity spaces often involve the remix and collaboration of joint text-making practices (Hafner et al., 2015).

Although these affinity spaces are commonly associated directly with digital gaming and fan faction (Chik, 2014; Rama, et al., 2012; Thorne, Black, & Sykes, 2009), many other digital communities have begun to harness the potential of affinity spaces. These include private businesses who have created affinity spaces for their customers or even internally for their employees, social activists (Gee, 2004), and SNSs such as Flickr (Davies, 2006) and Facebook which provide a wealth of common interest pages in a wide array of languages. Owing to the open access nature of many of these affinity spaces within SNSs, speakers of many languages may participate. Within an SNS such as Facebook, affinity spaces offer not only a multilingual contact zone for speakers of many languages with a shared common interest, but also the opportunity to invoke translanguaging practices through the affordances of the platform. For example, text-based messages that are written in a language that differs from the settings of the user’s profile will be accompanied by a “translate” button, allowing the user to see an instant,
although at times rough, translation into their L1. Although these translations may be
slightly nonsensical at times, even monolingual participants are able to translanguage the
meaning of the message by piecing together what they understand from the written
translation in conjunction with semiotic resources such as images or emoticons that
accompany the post (Ortega, 2017).

However, users are not simply limited to textual exchanges. Rather, they can
share images, videos, and/or emoticons which can support the user’s message for their
multilingual audience. They can also “react” to another user’s post by “liking”, “loving”
or “laughing” at it through designated emoticons (West & Trester, 2013), demonstrating
the “semiotic pressure” that SNS platforms display on discourse (Zappavigna, 2012). The
inclusion of this wide array of semiotic resources allows users to focus more on their
actual interactions with speakers of other languages and the process of effectively
communicating, rather than dedicating their attentional resources exclusively to
linguistically accurate output. The examination of translanguaging practices in
conjunction with DL, SNSs, and affinity spaces is an important step toward better
understanding the language practices of students in these ubiquitous digital contexts that
are growing in popularity for education.

**Heritage Language Learners vs. L2 Learners**

Much of the existing translanguaging scholarship has focused on bi/multilingual
language users. One such population of such bi/multilinguals is that of HLLs. These
learners, according to the more narrow definition of HLLs, are students who have
developed some sort of competency in a language by means of exposure during
childhood (Valdés, 2000). These learners have unique sets of linguistic characteristics,
i.e., they may be able to understand more of the HL than they can produce, have limited reading and/or writing skills, and/or display stigmatized features of the HL such as the use of borrowings, code-switching, and extensions (Beaudrie, Ducar, & Potowski, 2014; Potowski, 2005). These multilingual students frequently engage in translanguaging practices as they often shuffle between languages or they mix languages in familial, social, professional, and educational contexts. HLLs could greatly benefit from the integration of translanguaging as a tool into language pedagogy as it would allow them to access all parts of their linguistic repertoire.

Although translanguaging was originally conceived for bilingual education, Ortega (2017) argues that it is also highly relevant for L2 learners, operationalized for the present research as non-native speakers who begin learning the target language outside the home. L2 learners often study the target language in a classroom setting and do not begin acquiring their L2 until after early childhood, differentiating them from HLLs. She explains that interlocutors can use language(s) and semiotic resources at their disposal regardless of their level of proficiency, meaning that L2 learners even in the beginning stages of language acquisition can call upon resources from their L2 in the translanguaging process. Kramsch and Whiteside (2007) also state that the focus of multilingual interactions should be the ability to effectively communicate rather than displaying “near-native” proficiency in a language or languages. While Kramsch and Whiteside argue that the goal should be on effective communication, there is also some evidence of the use of translanguaging to support the development of the lesser developed language(s) or register in a learner’s repertoire (Baker, 2011; Oliver & Nguyen, 2017). It is also argued in this vein of research that translanguaging is a natural
process for L2 learners and even within a context with strict language use policies in
place, such as in classrooms that adhere to “English only” policies, students will
continue to utilize translanguaging practices (Oliver & Nguyen, 2017). This may take the
shape of internal, or external, translations or the use of negotiation strategies when they
do not know a word in the target language. Therefore, if learners are translanguaging with
or without the consent of the teacher or the institution, it is vital that pedagogues
understand better this phenomenon and how to harness the potential pedagogical benefits
that it offers.

Both HLL and L2 learners form a part of the present research due to the relevance
of translanguaging practices to each group as previously discussed. In addition, mixed
classrooms, or classes that include both HLL and L2 learners, are common in educational
contexts where there is a low number of HLLs or where there are insufficient resources to
create a separate track for the L2 and HL leaners within the institution, among other
reasons (Carreira, 2016). Due to the prevalence of these language learning contexts in
which both L2 and HL students are enrolled, the present study examines both participants
from a HL course as well as an L2 course in order to understand the use of
translanguaging by both groups.

In order to effectively take into account both HLL and L2 learners and their
coeexistence in many language courses, the study of translanguaging practices opens the
door to understanding these learners’ use of their entire linguistic repertoire in order to
communicate in a wide array of contexts, including the digital communicative contexts
found within SNSs. In order to navigate these SNSs and the affinity spaces housed within
them, students must employ the skills that make up their digital literacies. While the
previous sections have demonstrated the changing landscape of technologies in the field of SLA and CALL and their potential benefits for learners, both L2 and HL learners, the issue of integration into L2 curriculum remains. The following section will delve into the theoretical potential for the integration of collaborative digital tools and DL into SLA in order to incorporate the learning potential of translanguaging by means of an in depth look at the relevant existing literature.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

While research that explores translingual practices in language education is relatively new to the field, there is a growing body of empirical research available. Much of this research comes from the field of bilingual education (García & Li Wei, 2014; Garza & Langman, 2014; López, 2012; Martínez, Hikida, & Durán, 2015; Mazak & Herbas-Donoso, 2014; Palfreyman & Al-Bataineh, 2018). However, the use of the term *translanguaging* to describe phenomena produced by L2 learners is gaining traction in the field of SLA and foreign language education (Blyth & Dalola, 2016; Kulavuz-onsal & Vásquez, 2018; Oliver & Nguyen, 2017; Wang, 2016). In order to understand the relevance of this research and the theoretical framework for the present study, this section will explore (i) ecological linguistics as a conceptualization of translanguaging, (ii) the models of communicative competence and their relevance to translanguaging, followed by (iii) an examination of the empirical research as relevant to the present study. Finally, (iv) a justification for the current study and the research questions will be presented.

**Ecological Linguistics**

Translanguaging in and of itself is not an SLA methodology, rather it serves as a conceptualization of the interwoven processes involved in the use of not only the language(s) known to an interlocutor, but also the involvement of other resources and contextual factors. Similarly, language learning as a process can be viewed through an ecological lens. This conceptualization of language learning relies upon the metaphor of a biological ecology in which all organisms and their relationships have an effect on one another and create the system as a whole. Therefore, ecological linguistics focuses on the
relations between language use itself and the context of its use (van Lier, 2004). Within SLA, the ecological perspective allows scholars to approach the psychological, social, and environmental processes of SLA as linked and interwoven, rather than as totally separate processes (Lam & Kramsch, 2003). This interlacing of perspectives also allows SLA as a field to incorporate multilingualism and a focus on social justice to serve modern language learners, not only most effectively but also most equitably by recognizing the language practices and needs of multilingual as well as monolingual learners (Ortega, 2017).

Several components make up the ecological approach to language learning, as explained by Lafford (2009).

1. Language must be studied as a phenomenon situated in context.

2. An ecological linguistic analysis uses an *emic* approach, in which the perspectives of both the learners and language practitioners (e.g., teacher voice) are used to contextualize the data.

3. Language is seen as a ‘system of relations rather than a collection of objects’ (van Lier, 2004, p. 5).

4. Learners acquire language by taking advantage of various *affordances*.

5. Language use is contingent on the communicative needs of the participants in particular speech situations -- in particular, times and places.

6. As language use is contingent and dynamic, feedback given to learners and the evaluation of their linguistic abilities also need to be (a) flexible and adaptive to what learners produce and (b) based on criteria created to appropriately evaluate linguistic outcomes and cultural competence in given contexts.
7. Second language acquisition research and language learning activities should be ecologically valid.

8. An ecological perspective on language, language learning, and education is value-laden and potentially interventionist (p. 674-675).

With this ecological conceptualization of linguistics, translanguage can be viewed as a holistic practice common to all emergent bilinguals and language users. To best understand the actual competences necessary to utilize the language(s) in a learner’s repertoire, the following section will explore the models of communicative competence in reference to translanguage practices for emergent bilinguals in digital environments.

**Models of Communicative Competence**

In order to examine the skills that learners need to navigate the use of a language or languages, we must understand the competencies that make up their ability to communicate. The concept of communicative competence in applied linguistics arose in order to shed light on what it means to acquire a language, the abilities and knowledge needed to use a language, and the objective of learning or teaching a language (Cenoz Iragui, 2004). As a first step toward answering these questions, in the 1960s Chomsky (1965) differentiated between *competence* and *performance* in reference to language acquisition. According to this distinction, *competence* is the internal grammatical knowledge of an idealized native speaker (NS) of the language whereas *performance* is conceptualized as an external process that produces an imperfect realization of that grammatical knowledge. While from Chomsky’s perspective competence and performance are separate concepts, he took a greater interest in the internal processes associated with competence, focusing on grammatical competence. Chomsky (1980) later
defined pragmatic competence as “knowledge of conditions and manner of appropriate use (of the language), in conformity with various purposes” (p. 224); he still centered these competencies on monolingual native speakers (Cenoz Iragui, 2004). This focus on monolingual NSs offers a very limited scope of the users of a language who are present in the real world.

Reactions to Chomsky’s original competence/performance distinction served as the springboard for the concept of communicative competence as an integral part of research in both SLA and L2 pedagogy among scholars (Cenoz Iragui, 2004). Many linguists found Chomsky’s (1965) conceptualization of competence to be a deficient model due to its lack of consideration of learners of a language as well as the lack of focus on the actual use of the language (Cenoz Iragui, 2004). As explained by Cenoz Iragui (2004), many scholars considered that competence according to Chomsky “no tiene una relación directa con la capacidad y habilidad para utilizar una o varias lenguas en la comunicación interpersonal por parte de hablantes monolingües y plurilingües en sociedades multiculturales” [does not have a direct relation with the capacity and ability to use one or various languages in interpersonal communication by monolingual and multilingual speakers in multicultural societies] (p.1). Consequently, Hymes (1972) put forth the first model of what is now known as communicative competence. The impact of Hymes’ model was expansive and resulted in several models that encompassed a wider view of a speaker/learner’s repertoire of linguistic competencies surfaced over the course of the next several decades (Bachman, 1990; Bachman & Palmer, 1996; Canale, 1983; Canale & Swain, 1980; Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, & Thurrell, 1995). These other models, applied outside of the grammatical focus of the
generative grammar approach taken by Chomsky (1965), were more related to the use of the language and to interpersonal interactions that attempted to describe the aspects of learning, knowing, using, and communicating with a language (Cenoz Iragui, 2004). For an outline of the competencies included in these communicative competence models, see Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hymes (1972)</td>
<td>Communicative Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability of Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammatical Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociolinguistic Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canale &amp; Swain (1980)</td>
<td>Communicative Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammatical Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociolinguistic Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discourse Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canale (1983)</td>
<td>Communicative Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammatical Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociolinguistic Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discourse Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachman (1990)</td>
<td>Communicative Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pragmatic Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammatical Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textual Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illocutionary Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociolinguistic Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, &amp; Thurrell (1995)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Communicative Competence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discourse Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actional Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociocultural Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bachman &amp; Palmer (1996)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Communicative Competence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pragmatic Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammatical Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textual Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lexical Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociolinguistic Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. Models of communicative competence and the competencies included in each.*

Although Canale and Swain’s (1980) model, which includes grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence in its description of communicative competence, has dominated the field of SLA for years, likely owing to its simplicity of application, Celce-Murcia et al.’s (1995) model is the most relevant for the purposes of the present research. This model of communicative competence is composed of five components that attempted to resolve the criticism that previous models were incomplete in their accounting for competencies needed for human communication.

**Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, and Thurrell (1995)**

Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) created a model that addressed the criticism of previous models for their lack of complete definitions and lack of a comprehensive consideration of language learners. This model consists of five aspects that form
competence in a language: *discourse competence, linguistic competence, actional competence, sociocultural competence, and strategic competence.*

*Figure 2.* Celce-Murcia et al.’s (1995) model for communicative competence.

**Discursive competence.** Similar to discursive competence as described by Canale (1983), this component consists of the ability to use and organize aspects of a language to create a unified text. Specifically, this includes “*cohesión, deixis, coherencia, estructura genérica y estructura conversacional inherente a la alternancia de turnos*” [cohesion, deixis, coherence, generic structure, and inherent conversational structure and turn taking] (Cenoz Iragui, 2004, p. 9).

**Linguistic competence.** There is also a visible connection between linguistic competence as described by Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) and Canale and Swain’s (1980) model. Linguistic competence here closely mirrors the definition of Canale and Swain’s grammatical competence as the understanding of formal aspects of the language,
including lexical, morphological, syntactic, and semantic elements with the additional inclusion of lexical and phonological aspects.

**Actional competence.** Actional competence, also known as pragmatic competence, is composed of the knowledge of the functions and acts of speech. It is centered on the ability to understand and interpret these linguistic functions.

**Sociocultural competence.** Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) describe sociocultural competence in a similar way that sociolinguistic competence is described in other models (Bachman, 1990; Bachman & Palmer, 1996; Canale, 1983; Canale & Swain, 1980; Hymes, 1972). The differentiating factor here is the depth of their description. This competence is composed of factors based in the social context of the language use, stylistic factors, aspects influenced by the culture in the context of language use, and by non-verbal acts.

**Strategic competence.** Finally, strategic competence is operationalized as the use of communicative strategies. These strategies are key skills in situations in which an interlocutor needs to ask for clarification or help from another speaker. This can be conceptualized as the speaker’s ability to solve communicative problems. Strategic competence is of great importance to the present study as it incorporates the strategic navigation of communicative interactions, including negotiation strategies, common in multilingual interactions and language contact zones.

While a large body of literature makes reference to Canale and Swain’s (1980) model of communicative competence, Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) offer more in-depth definitions. Another important aspect of this model is the relative weight that all the competencies hold: all five competencies are linked and are necessary to achieve
communicative competence (Cenoz Iragui, 2004). It is these connections between all the
different components that support the growth of communicative competence (Celce-
Murcia, 2008). It is an important model both in the field of SLA research and in language
education owing to its direct applicability to pedagogy and its focus on the interactions
between the various components of competence.

**Performative Competence and Negotiation Strategies**

It should be noted that the most recent of the models discussed here, Bachman
and Palmer (1996), was created over twenty years ago. Over the past twenty years the
contexts in which learners engage in language learning have changed drastically owing to
the globalization and digitization of the language classroom. In response to the changes in
the way students are learning languages and to fill the gap that exists in the existing
models of communicative competence for communication in multilingual contexts,
Canagarajah (2013) purports the addition of *performative competence*. Performative
competence (PC) was originally conceptualized for the field of bilingual education and
focuses on how interlocutors communicate rather than what they communicate. This
competence is therefore a “*procedural knowledge*, not the *propositional knowledge* of
either grammatical or communicative competence” (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 173-174)
which is not touched on in Celce-Murcia et al.’s (1995) model of communicative
competence. Six practices comprise the procedural knowledge that is critical in the PC of
interlocutors:

1. Start from your positionality
2. Negotiate on equal terms
3. Focus on practices, not form
4. Co-construct the rules and terms of engagement

5. Be responsive to joint accomplishment and goals

6. Reconfigure your norms and expand your repertoire (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 175)

While the models of Canale and Swain (1980) and Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) do involve problem-solving skills in their description of strategic competence, this facet of communication has become a much more complicated and far-reaching competence since the advent of those models due to the ubiquitous nature of Web 2.0 technologies and the vast quantity of communication that takes place via digital mediums. With the ever more present possibility for the negotiation of meaning to be achieved through the use of digital tools and resources such as digital dictionaries, online translators, and the possibility to include photos and emoticons in output, the concept of alignment is also now a key aspect of PC. Although it originally stemmed from psycholinguistics, alignment in translanguaging is defined as “...connecting semiotic resources, environmental factors, and human subjects in relation to one’s own communicative needs and interests in order to achieve meaning” (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 174). In other words, alignment is the ability of an interlocutor to adapt to the use of various symbolic codes in order to communicate in multilingual contexts. Taking alignment into consideration, PC is key in the development of learners’ communicative competence, especially in contexts that are prone to language contact such as SNSs and affinity spaces.

Within this strategic concept of alignment, several macro-level negotiation strategies are housed which “translinguals use to produce and interpret codes in contact zones” (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 174): envoicing, which focuses on the personal elements of interaction, recontextualization, which focuses on social aspects, interactional, which
focuses on textual components of interaction, and finally entextualization, which is largely contextual (Widiyantao, 2016).

**Envoicing.** This strategy encompasses the encoding of the speaker’s identity and location. Within this strategy it may be difficult to draw the line between representation of self and negotiation of meaning. Envoicing is taking action to “populate language resources with one’s own intentions and histories” (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 80), which may be evidenced in the building of relationships with other speakers or with social groups. This may take the form of self-presentation through use of profile pictures or the use of semiotic resources in order to create a sense of personality in a digital communicative context.

For translinguals, the decision of how to envoice in their communicative interactions is highly strategic. They face decisions such as which language(s) or mixture of languages to use when and with whom. These language users also must strategically navigate the use of non-linguistic elements of language such as laughter in face-to-face contexts or the use of images and emojis in digital interactions to shape their identity as a speaker.

**Recontextualization.** Recontextualization, which takes into account the social aspects of an interaction, requires the interlocutor to address the framing and footing of the interaction (Widiyantao, 2016) in order to facilitate uptake, i.e., the learner’s reaction to feedback in a way that may repair an utterance (or shows the need for repair of an erroneous utterance) (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). In short, this negotiation strategy “amounts to having both sides be comfortable with their differences” (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 81). This may take the shape of framing an interaction in only Spanish if the speaker believes
that their fellow interlocutor will best be able to understand Spanish within the interaction, as opposed to using English or a combination of both languages.

The wider context of an interaction is often ignored in existing research in order to focus on the micro-context. Investigating the macro-context can be difficult, owing to the wide variety of ways that it can appear in any given interaction. Recontextualization strategies may appear as linguistic output, as non-verbal communication, or as the use of semiotic resources. For example, in digital communication that takes place in contact zones, recontextualization may take the form of an interlocutor making the choice of which language(s) to use in order to best facilitate communication with their communication partner.

**Interactional.** This textually-based strategy involves the use of dynamic, collaborative strategies in a reciprocal fashion in order to communicate effectively. These interactional strategies are very much in line with the previously described concept of alignment. They may be listener-initiated or speaker-initiated strategies and often reach outside of the interlocutor’s formal language competence in order to creatively navigate their interaction. One interactional strategy common in multilingual interactions is the let-it-pass strategy, or the choice on behalf of the listener not to ask for clarification in reference to an unclear word or phrase used by the speaker based on “the assumption that it will either become clear or redundant as talk progresses” (Firth, 1996, p. 243). This strategy is illustrated by an interlocutor’s willingness to move past an item that is unintelligible to them or incorrect from their point of view. In multilingual interactions, the let-it-pass strategy allows for the focus to remain on meaning-making and the success of the interaction, rather than on the linguistic accuracy of output (Canagarajah, 2009).
**Entextualization.** Finally, entextualization addresses the contextual factors of negotiation strategies. “It reveals how speakers and writers monitor and manage their productive processes by exploiting the spatiotemporal dimensions of the text” (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 84). The underlying assumption in reference to entextualization is that we can better understand what a speaker wants to communicate by looking at the changes and edits that they make to their output. Within F2F contexts, entextualization strategies may be witnessed by looking at multiple drafts of an essay and the edits that the learner makes. It is important to note here that most decisions that interlocutors make regarding entextualization strategies are done in relation to envoicing and recontextualization factors.

These negotiation strategies, as defined by Canagarajah (2013), offer a more holistic approach to the communication that occurs in contact zones. While they were originally conceptualized with English in contact zones in mind, here I will apply them to multilingual digital contexts that may include English and/or Spanish as well as a number of other languages or communicative systems. In order to further build the theoretical framing for the present research, several empirical studies and their relevance to the present research will be examined in the following section.

**Empirical Research on Translanguaging**

The majority of existing research that addresses the use of translanguaging in educational contexts focuses on translingual practices in bilingual education (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García, 2011; Lasagabaster & García, 2014). While some research does exist that explores the use of translingual practices within SNS environments that are prone to high language contact, such as Facebook, these principally focus on the
negotiation of learner identity through translingual practices (Li Wei & Hua, 2013; Schreiber, 2015; Tagg, 2014). This section will explore seven empirical studies that have played a role in shaping the present research beginning with research that applies to the present study in a more broad, conceptual manner to highlight the presence and prevalence of translanguaging in the field of SLA research. Then research that more closely mirrors the goals and methodology of the present study and the intersection of translanguaging and CALL will be examined.

First, Kramsch and Whiteside (2007) analyzed face-to-face (F2F) multilingual exchanges among immigrants in California. As translanguaging practices are commonplace among the bi/multilingual residents in California in order to communicate in a multicultural community, in this case the San Francisco bay area, these authors explored the language use “...in a global economy that knows no national borders, no standard national languages…” (Kramsch & Whiteside, 2007, p. 913). The authors examined a case study of a Spanish-speaking farmer who shopped through his neighborhood, particularly in a Vietnamese grocery store, for food for his restaurant. In this context English, Maya, Spanish, and Vietnamese are used by the interlocutors to signal symbolic identity through the language they select for their utterances as well as showing resistance to language ideologies that may position Maya as a less prestigious language. Through their research, these scholars called for a reconsideration of three key concepts in SLA: native speaker, interlanguage, and language learner. They argue that these terms must be expanded to include more social and cultural components, aligning these ideas with the social turn in SLA as proposed by Firth and Wagner (1997) and Block (2003). According to Kramsch and Whiteside, it is more important for speakers in
a multilingual context such as this to be able to know when and with whom to use the language(s) they know in order to effectively communicate rather than to be perceived as a (near) native speaker by another interlocutor (Kramsch & Whiteside, 2007). While this study helped to open the door for translanguaging research, its focus on naturalistic face-to-face (F2F) communication left the world of digital multilingual communication as an area still to be addressed.

Ten years later, Tullock and Ortega (2017) reviewed the reports from 401 study abroad (SA) programs covering a 22 year span in their analysis of fluency and multilingualism in SA contexts. Their investigation of the qualitatively-oriented SA studies displayed “...the multilingual nature of SA learning” (p. 16); this finding intersects with the present research as it clearly articulates that language learning, even in an environment such as SA that is widely considered to be monolingual, is multilingual in nature. The authors note that while previously SA was often viewed as a monolingual endeavor in which the learner was expected to perform as a monolingual in the target language during their SA experience, these students all displayed varying degrees of bi/multilingualism and therefore could not be expected to perform as monolinguals or even to experience exclusively monolingual and/or monocultural encounters in the target community. This re-conceptualization of the experiences of these learners as inherently multilingual and multicultural is applicable not only to students in these F2F SA contexts who are able to communicate with family and friends in their L1 while abroad (due to their access to Web 2.0 technologies), but also to students studying at home who have the whole world at their fingertips due also to their use of Web 2.0 technologies such as SNSs.
In an attempt to recognize the crossroads that exist between computer-mediated communication (CMC) and multilingualism, Androutsopoulos (2015) presented a case study of a group of Greek-background secondary school students in Germany and their languaging practices on Facebook. The researcher employed an online ethnographic approach by utilizing systematic observation of the students’ online activities, the collection and analysis of screen data, and the data elicited through direct contact with the users to understand better the students’ linguistic repertoires, language choices, and their use of multilingual communication. Based on the findings, the author proposed the term *networked multilingualism* as a means to describe multilingual practices in CMC environments such as Facebook. Networked multilingualism was found to be constrained by “digital writtenness, access to the global mediascape of the web, and orientation to networked audiences” (Androutsopoulos, 2015, p. 201); this finding led the author to conclude that this networked multilingualism is individual, is modified by genre, and is based on the individual’s stratified repertoire which may include parts of multiple languages or other semiotic resources such as images and signs. Consequently, the author argued that this networked multilingualism is emergent and flexible as it depends on what resources are called upon as the communicative context evolves. While this study made an attempt to include the resources beyond written language that are available to these students within Facebook, the semiotic resources available to students, such as emoticons and image-sharing capabilities, acted as more of a footnote than a focal point of the study.

In order to understand better the role that these semiotic resources may play in multilingual digital environments, Schreiber (2015) examined the multilingual writing
practices of Serbian students at the university level on Facebook. This case study aimed to shed light on the participant’s construction of a multilingual identity through Facebook interactions that were not a part of classroom assignments. She closely examined one student’s use of diverse varieties of his languages, English and Serbian, in conjunction with images and video on the SNS by means of online observation, rhetorical analysis, and stimulated-recall interviews. Schreiber (2015) concluded that the subject of her case study displayed a self-presentation within Facebook that may be typical of many multilingual youths by “…displaying high levels of linguistic creativity and drawing on an assortment of semiotic resources and widely circulating digital texts” (p. 82). Another striking discovery of this case study is the participant’s awareness of the importance of the semiotic resources afforded by Facebook in communicating with an audience that was known to him to be multilingual. This led the author to conclude that his identity was not tied to an individual or separate language(s) and that adopting a translingual lens through which to view these online practices may have implications for language pedagogy.

One empirical study that has noted the implications of a translingual affinity space through the SNS Facebook for language acquisition and pedagogy comes from Blyth and Dalola (2016). Their case study examined the potential of technology to support translingual pedagogy in L2 education through the implementation of a new textbook meant to foster the use of translanguaging. Although the textbook and accompanying materials that the authors created included uses of the learners’ “L1, codemixing, and ‘ungramaticalities’” (p. 298) in an attempt to encourage translanguaging, they noticed very little uptake of translingual practice by their students. However, after the addition of an accompanying translingual affinity space on Facebook, they noticed language mixing
exhibited through language play as well as the acceptance and approval of multilingual language use. The authors credit this use and approval of translilingual practice to the more open and free environment that an affinity space housed within an SNS provides in comparison with a traditional, or even digital, classroom context (Blyth & Dalola, 2016).

In order to further consider these pedagogical implications of translanguaging, Oliver and Nguyen (2017) turned to translingual practices within Facebook as a means to develop linguistic competence by not only incorporating “…students’ actual language practices but it also encourages them to make use of all the language resources at their disposal. All their language skills are thus reinforced and their cognitive and literacy abilities improved” (p. 466). This study examined the translingual practices of seven university students and their use of Aboriginal English in conjunction with Standard Australian English on Facebook over the course of 18 months. These posts were analyzed by means of discourse analysis; the authors found that Facebook offered these participants the opportunity to employ translingual practices that served the creative use of multiple linguistic repertoires, the construction of identity, and the inclusion or exclusion of others from their interactions. Pedagogically, the researchers found that the use of these translanguaging practices within Facebook aided the participants in the development of their proficiency in Standard Australian English, the lesser developed variety of English for these individuals. While this evidence of improvement in a weaker dialect, or language, vis-à-vis translanguaging in CMC environments would add to its potential pedagogical benefits for L2 students and emergent bilinguals, there is a striking lack of research on this population of learners.
In an attempt to fill this void of research on translanguaging for L2 learners and emergent bilinguals, Kulavuz-Onal and Vásquez (2018) utilized computer-mediated discourse analysis to analyze over 1,000 posts in a Facebook group created for students learning English. The L2 English students came from two separate language classes, one with an L1 of Arabic and the other with an L1 of Spanish. Within the Facebook group, which the instructors designated an “English-only” space, the language that all students had in common was their L2 (English). The goal of the interactions within the Facebook group were to provide meaningful interactions in the target language as well as for the students to learn about each other’s home countries and cultures. Interestingly, the students and instructors alike broke the “English-only” rule and incorporated their L1s into the Facebook interactions, even when the other interlocutor in an interaction did not share that L1. The authors argue that this finding is due to “the intentions of the community, the affordances of the internet, and the socialization practices that are intentionally or unintentionally encouraged by the participants” (p. 252). These authors also stated that an implication of these findings was that platforms such as Facebook, which include multi-modal affordances as well as the potential for one-to-many communication that can be synchronous or asynchronous in nature, create an environment that fosters translanguaging practices among students.

This existing research on multilingual and translanguaging practices in both SLA and CALL has brought the ubiquitous nature of multilingualism to light as well as having highlighted the need for a greater understanding of the actual processes and strategies that learners engage in within these multilingual contexts. While research has begun to delve into the pedagogical potential of translanguaging practices for the development of a
second dialect (Oliver & Nguyen, 2017), much work is yet to be done to understand the role that translinguaging practices may have in L2 and HL pedagogy.

**Justification and Research Questions**

The previously discussed research has made great strides toward better understanding translinguaging practices and their potential benefits for language learners. However, there is much work to be done. There is a need for more research that investigates the intersection of CALL and SLA with respect to translinguaging in order to understand what role these multilingual practices may have in language pedagogy. This investigation of translinguaging will also help scholars and pedagogues alike understand the role that translinguaging plays within the theorization of CALL and SLA research. The actual processes and strategies utilized by these language learners in digital language contact zones should also be explored in order to understand their development of performative competence and use of negotiation strategies.

As Kramsch and Whiteside (2007) note, the goal of L2 education needs to be reconsidered: “It is here of paramount importance to be perceived or regarded as a legitimate social actor, in whatever language or mixture of languages you speak, not to become an objectively measurable near-native speaker on any interlanguage proficiency scale” (p. 917). The inclusion of translinguaging in language pedagogy is a seamless fit both to meet the needs of language learners in digital contexts and to meet the calls for the inclusion of multilingualism in CALL and SLA as proposed by Ortega (2017).

Previous research has displayed cognitive, linguistic, academic, and sociolinguistic benefits of engaging in translinguaging (Creese & Blackledge, 2015; García & Li, 2014; Lewis et al., 2012; Sayer, 2013) and the potential benefits of
translanguaging for bi/multilingual students in educational contexts have begun to receive some attention (Oliver & Nguyen, 2017). While this research is invaluable in the developing field, there is much work to be done. For example, as Ortega (2017) notes, it is not only bi/multilinguals who engage in translanguaging practices. She also notes that SNSs and other Web 2.0 technology mediums are “so pervasively multilingual” (p. 296) that even monolingual participants develop ways to cope, ignore, and/or celebrate the various languaging practices that occur in these platforms. Therefore, it is imperative that translanguaging be an area of focus for SLA, considering that “…one can adopt language resources from different communities without ‘full’ or ‘perfect’ competence in them (as traditionally defined), and these modes of hybridity can be socially and rhetorically significant” (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 10). As these L2 students regularly engage with technology and SNSs, it is imperative to explore the way that they engage in translingual practices in order to best support their learning as well as to harness the potential cognitive and pedagogical benefits of translanguaging by supporting the development of their PC.

Therefore, in order to better understand the languaging practices of L2 learners, the present research is the first to explore the use of translanguaging practices by L2 learners in affinity spaces within SNSs in online language courses. The study is exploratory in nature and takes an online ethnographic approach (Androutsopoulos, 2008; Kozinets, 2010; Markham, 2005), which involves the observation and collection of data from online platforms paired with data which is elicited from contact with the users of these online platforms (see Methodology chapter for a more in-depth description of online ethnography), following the lead of Androutsopoulos (2015). Due to the data-
driven approach to this exploratory study, the following research questions were formed through the iterative process that “helps a study achieve rigor in a qualitative paradigm” (Ravitch & Mittenfelner Carl, 2016, p. 81).

1. How do students of Spanish utilize, or not utilize, translanguaging within affinity spaces in the SNS Facebook?
   a. How does the use, or lack of use, of translanguaging in these affinity spaces by L2 learners compare with those of HLLs of Spanish?

2. How does the participants’ use of alignment and other negotiation strategies of performative competence affect their communication in the Facebook affinity spaces?
   a. How does the L2 participants' use of alignment and other negotiation strategies of PC and their effects on communication in FB affinity spaces compare to those of HLLs of Spanish?

This chapter has mapped out the framework that acts as the theoretical underpinning of the present research, including the conceptualization of linguistics as an ecology, Celce-Murcia et al.’s (1995) model of communicative competence, and the concepts of PC and translanguaging negotiation strategies. Following the explanation of the importance of translanguaging ideologies for the present research, the existing research that is paramount to the present study was explored in terms of the presence of translanguaging in the field of SLA and translanguaging in digital contexts. The following chapter will describe the methodology employed in the present study to answer these research questions.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The ubiquitous nature of multilingual digital contexts has made the need to understand the communication of learners in such spaces a pressing concern. Even those learners who may be monolingual or possess limited knowledge in a second language are able to interact in multilingual spaces due to the strategic practices they employ in these digital contexts. “Namely, the digital wilds are so pervasively multilingual in many cases (e.g., when we see large translocal groups of friends on Facebook with different linguistic repertoires and language ideologies) that so-called monolingual members in those affinity spaces learn to cope, let it pass, or even enjoy and celebrate multiple languages and translanguaging” (Ortega, 2017, p. 296). Limited empirical research has been conducted to explore the translanguaging practices of bilinguals within social networking sites (SNSs) and the performative competence (PC) of these language users. In particular, there is a paucity of investigations into the translanguaging practices of L2 learners/emergent bilinguals in CALL contexts as well as a lack of research that investigates the actual practices (as opposed to the published output) of these learners, their PC and their use of negotiation strategies. The present study was inspired by this small but growing body of research on these subjects (Androutsopoulos, 2008; Blyth & Dalola, 2016; Canagarajah, 2013; Kulavuz-Onal and Vásquez, 2018; Oliver & Nguyen, 2017; Schreiber, 2015).

The current research is heuristic and qualitative in nature. However, some quantitative data analysis methods have been employed, adding rigor and validity to the qualitative aspects of the study by means of a mixed-methods approach (Ravitch &
Mittenfelner Carl, 2016). As described by Teddlie and Tashakkori (2006), the mixed methods approach used in the present study is a conversion mixed design; in this type of design “one type of data (e.g., QUAL) is gathered and is analyzed accordingly (QUAL) and then transformed and analyzed using the other methodological approach (e.g., quantitized)” (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2006, p. 23). In the case of the present research, the data was gathered in a qualitative manner through the TAPs, stimulated recall interviews, and written reflections. Parts of the data were then “quantitized”, such as the frequency counts which will be discussed in chapters 4, 5, and 6, in order to be analyzed in a quantitative manner. In line with qualitative data collection methods in the digital age, this study uses an online ethnographic approach.

**Online Ethnography**

Ethnography is a long-standing, qualitative research methodology that “places an emphasis on in-person field study and includes immersion, through participant observation, in a setting to decipher cultural meaning and generate rich, descriptive data” (Ravich & Mittenfelner Carl, 2016, p. 21). However, this type of research can be time consuming, labor-intensive, and can be intrusive due to the face-to-face nature of participant observations. The use of online ethnography, also known as netnography, allows the researcher to reduce the laborious nature of logistical aspects of traditional ethnography such as eliminating the need to travel to and from research sites. Online ethnography also, depending on the research design, offers a less intrusive and more naturalistic view of communicative behavior in digital contexts (Kozinets, 2010).

The vast majority of the existing digital or SNS research focuses on static, published content such as the information that users post to their “wall” on Facebook
(Androutsopoulos, 2015; Oliver & Nguyen, 2017; Schreiber, 2015). Canagarajah (2011b) noted that “We have to go beyond studying the strategies of translanguaging production to studying strategies of negotiation. Studies on translanguaging have also been conducted in a product-oriented manner, leaving processes out of consideration” (p. 5). In order to answer Canagarajah’s (2011b) call for the investigation of more dynamic, process-oriented data that delves into the negotiation strategies employed by language users as a part of their PC, the present study employs an online ethnographic approach. As described by Androutsopoulos (2015), an online ethnographic approach involves the “systematic observation of online activities, collection and linguistic analysis of screen data, and additional data elicited through contact to users” (p. 192). This approach allows for not only an observation of what participants are actually doing within Facebook, but also for the inclusion of interview data from interactions with the participants after their participation in the Facebook groups (see Procedures section of this chapter for more detail).

**Researcher Identity**

As is paramount in qualitative research, here I outline my positionality as the researcher in this study and its potential to mold the process of meaning-making from the data as well as its other potential influences on the research as a whole (Ravitch & Mittenfelner Carl, 2016).

For years I have been interested in working both as a teacher and in an administrative role in an educational setting; my interests in SLA include CALL and its implementation in L2 classrooms. This interest sprouted when I began teaching at the university level. Immediately I saw firsthand how much technology my students were
consuming, and maybe even more importantly, how much technology was a part of their education experience. These observations coupled with the completion of a graduate certificate on CALL theory and practice brought the implementation not simply of technology, but of effective technology, to the forefront of my research agenda.

I believe that the role of a researcher, especially in qualitative research should be a careful balance of objectivity and involvement. I think by recognizing some of my own assumptions and biases I can interpret data in a more objective fashion that will add to the validity of my findings.

As I currently work as a teaching associate in a higher education institution, I have an insider perspective on the more specific topic that I am investigating: students use of translingual practices in the language classroom as well as their use of technology and SNSs. This insider perspective has obvious positive and negative aspects. The positive aspects include access to subjects and previous knowledge about the field, which allowed me to take on an online ethnographic approach to data collection.

However, the role of the researcher as an insider can bring negative assumptions as well. First, is it possible for me to objectively assess data collected from a department where I work? As a researcher and instructor, it may be difficult to keep an objective distance from the subjects of my research, especially the ones who were students in the Spanish 313 (SPA 313) course that I taught and consequently got to know better than if I had taken the role of solely researcher.

Second, my age may prove to be another influence on the assumptions in my research. As I am in my twenties, I have grown up surrounded by technology and fall into the classification that researchers have named “digital natives” (Prensky, 2001). This
position that I have may bias my interpretation of data from students or make it more difficult for me to understand the ideas and attitudes from students who have not grown up surrounded by the technologies implemented in the study. This position could also lead to an assumption on my part that other people in my age bracket that fall into this loose definition of “digital natives” are also highly experienced and comfortable with technology. However, it is important to remember that personal experiences also play a large role in technological abilities and skills.

To conclude, my personal experiences as an instructor have helped to shape my identity as a researcher. This brings both positive and negative assumptions that must be taken into account in order to maintain the validity of my research on the translanguaging and PC of students enrolled in Spanish courses.

**Participants**

Participants for this study were selected from a pool of students enrolled in an online Spanish course at a large university in the Southwest of the United States. The participants were enrolled in either Spanish 313 (SPA 313), a fifth semester conversation and composition course designed for L2 learners, or Spanish 315 (SPA 315), a fifth semester advanced Spanish course designed for bilinguals. The courses are considered to be academically equivalent; the differentiating factor consists of the course content and the pedagogical approaches used for L2 students vs. HLL. Students from these two courses were chosen as the participant pool for the present research due to the position of these classes in the sequence of courses offered at this university. Students had to either be placed into the course by a placement exam or have completed the prerequisite courses. It is expected then that both the L2 and the HLL students enrolled in these two
courses entered the semester with the ability to express themselves in Spanish and allowed for the courses to focus on the development of a more advanced proficiency without dedicating large portions of the class to grammar or other language features that are typical of lower division courses. Therefore, it was assumed that the participants were able to focus more on the content of their output and their choice of language(s) used within the Facebook groups than on their actual linguistic ability to express themselves. It should be noted that while this is the expectation for entry into the course, some students may come in either under or over prepared for the language level expected for the class.

Potential participants were contacted via email by the researcher, informed of the project, and asked for their voluntary participation. Participants did not receive any form of compensation for their involvement in the study. All students enrolled in the course did have the opportunity to earn extra credit by participating in more than one Facebook group; however none of the participants or non-participant students took on this extra credit assignment. It should be noted that the researcher was the instructor for the SPA 313 course. The instructor who taught the SPA 315 course included the researcher in the learning management system for the course and assisted in recruiting participants from his class. The researcher did have direct contact with students from both the SPA 313 and 315 courses via email and the learning management system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Native language(s)</th>
<th>Language(s) other than English and Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>French, German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Japanese (novice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>French, German (novice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Listened to Serbian as a child, German (novice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariah</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>4-5 years of French in high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Portuguese (novice)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The language levels listed are self-reported by the participants.

Six students from the SPA 313 course and four from the SPA 315 course consented to participation and completed all of the required tasks. Originally, five students consented to participation from the SPA 315 course. However, one student did not complete all of the required assignments and dropped the class before the end of the
semester, resulting in four participants from this class. Although there were six participants in the L2 course, SPA 313, one of them, Eva, met the description of a HLL. She was born in Venezuela, but grew up in the United States and spoke Spanish at home, although her education was primarily in English. Her data was consequently analyzed as a part of the SPA 315 HLL group. Therefore, five L2 learners and five HLL participated in the study. The mean age for the L2 participants was 43.2 years whereas the mean age for the HLL participants was considerably lower at 31.6 years. See the Table 1 for basic demographic information about the participants.

**Instruments**

In order to employ the online ethnographic approach to the present study, several instruments were designed and implemented. These three key research tools will be explained here in depth: (i) the modified language contact profile, (ii) the use of Screencast-o-Matic videos paired with Think-Aloud Protocols (TAP), and (iii) immediate stimulated recall interviews with participants.

**Language Contact Profile.** Upon consenting to participate in the study, the participants completed a modified version of the Language Contact Profile (LCP) (see Appendix A) (Freed, Dewey, Segalowitz, & Halter, 2004). This demographic questionnaire served to explore each student’s previous and current language exposure and experience both with Spanish and with any other languages. This information identified any potential participants who may have had extensive childhood exposure to Spanish that would affect their use of translanguaging as an L2 learner for the students in the L2 class. The use of the LCP allowed for the identification of Eva, the student enrolled in the L2 class who did in fact match the definition of a HLL. Therefore, her
data was analyzed as a part of the group of HLLs, rather than with the group of L2 students.

The researcher modified Freed et al.’s (2004) LCP in order to also gather information about the participants’ use of technology and SNSs in order to determine their level of comfort with navigating Facebook as well as for what purposes (e.g., personal, professional, familiar) they used, or did not use, this platform and in what language(s) they had interacted previously in these digital spaces. For example, Alex, a student in the L2 group, stated on his LCP that he frequently used Facebook in English, Spanish, French, and German. He cited this previous use several times in his interviews as an explanation for his language choices during the assigned activities. On the other hand, Eva had never had a Facebook account before. This greatly increased the cognitive overhead for her, causing her response to the first week’s assignment to be mostly spent working on understanding the SNS platform, rather than focusing on communicative interactions.

**Screencast-O-Matic Videos and Think-Aloud Protocols.** While previous research has relied on data published on ‘walls’ within Facebook (Androutsopoulos, 2015; Oliver & Nguyen, 2017; Schreiber, 2015), the previously mentioned insights from Canagarajah (2011b) call for investigations to go beyond the translanguaging *productions* of language users and to dig deeper into the *processes* that lead to that output. The use of the screen capture service Screencast-O-matic allowed the researcher to see the process that learners go through in browsing, publishing, and interacting within these Facebook affinity spaces. The affinity spaces were vetted by the instructor to ensure a safe digital environment for the students as well as the potential for translanguaging activity. If
students were uninterested in any of the recommended pages they were welcome to
search for pages that aligned with their personal interests, but the pages all needed to be
approved by the instructor to ensure their appropriateness. The affinity spaces originated
in the United States as well as in other Spanish-speaking countries—the main
requirement being the prevalent use of Spanish amongst users. See Appendix B for the
assignment instructions that were given to students and a list of the suggested Facebook
affinity spaces.

Screencast-O-matic allowed students to record their screen while using Facebook
and to verbally narrate their actions; the use of a TAP served to externalize some of the
internal processes of the learners (Jääskeläinen, 2018; Seliger & Shohamy, 1989). All
students had access to a sample TAP video which used both Spanish and English in
navigating a Facebook page and guided the participants to explain their actions and what
they were thinking as they navigated the pages. This sample video also encouraged the
participants to reflect out loud on the choices they were making about language use and
the inclusion of other semiotic resources such as “likes” or emojis. The use of the TAP is
key in collecting information about \textit{how} learners solve problems (Gass & Mackey, 2011),
a key construct in understanding their PC. The TAP allowed the researcher to gain insight
into the students’ translingual processes (e.g., beginning to type a message in one
language and deleting and switching languages) rather than simply the content they chose
to publish. Another benefit afforded by the Screencast-O-Matic recordings is the insight
into any other resources (e.g., online dictionaries) that the students used to help them
navigate their interactions within the affinity space. While other studies have employed
screen capture technology in the collection and analysis of learner interactional data, this
is the first study to use screen capture technology to investigate the translingual processes and practices used by language students in affinity spaces in SNSs.

**Immediate Stimulated Recall Interviews.** Following the lead of Schreiber (2015), participants engaged in stimulated recall interviews, or “a technique in which participants are asked to recall thoughts they had while performing a prior task” (Gass & Mackey, 2016, p. 22); during these recalls they watched the Screencast-O-Matic recordings of their interactions on Facebook immediately after creating them. The participants were asked to elaborate on their decision-making processes and translinguaging practices in these semi-structured interviews twice during the semester.

A limitation of the use of stimulated recall interviews is the potential issues concerning “memory and retrieval, timing, and instructions” (Gass & Mackey, 2011, p. 54). To address this issue, the interviews were placed directly after the students recorded their interactions in Facebook creating what Gass and Mackey call *consecutive recall*. In other words the stimulated recall happens very shortly after the event in question to lessen any potential interference from memory retrieval. Pairing the stimulated recall interviews immediately after the Facebook interactions with the TAP and Screencast-O-matic videos can counter some of these risks as participants will be able to hear their own self-narrated thought processes captured “in the moment” when watching the videos during the interviews. For example, the students could hear their own thought processes as captured by their Screencast-O-matic video while watching their own actions on the screen as they answered the interviewer’s questions.

The questions that were asked during the interviews followed Gass and Mackey’s (2016) guidelines for stimulated recall interview questions, focusing on what the
participant was thinking at the moment in question rather than why they did something.

Due to the completely online nature of the courses, many students were in different states or even countries at the time of the interviews, making F2F interviews impossible. Therefore, the interviews were conducted via Adobe Connect, a platform with which all participants were familiar as it was used for other components of their coursework. Adobe Connect allows for video and audio chatting as well as for screen and video sharing capabilities. This allowed the researcher to share the participant’s Screencast-O-Matic recording on the screen so that they could watch it and answer questions as the video progressed. The interviews were recorded and all audio was transcribed by an outside transcription service and edited for accuracy by the researcher.

**Procedures**

During five weeks of the six week summer semester, participants from the SPA 313 and 315 courses chose an affinity space(s), from the set approved by the instructor or groups of their own choosing (approved by the instructor), with a Spanish language presence that met their interests. A few examples of these pages were the Facebook groups for the Real Madrid soccer team, Libros Infinite, a group dedicated to a shared interest in reading and the other media such as TV series and movies associated with popular books, and LUCHA, a group dedicated to social change and political issues affected the Latinx community in Arizona. All of the pages included content and comments, which included text, videos, photos, and graphics (such as emojis) due to the multimodality of the Facebook platform, that incorporated both in English and Spanish.

After completing the LCP, students participated in weekly assignments requiring them to post and comment within the affinity space in accordance with the instructions
provided to them (see Appendix B). The instructions encouraged students to include 50
words in their posts in order to avoid one-word posts; they were also reminded that they
could post in either Spanish or English, or a combination of the two, and that they were
welcome to include photos or other forms of media in their Facebook interactions. These
interactions were recorded and narrated by the students using Screencast-O-matic and
submitted to their instructor. These affinity space interactions acted as required
assignments for all students enrolled in the course in order to encourage task completion.

In order to reflect on their language use and interactions in the affinity spaces,
during weeks two and four the participants completed one-to two-page written
reflections. The instructions allowed for them to use whatever language(s) or mix of
languages they chose in order to best express themselves (see Appendix C). The
instructions for the written reflections encouraged participants to reflect on questions
such as which language(s) they used, when and why they used that language(s), and what
types of outside resources they may have used to help them navigate the Facebook
page(s).

Following the weekly posts in weeks three and five, participants engaged in
stimulated recall interviews with the researcher. In order to facilitate these immediate
stimulated recall interviews, students signed up for weekly time slots in which they are
expected to create their Screencast-O-matic videos. At the end of these 30 minute
sessions, the interview with the researcher was conducted. These scheduled time slots
allowed the researcher to conduct the stimulated recall interviews immediately after
students completed the work, following the suggestion by Gass and Mackey (2016) to
conduct stimulated recall interviews as soon after the action of study as possible. It
should be noted that the only aspect of participation in the study that was not a part of the regularly assigned coursework for all students was the two interviews with the researcher. Therefore, the extra time and effort put in by the participants was not much greater than the rest of the students enrolled in their course who opted not to participate. The stimulated recall interviews were video recorded and later transcribed by the researcher for analysis. For a sequential breakdown of the tasks completed by participants see Table 2.

Table 2

*Table of procedures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TAP + Screencast-O-Matic video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TAP + Screencast-O-Matic video Written reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TAP + Screencast-O-Matic video Stimulated recall interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TAP + Screencast-O-Matic video Written reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TAP + Screencast-O-Matic video Stimulated recall interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis**

Though limited in scope, the existing research on translanguaging in digital contexts has used a wide array of data analysis methods. For the purposes of the present study, *content analysis* (CA), was employed first (Krippendorf, 1989). This method “goes outside the immediately observable physical vehicles of communication and relies on their symbolic qualities to trace the antecedents, correlates, or consequences of...”
communications” (p.403); it has been used in order to identify, compare, and code themes from qualitative data (e.g., Schreiber, 2015). This method was utilized first in order to identify and code the themes from the data.

Second, critical discourse analysis (CDA), one of the two facets of discourse analysis (DA), or the study of language-in-use (Paltridge, 2006), was employed. This method was used in order to critically dissect the use of language and its relations to power structures. Consequently, CDA was also used to examine the pedagogical implications associated with translanguaging in language courses. The appropriateness of each of these methods will be further discussed here.

Content analysis. The first tool that was integrated into the data analysis process, due to the multimodal nature of the data, was CA. While CDA studies language-in-use, CA focuses on “cultural artifacts, or the things humans have created, rather than people themselves” (Abbott & McKinney, 2013, p. 316). The use of CA “seeks to analyze data within a specific context in view of the meanings someone -a group or culture- attributes to them” (Krippendorf, 1989, p. 403). This method of analysis, which is commonly used to analyze products of the media, can extend beyond verbal communicative content and into the affordances of the context as well as the semiotic repertoires of the interlocutors. In the case of the present study, these “cultural artifacts” took the form of published content in the Facebook affinity spaces.

As data was collected throughout the course of the semester, the researcher engaged in open coding, or multiple rounds of examining and labeling the data that allows themes to be identified in the data (Ravitch & Mittenfelner Carl, 2016). This identification of themes informed the development of the research questions in the
iterative process typical of qualitative research. The use of open coding allowed first for the identification of themes or practices that stood out, followed by a more specific analysis of the data with respect to the research questions (Ravitch & Mittenfelner Carl, 2016). This practice of open coding was applied to the Screencast-O-Matic recordings, written reflections, interview recordings, and field notes taken by the researcher. Field notes are of paramount importance in qualitative research as they document the researcher’s firsthand observations and experiences while collecting data. The researcher documented written field notes during all interviews as well as while coding the data. This use of observation and field notes serves to protect the rigor and validity of the qualitative methodology employed in this study as it is considered to be a form of triangulation, or the “use of multiple data sources to achieve a range of contextual data” (Ravitch & Mittenfelner Carl, 2016, p. 160); this triangulation process allows for reflective engagement and further insight on the part of the researcher.

One potential risk associated with the open coding procedures that accompany CA is the risk for researcher biases. As the coding comes from the researcher’s interpretation of patterns in the data, it is impossible for the process to be completely objective. However, in order to protect the validity and rigor of this analysis method, all findings must be substantiated by the data at hand. It is also important to note that the findings from this type of research cannot be generalized to any context other than the context used in the current study (Abbott & McKinney, 2013).

Interrater reliability, also known as multiple coding, was also employed in the data analysis after the coding process was completed. This practice attempts to mediate the issue of subjectivity involved in open coding by engaging a third party, who has been
appropriately trained on the coding themes and data at hand, to code excerpts of the data. This allows the researcher to look for overlaps or discrepancies in the coding and to check for a “shared understanding” of the codes (Ravich & Mittenfelner Carl, 2016). In the case of the present study, the data samples that were coded again by a second researcher had 100% alignment with the researcher’s original coding.

**Critical discourse analysis.** According to Gee (2011), DA is simply “the study of language-in-use” (p. 8) and can be separated into two categories: *descriptive DA* and *Critical discourse analysis (CDA).* First, descriptive DA works to understand how language works by means of describing the language itself. On the other hand, CDA goes a step beyond the description of how language works in order to “speak to and, perhaps, intervene in, social or political issues, problems, and controversies in the world. They want to apply their work to the world in some fashion” (Gee, 2011, p. 9). Gee argued that all DA should adopt this critical lens owing to the largely political nature of language use itself. For example, while DA might describe a linguistic phenomenon, CDA delves into the socio-political context and its relation to that specific linguistic phenomenon.

Owing to the politically charged nature of bilingual education and, as Gee noted, of language(s) and their use, the present dissertation research analyzed the data using CDA. The use of CDA also allows for a critical analysis of the data that can lend itself to realistic pedagogical implications that will be drawn from the findings of this research. This data analysis method is not unprecedented in the existing body of research, as it follows the lead of Oliver and Nguyen (2017), whose use of DA, and their data analysis goals of finding and examining uses of translingual practices, were similar to the present study. As Oliver and Nguyen pointed out in their study, DA recognizes the tie between
language use and the sociocultural context (Paltridge, 2006), a point of view that is highly consistent with translanguaging practices which conceptualize sociocultural context and language practices as inseparable (García & Li Wei, 2014). Similar to these authors, the present research took a holistic approach to the unit of analysis, choosing to conceptualize whole texts/recordings as the unit of analysis. Due to the ecological linguistics framework applied here, communicative practices must be examined as a whole, rather than as smaller components such as individual words or phrases.

While the data analysis methods involved in this study are principally qualitative in nature, the use of some quantitative measures such as the use of frequency counts and descriptive statistics help to describe the large quantity of data at hand and substantiate patterns found through the process of open coding (Ravitch & Mittenfelner Carl, 2016; Seliger & Shohamy, 1989).
CHAPTER 4

HERITAGE LANGUAGE LEARNERS’ USE OF TRANSLANGUAGING AND PERFORMATIVE COMPETENCE

Through the process of open coding, as described in the previous chapter, the researcher was able to identify themes within the data. The existing body of research on translanguaging practices has focused primarily on bilingual education, leaving a gap in the literature for studies that explore the experiences of other learners. In order to connect to the existing literature while also contributing to the larger fields of CALL and SLA research that focus on translanguaging practices, the present analysis examined both HLL and L2 learners. The data from the HLL participants is examined first in the present study as this group most closely reflect the characteristics of the individuals on whom the existing research has focused. In the following chapter the data analysis will investigate the L2 participants, followed by a chapter that examines the similarities and contrasts between the two groups and their consequences for the incorporation of translanguaging into language curricula.

One factor that was strikingly evident in the first round of coding was the effect of these language ideologies toward language use, and translanguaging, on their language practices. These language ideologies will be further analyzed in the following section. The first round of open coding also identified instances of translanguaging as well as the PC of the participants by means of the negotiation strategies they employed while navigating the Facebook pages. As described previously in the review of literature, the concept of PC is understood as a component of communicative competence that focuses on how speakers communicate rather than what they communicate. Beneath this umbrella
term of PC, four macro-level negotiation strategies (envoicing, recontextualization, interactional, and entextualization strategies) are found. Therefore, within the discussion of each of these more narrowly defined negotiation strategies, a larger discussion of the interlocutors’ PC is also at hand.

Keeping in mind the importance of the problem-solving skills of strategic competence within the communicative competence model described by Celce-Murcia et al. (1995), there was an evident parallel between Canagarajah’s (2013) four previously discussed macro-level strategies for translanguaging and the strategies employed by the HLL participants. Therefore, after the initial round of open coding and a revision of the research questions, the following rounds of coding were more specialized and aimed to describe and analyze the findings within the following categories of ideologies, which were found to be a contributing factor to the participants’ translanguaging practices, and translanguaging negotiation strategies: (i) language ideologies, (ii) envoicing strategies, (iii) recontextualization strategies, (iv) interactional strategies, and finally (v) entextualization strategies. As will be further explained within each of the following sections, in some instances the operational definitions of strategies (as described by Canagarajah) were not comprehensive enough to describe the strategic processes utilized in the SNS context, in particular where technology was used as an aid for effective communication. In order to incorporate these processes that did not fit into the four categories as conceptualized by Canagarajah (2013), the categories were expanded to take into consideration the communication strategies employed in these digital, multilingual environments.
The four different data collection instruments that were used in the present study served different purposes for the data analysis. See Table 3 for a breakdown of which instruments were used in the analysis of each theme. To analyze the envoicing and recontextualization strategies the three data collection instruments that focused on their interactions within Facebook were considered. When examining the interactional strategies the LCP, TAPs, and stimulated recall interviews were analyzed. Finally, the LCPs, TAPs, and stimulated recall interviews were utilized in order to gain insight into the participants’ entextualization strategies; the TAPs were of principal importance here as they allowed for insight into the actual processes and editing that the learners employed within the affinity spaces.

Table 3

*Data Collection Instruments for HLL Data Themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>LCP</th>
<th>TAPs</th>
<th>Stimulated recall interviews</th>
<th>Written reflections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Envoicing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recontextualization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entextualization</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. X indicates that the instrument was used for the respective theme. A 0 indicates that that instrument was not used for the respective theme.*

**General Findings**

When examining the participants’ interactions within the Facebook affinity spaces, the HLLs demonstrated some evidence of translanguaging practices. However,
the majority of HLLs exclusively used Spanish in their written output within the Facebook groups (90% of total HLL comments), meaning that their translinguaging practices were visible through their process and actions as they navigated the affinity spaces rather than exclusively in written output. As seen in Table 4, only one of the five participants, Olivia, left comments in English (46% of her total comments) as well as comments that used both English and Spanish (18% of her total comments). In the stimulated recall interviews and written reflections, many of them attributed this tendency to use only Spanish to their observation of the language use of the other group members, stating that they followed the lead of these established members. This awareness of their audience and the language use practices of the other users will be explored in greater detail in the recontextualization and interactional strategies sections of this chapter.

Another overall trend among HLL users was the use of non-linguistic semiotic resources such as emojis, ‘likes,’ and outside digital resources. As seen in Table 4, three of the five participants included emojis in their posts, four of the five incorporated likes, and two utilized outside digital resources (e.g., online dictionaries, translate button) in order to navigate the Facebook pages.
Table 4

*Overall Frequency Counts for HLLs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Spanish comments</th>
<th>English comments</th>
<th>Spanish/English comments</th>
<th>Total comments</th>
<th>Reactions</th>
<th>Emojis</th>
<th>Digital resources</th>
<th>Total non-linguistic resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
<td>5 (46%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
<td>7 (54%)</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>13 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>16 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>17 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 (57%)</td>
<td>13 (43%)</td>
<td>23 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabela</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>8 (80%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61 (90%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30 (41%)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18 (25%)</td>
<td>73 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Percentages for Spanish, English, and Spanish/English comments are taken from the total number of linguistic semiotic resources. The percentages for Reactions, Emojis, and Outside Digital Resources are taken from the total number of non-linguistic semiotic resources.
These general findings and the strategies used by these HLLs as a part of their PC will be explored in more depth in the following sections.

**Language Ideologies of HLL**

The main function of the stimulated recall interviews in the present study was to go beyond the published output created by the participants and to understand the processes and strategies at play in their languaging practices. The language ideologies that these learners housed emerged as a contributing theme to their languaging practices while navigating the Facebook pages. Language ideologies, a concept which originated with Silverstein (1979), has been widely explored and other scholars have proposed their own definitions of this construct. Kroskrity (2004) defined language ideologies as “beliefs, or feelings, about language as used in their social worlds” (p. 498). Language ideologies, which are broader concepts that “represents a perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest of a specific social or cultural group” (Martínez, 2006, p. 9), are made up of language attitudes. These language attitudes are defined as a “combination of ideas and beliefs, feelings and emotions, and actions and reactions” (Martínez, 2006, p. 21). While these attitudes are an important factor in understanding language ideologies, they apply more on an individual level, rather than a group or societal level as language ideologies do, and are consequently not the focus of the present research.

Kroskrity (2004) also purported the idea that ideologies are multiple; a speaker does not have one single ideology of language, but rather, many which work together to influence their language practices. Owing to the multiplicity of the nature of language
ideologies, they can also be differentiated into articulated and embodied ideologies. Articulated ideologies are those expressed by the speaker whereas embodied ideologies are those that can be observed in actual language use (Kroskrity, 2004). While a language user’s articulated and embodied ideologies may align, it is not uncommon to see a disparity between the two. The ideology of linguistic purism, which frames the mixing of languages in a negative and deficient light and favors the separation of languages (Martínez et al., 2015), often plays a role when this distinction between articulated and embodied ideologies is examined. That is to say that while speakers may express strong opinions against linguistic purism, their actual language practices may not match up and may in fact show favor toward the separation of languages (Hill, 1985; Mendoza-Denton, 2008). While much research has been conducted exploring language ideologies, very little has explored language ideologies in reference to translanguaging, particularly teachers’ language ideologies and their potential effects on students’ translanguaging practices or their own language ideologies (Martínez et al., 2015).

In line with the tenets of online ethnography, this study elicited data through contact with the participants, reaching past the static data from Facebook posts and comments. Several overarching findings were made by means of these stimulated recall interviews in reference to the language ideologies of the HLL participants: (i) a description of their language use as a subconscious switch, (ii) the adherence to the ideals of linguistic purism, and (iii) a disparity between their articulated and embodied language ideologies.
As all of the HLL participants, with the exception of Olivia, wrote their Facebook posts and comments in Spanish (90% of total comments), this was a point of interest during the stimulated recall interviews. After each post, the participants were asked what they were thinking when they decided to comment in Spanish. Sara and Diego both expressed that their tendency to remain only in Spanish when commenting or posting in the affinity spaces was in part due to an internal process that was not a conscious choice. For example, in her first interview Sara specifically expressed that it was not difficult for her to switch back and forth between English and Spanish, but followed up by saying that she stays in one language without noticing in instances such as this in order to maintain her train of thought. This explanation of her language use as a subconscious internal process was expressed in her second interview as well. When asked why she chose to comment in Spanish on a post that contained only an image without words, she explained that she did not have an explanation of why she chose to comment in Spanish rather than a different language or languages.

“I, I don’t know why I chose Spanish. Probably because my brain was already going in Spanish. That’s why I chose Spanish. I didn’t even notice that it [the post] didn’t have words until you mentioned it.” Sara, Interview 2

Diego also displayed an understanding of his language use as a subconscious choice that was not overtly intentional when explaining his use of Spanish in his comments and posts.

“Every time that I, uh, like literary, writing, or poetry, or my brain always gravitates to Spanish. I don’t know if it’s a generational aspect or the fact that I went to school speaking Spanish, but I always process it in Spanish...So my brain had to automatically translate everything, you know, while writing a report or an essay, or you know like any type of commentary.” Diego, Interview 2
It is possible that these two participants did not have an explanation for their use of Spanish due to their high-level proficiency in the language. Both Sara and Diego listed Spanish as their native language in their LCP and reported speaking Spanish in their homes from childhood. For this reason they may simply have felt more comfortable communicating in Spanish.

While these two participants described their language use as a subconscious force rather than an active decision, many other instances in the data showed that these HLL adhered to the ideals of linguistic purism. This ideology portrays the mixing of languages as a deficient practice (Martínez et al., 2015). Spanish in the Southwest of the United States often experiences a stigma all its own due to some of its unique features such as calques, extensions, and borrowings (Beaudrie et al., 2014; Potowski, 2005). These linguistic features of Spanish in the Southwest are sometimes viewed as a simple mixing of English and Spanish (Spanglish), a practice that would be considered deficient and erroneous when viewed through the lens of a linguistic purist, rather than a valid variety of the language (Martínez et al., 2015). Therefore, these HLLs are faced with a society that prefers the separation of languages and stigmatizes the variety of Spanish that they speak. While examining their individual language attitudes, there is evidence, both conscious and unconscious, of adherence to the ideals of linguistic purism as well as a preference for a more “standardized” variety of Spanish.

While Eva used both English and Spanish in her narration of the TAPs as well as in her written reflections, she posted comments exclusively in Spanish. Isabela also wrote her reflections in English, but used no English in her posts and comments. This
demonstrates a willingness on the part of both learners to incorporate their multilingualism in contexts which are less public and less intimidating, such as a one-on-one verbal interview, than the content that they publish on the SNS in an affinity group with thousands, or in some cases millions, of members. Isabela goes so far as to express that utilizing more than one language in this context could cause issues for her identity with the other group members.

“I used Spanish because I saw that most of the people that were commenting on the post were posting in Spanish. I did not want to seem distrustful or unfriendly.” Isabela, Reflection 1

When they used Spanish, Eva, Isabela, and Olivia all used outside resources to monitor and/or modify their Spanish use. Eva, who is of Venezuelan heritage, used an online dictionary several times to check that the word from her variety was in fact a word that appeared in the Spanish dictionary and would be understood by her Spanish-speaking audience; thus, she aligned her linguistic practices with a more standardized variety of the language.

Researcher: “And so there you had already written clase and then you went and looked in the dictionary. So how come you went over to Word Reference there?” Eva: “Because we say clase in Venezuela like to mean type. And I was like well I don’t know. Because it’s also classroom.” Eva, Interview 2

This linguistic purism was more evident in the students’ written output than in their oral production during the TAPs. Both Eva and Olivia freely used both English and Spanish in their narrations of the Screencast-O-Matic video, but voiced a preference to use only Spanish in their written comments and posts, reflecting the privileged position that written language holds in the world of discourse. The plethora of differences in
written versus spoken language have been researched extensively (see Chafe & Tannen, 1987 for a comprehensive list of this research). Halliday (1994) noted this disparity in the formality that is associated with spoken and written language: “Spoken language in its natural form, spontaneous and unselfconscious, was not taken seriously as a medium of learning (p. 51)”. This understanding of written language as requiring a more formal register was evidenced in the participants’ adherence to one language in their written output, but a fluid use of all their linguistic resources in spoken communication. Another striking example of this preference for a standardized variety of Spanish and the avoidance of an ecological linguistics approach that would allow the learner to use all of the communicative resources at her disposal is Sara’s description of why she chose to comment only in Spanish and not include both of her languages.

```
“...se me hace mas facil quedarme con un lenguaje al estar brincando de uno al otro. Cuando hago eso, muchas veces hablo el spanglish, y no me gusta por que la gente luego nos llama “pochos” al usar el espanglish./[it’s easier for me to stay in one language than to jump from one to the other. When I do that, I often speak Spanglish, and I don’t like it because later people call us “pochos” when we use Spanglish.]” Sara, Interview 2
```

Here Sara describes previous discrimination she has felt when using more than one language in what she describes as Spanglish. The term pocho is a derogatory term used to describe the speakers of a Spanish language variety typical of speakers in the Southwest of the United States, previously described as including borrowings and calques (Silva-Corvalán, 2004). This term is widely used by mainstream society and its negative connotation is evidenced by the website Urban Dictionary, which serves to provide definitions and contexts of popular terminology not found in standard dictionaries. Urban
Dictionary explains that “Pocho means americanized Mexican, or Mexican who has lost their culture. (Which largely refers to losing the Spanish. [sic]) It is a derogatory term can be someone who's trying to ‘act white’…” (2018). Having experienced previous discrimination such as this may have been an influencing factor that led Sara to attempt to keep her languages separate.

These participants also used online dictionaries regularly to check the spelling of words in Spanish. This finding is not surprising as HLLs often have less developed written language skills than oral or aural skills in their HL (Beaudrie et al., 2014). As described earlier in this section, another contributing factor to this attention to linguistic accuracy in their written comments may be due to the more formal nature that is often associated with written rather than oral communication. Olivia and Eva also used online dictionaries to check the meaning of Spanish words in other users’ posts, helping them to understand the content of the affinity spaces and to navigate them more effectively. This will be further discussed in the interactional strategies section of this chapter.

As has been noted in the previous descriptions of these learners’ broader ideologies and individual attitudes toward language use, there is often a disparity between their articulated and their embodied language ideologies. This distinction is not uncommon and may be affected by the internalized attitudes, which are shaped by larger language ideologies that may be harbored by the participants, such as linguistic purism or a preference for a standardized variety of Spanish. One common distinction is the articulated ideology of language purism coupled with the embodied ideology of translanguaging practices. For example, all five of the HLL participants displayed an
articulated ideology that supported a linguistic purism point of view in which they expressed hesitance or resistance to the mixing of linguistic systems.

One example of this disparity between the articulated and embodied ideologies was seen in Olivia. She expressed in both of her written reflections that she preferred to comment only in Spanish and that it would have been out of place for her to use English, her articulated language ideology. However, over the course of the five weeks she had a total of 11 posts (including posts and comments), five of which were in English (46%) and two of which used both Spanish and English (18%), displaying a very distinct embodied ideology. On the other hand, Eva expressed in her first interview that she saw value in using both English and Spanish together as she grew up translating for her Venezuelan grandparents and she viewed her two languages as intertwined. However, she expressed that when other users commented in Spanish, she felt obligated to respond with the same language, even when more than one language was present within the page itself (see example below). This displays an application of alignment. As previously defined, alignment is an interlocutor’s ability to adapt to the use of multiple symbolic codes in order to communicate in multilingual contexts (Canagarajah, 2013). In this instance, Eva adapted her own linguistic output, the use of Spanish, to the linguistic output she witnessed by her fellow interlocutors, who utilized Spanish. In fact, the participants frequently explained their language choices as based off of the languages used previously by the other users. In the following example Eva expressed that, even though she saw both English and Spanish at play within the affinity space, she felt pressured to respond in only the language used in the previous comment.
She explains that she felt “forced” to use Spanish in her comment, even though the vast majority of her TAP narrations incorporated her entire linguistic repertoire, freely moving from Spanish to English and back again as well as including non-linguistic semiotic resources. Translingual practices, such as the ones seen in Eva’s TAP, have shown cognitive, linguistic, academic, and sociolinguistic benefits for learners (Creese & Blackledge, 2015; García & Li, 2014; Lewis et al., 2012; Oliver & Nguyen, 2017; Sayer, 2013). Therefore, the conflict of individual language ideologies as well as an adherence to a linguistic purist ideology displayed by these HLLs is damaging as it limits the development of learners’ PC as well as their use of translanguaging in their writing. Learners such as Olivia and Eva were already implementing translingual practices and strategies of PC, which will be discussed in the following sections, in their spoken language practices, but were evading these practices, and their potential benefits, in their written output in Facebook.

**Envoking Strategies**

As Canagarajah (2013) explained, envoking strategies are a negotiation strategy that forms part of an interlocutor’s PC that allow the speaker to encode their identity and their location. In short, it is how the speaker chooses to present themselves, in this case, in a multilingual context. It should be noted that in a language contact zone, such as these digital affinity spaces in which more than one language is at play, envoking becomes an even more complicated series of strategic choices that the speaker must make in order to
“be mindful of the language resources their interlocutors bring with them, and the affordances in the context for intelligibility and communicative success” (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 80).

While examining the data, two main envoicing themes emerged: the use of the dominant language of the page as a deferential envoicing strategy (Canagarajah, 2013) and the use of digitally mediated tools in order to present a less threatening or friendlier self. First, the participants frequently explained their choice of language use as a reflection of what language the other users were using most commonly in that particular thread of comments. The students’ use of the language that they viewed as the lingua franca of the exchange, most frequently Spanish in the case of the HLLs, was chosen as a negotiation strategy that allowed them to relate more to the other members of the affinity spaces and to present themselves as respectful and approachable members of their chosen group based on the content’s alignment with their own personal interests.

“I used Spanish because I saw that most of the people that were commenting on the post were posting in Spanish. I did not want to seem distrustful or unfriendly.” Isabela, Reflection 1

Although the participants all acknowledged in their interviews that there was likely a large number of multilingual members of the affinity spaces due to multilingual content, they still stated that it would have been “rude” for them to include a post that did not follow the dominant language of that thread of comments. Likewise, the participants used and/or acknowledged the availability of digital resources to navigate content not comprehensible to them, such as the “translate” feature on Facebook or online dictionaries. However, they still chose to use the language they viewed as the most
commonly used in order to, as Isabela stated, “associate better with the group” (Interview 1) and to not “seem rude or off putting” (Reflection 2). This demonstrated the desire of these participants to become a member of this affinity space (Gee, 2004).

Beyond choosing English, Spanish, or a combination of the two in order to envoice, the participants also relied on digitally mediated systems to aid in this strategic practice. This included two affordances of Facebook: emojis and “reactions,” which includes the ability to give a post or comment a “like,” “love,” “haha,” “wow,” “sad,” or “angry.” This practice of supplementing written text in order to compensate for the lack of nonverbal cues present in F2F communication was noted by Melo-Pfeifer (2015) in her examination of the negotiation strategies employed by speakers in multilingual contexts. “Alongside with linguistic codes, non-linguistic features like smileys, (laughter) interjections, capitalization and effusive punctuation are used to improve the sense of the verbal cues” (p. 109). Olivia, Eva, and Isabela included emojis in their posts. The use of emojis comprised 34% of the non-linguistic semiotic resources used by the HLL. All three of these participants also explained that their use of emojis was used to soften their posts and to seem friendlier, contributing to what Melo-Pfeifer (2015) referred to as the creation of a “friendly translanguaging atmosphere” (p. 109).

“I often use emojis to appear friendlier and more approachable.” Olivia, Reflection 1

These three participants also described emojis as a system that was not directly correlated with English nor with Spanish, but rather a system that could weave in and out of both language systems in order to help them to best express themselves.
Researcher: “And do you think, would you consider, because I know last time you told me that you use them in almost all of your posts, do you feel that [the emojis] are English or Spanish?”

Sara: “I think it’s in both. Because when I am texting or commenting on whatever I use a lot of emojis. It’s kind of a way to express what I’m feeling or an emotion. It doesn’t matter what language I’m using I think I always use emojis.” Isabela, Interview 2

Although the participants expressed a preference to keep their languages (English and Spanish) separate in their written output in Facebook, none of them expressed any concern at including the semiotic system of emojis into their output. This sentiment illustrates that the participants clearly did not view the alternation between using written language and emojis as a type of code switch. While the inclusion of this semiotic system would likely not fit the definition of code switching, “a speech style in which fluent bilinguals move in and out of two (or conceivably more) languages” (MacSwan, 1999, p. 37), it fits perfectly with the ecological linguistic perspective of translanguaging practices which allow the language user to incorporate all of the communicative resources at their disposal (Garcia & Li Wei, 2014). In this digital context, emojis are a part of these speakers’ entire linguistic-symbolic repertoire and work as a substitute for the nonverbal elements of communication that would be present in F2F communication (Wei, 2012). Therefore, the inclusion of all the resources in their communicative repertoire, in this case Spanish and emojis, allowed Sara and Isabela to more fully express the intent and the meaning of their output.

Similarly, four of the participants incorporated the use of the reactions feature on Facebook in their interactions, accounting for 41% of the non-linguistic semiotic resources used by the HLL. This served a symbolic purpose in that it created a hierarchy
of sorts for comments and posts. A comment that received a “like” was considered less impactful to the reader than one that received a “love” or a “haha,” as seen in the excerpt below.

| Researcher: “And why did you do the “haha” like button there?  
Sara: “Because the picture was very funny. I wanted to really express that it was funny, not just like it.” Sara, Interview 2 |

For content that was especially noteworthy to the participants, a “like” accompanied a written comment. This use of the reactions feature allowed the participants with an opportunity to attach an emotional context to their comments. This provided them to present their intent and emotion as a speaker, a feature of F2F communication that may otherwise be lost in text-based digital communication (Wei, 2012). This presentation of emotion serves the same purpose as the previously discussed use of emojis: the user is able to present themselves to the digital community in a more complete manner and subsequently attempt to meld into this affinity space.

The use of the dominant language as a deferential envoicing strategy as well as the use of non-linguistic semiotic resources, such as emojis, demonstrate the HLLs’ use of PC. These envoicing strategies support the facet of the procedural knowledge that comprises PC, as explained by Canagarajah (2013), that requires interlocutors to “start from your positionality” (p. 175). By finding ways to bring their own voices into these asynchronous, text-based interactions the learners “start from their social positioning” (p. 175).
Recontextualization Strategies

As the other translingual negotiation strategies are discussed here, it warrants a reminder that all of these strategies are connected within PC. Speakers employ recontextualization strategies based on the envoicing strategies that they have used themselves and that they have observed from other users. Therefore, one of the first observed recontextualization strategies that will be discussed here has also been discussed as an envoicing strategy. In short, the strategies are not mutually exclusive.

Recontextualization strategies address issues that may arise from the intercultural and/or multilingual nature of an exchange. The interlocutors must make decisions, which may be made either consciously or unconsciously, about whose culture or language will serve as the footing for the communication. If this is addressed in an up-front, mutual manner it may result in one language or culture being selected as the footing for the interaction, or it may simply result in the agreement to remain aware of the non-native position that (at least) one of the interlocutors is operating from (Canagarajah, 2013). The two main issues confronted by the HLL participants’ use of recontextualization strategies were the choice of when to use which language and the awareness of who their audience was within their chosen affinity spaces.

The implementation of the language used in previous comments and posts, a form of alignment, on the language(s) used by the participants was previously discussed as an envoicing strategy. However, the choice of language use is also tied to the recontextualization strategies employed by the HLLs. Owing to the asynchronous and digital nature of these communicative interactions, the participant rarely knew any
information about the user they chose to interact with aside from the information that they could gather from that user’s post. The most obvious information that they could glean from a user’s post is that the user knew the language that they used in that post. Based on that information, the HLLs tended to model their language use off of the linguistic information that they knew about the other interlocutor.

“I decided to use Spanish as in my post because most of the people that I saw on the Facebook page were using Spanish. I just thought it would be more appropriate.”
Isabela, Reflection 1

Alongside the alignment used by participants as evidenced by utilizing the languages used previously by the other group members, the awareness of the linguistic systems that their intended audience, the other members of the affinity space, utilized informed the participants’ language choices as we see in the previous excerpt from Isabela’s written reflection. Sara and Diego also demonstrated an awareness of their audience that interacted with their language ideologies and attitudes to affect their language output. While participating in the Libros Infinite Facebook page, Sara noted that most of the videos posted were in English, which lead her to believe that the audience of the page was largely multilingual. However, she also saw the other users commenting principally in Spanish, and followed suit, leaving all of her comments in Spanish as well. This is a perfect example of the interconnectedness of the different themes at play in this data. While Sara was able to acknowledge the potential linguistic abilities of her fellow group members, her adherence to linguistic purism coupled with the alignment of the other comments resulted in all Spanish comments.
Several components of Canagarjah’s (2013) description of PC are exemplified by the recontextualization strategies demonstrated in the data by the HLLs; the concepts of “negotiate on equal terms”, “co-construct the rules and terms of engagement”, and “be responsive to joint accomplishment of goals” are seen in the previously outlined data. First, the idea of “negotiate on equal terms” centers around the concept that all interlocutors, although they acknowledge the presence of power dynamics, expect that the negotiation of meaning will happen on open terms and that other power dynamics may be laid aside in the interest of achieving a mutual understanding in multilingual environments. This ties in closely with the other two aspects of PC that are at play here: the co-construction of the norms of the interaction and the dedication to the successful accomplishment of communicative goals. As they used recontextualization strategies to determine which language to use in each interaction as well as to highlight their awareness of their audience, they acknowledged the importance of their fellow interlocutor and that their ultimate goal was to be able to communicate effectively.

**Interactional Strategies**

While recontextualization strategies focus on finding a common communicative ground from which to operate in a multilingual environment, interactional strategies are those that center around alignment and allow the speaker to communicate effectively while using their entire communicative repertoire. These strategies can be listener-initiated, such as requests for clarification or lexical suggestions, or speaker-initiated, such as repetition or spelling out a word (Canagarajah, 2013). Within the HLL data, the role of technology-mediated interactional strategies was a central theme.
The *let it pass* principle, or the listener’s choice to let a communicative action that they did not understand pass by without clarification in hopes that it will become clear to them as the conversation progresses (Cicourel, 1973), was present in the HLLs’ actions as they navigated the Facebook affinity spaces. The participants were required to comment on several posts in each week, however they had complete autonomy in choosing the posts with which they would engage. The Screencast-O-Matic videos of the TAPs also captured their on-screen activity. This allowed the researcher to gain insight into the HLLs’ decision-making process when choosing posts with which to interact; when faced with content that they did not understand or was not relevant to their interests the users simply scrolled on in search of content that was of greater interest and comprehensibility to them. This was evidenced in the TAPs by participants’ comments as they scrolled through posts and by their explanations during the stimulated recall interviews of how they chose posts with which to interact. In order to choose these posts, the students relied heavily on their ability to translanguage content rich in multimedia; in order to understand the meaning of a post they had to parse together the written text used as well as the image or video that frequently accompanied the post. Often times the written text also included emojis, adding another layer to the communicative repertoire employed within these affinity spaces. In the case of some pages, such as the Real Madrid soccer team’s official page, the majority of posts were written in both Spanish and English. Therefore, the students’ ability to translanguage was key in their ability to successfully navigate these multilingual affinity spaces.
The interactional strategies described by Canagarajah (2013) were first outlined by Kirkpatrick (2010), who differentiated between listener and speaker strategies. The listener-initiated strategies include “lexical anticipation, lexical suggestion, lexical correction, don’t give up, request repetition, request clarification, let it pass, listen to the message, participant paraphrase, and participant prompt” (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 82). The speaker-initiated strategies included “spell out the word, repeat the phrase, be explicit, paraphrase, and avoid local/idiomatic references” (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 82). In the present study, due to the written, asynchronous nature of their communication, some of the interactional strategies that the participants employed differed from the ones outlined within Canagarajah’s conceptualization of interactional strategies. For example, the likelihood of a participant spelling out a word in order to overcome a misunderstanding is highly unlikely as both interlocutors can see the text spelled out on their screens. However, other strategies, such as “let it pass”, were frequently observed in the Facebook interactions. In order to take into account the different interactional strategies used by the HLLs in this digital contact zone and its effects on communicative interactions, this category has been expanded to include digital communication strategies used to interact with digital resources (e.g., online dictionaries, Google translate).

Eva and Olivia both relied on online dictionaries to help them with spelling, translating words and phrases, and to check the appropriateness of word use. The use of these digital resources supported not only their ability to understand the content of the pages but also to communicate effectively and to compensate for the gaps in their language knowledge. The use of outside digital resources constituted 25% of the non-
linguistic semiotic resources used by the HLLs. In Eva’s case, she felt very aware that her variety of Spanish from Venezuela may not have been the variety used by the majority of the Spanish speakers in the affinity spaces. Therefore, she used these digital resources to find out if some of the words and phrases she used would be comprehensible to other users.

Researcher: “And so there you had already written clase and then you went and looked in the dictionary. Um, so how come you went over to Word Reference there?”
Eva: “Because we say clase in Venezuela like to mean type. And I was like well I don’t know. Because it’s also classroom.” Eva, Interview 1

Digital resources, such as online dictionaries, were also used by the participants to compensate for gaps in their linguistic knowledge. This allowed them to effectively communicate with their audience by using the language that they had at their disposal coupled with their digital literacy skills.

“Intenta matar a su mejor amiga porque adelgazó y ella no.’ Actually I don’t know what this word means so I’m going to the Spanish dictionary really quick. Okay, ‘to lose weight’. That makes sense here then.” Olivia, TAP 2

In short, with the expansion of Canagarajah’s (2013) definition of interactional strategies to include the use of digital resources, all of the interactional negotiation strategies employed by these HLLs can be understood as attempts to most effectively communicate using all of the linguistic resources at their disposal. This broader definition of interactional strategies is better equipped to describe learners’ PC in the digital age.

Through the use of these interactional negotiation strategies, which highlighted the importance of digital resources as mediation tools for these HLL, both the concepts of “co-construct the rules and terms of engagement” and “be responsive to joint
accomplishment of goals” as facets of PC were addressed. Both of these were also discussed as components of recontextualization strategies in the former section, reiterating the ecological nature of translanguaging: no single component stands alone. All of the features of these learners’ linguistic repertoire work together to achieve successful communication in the multilingual, digital affinity spaces.

**Entextualization Strategies**

As explained by Canagarajah (2013), entextualization strategies are “how speakers and writers monitor and manage their productive processes by exploiting the spatiotemporal dimensions of the text” (p. 84). In other words, it is the conceptualization that how a speaker/writer edits their output can show their communicative intentions. These edits most often happen in real time. Therefore, the use of the Screencast-O-Matic recordings allowed the researcher insight into the dynamic nature of these revisions that would otherwise not be possible from examining only published output.

Similar to the other previously discussed negotiation strategies proposed by Canagarajah (2013), entextualization strategies requires an expanded definition in order to encapsulate the behaviors of the participants within the digital affinity spaces on Facebook. While in written texts students would need to notice their own spelling errors or receive corrective feedback in order to modify them, in a digital medium such as a SNS, noticing these errors is made easier for the user. Misspelled words are underlined in red and a right-click on the word offers a spell-check option to correct the spelling according to a digital dictionary. Several participants also alternated between a Spanish keyboard setting on their computer and an English keyboard setting. This allowed for the
spell-check feature to pick up on words in whatever language they chose to write in as well as facilitating the use of accent marks when they wrote in Spanish.

Researcher: “And it looked like you kind of switched keyboards there. Do you have an English keyboard and a Spanish keyboard?”
Isabela: “Yes, I do.”
Researcher: “Ok. And, um, why did you switch it over?”
Isabela: “I wanted to put an accent mark on the word, on the e.” Isabela, Interview 2

Translanguaging also played a role in the participants’ use of entextualization strategies. While most of the HLLs published comments and posts exclusively in Spanish, Olivia included both English and Spanish in her comments. As seen in Figure 3, Olivia utilized both English and Spanish when commenting on a Spanish language post. However, as seen in the excerpt, the screen capture video allowed the researcher to see how she edited her language use while creating her output.
Figure 3. Olivia’s comment on a video of a reggaeton song in the Amantes del Reggaeton Facebook group.

“Que bonita esto canción. Quien esta cantando? Me encanto sus voces; I love their voices. Que pretty. 😊” Olivia, TAP 1

In this excerpt from her first Screencast-O-Matic video, Olivia begins typing in Spanish and then switches over to English. However, she deleted what she began to type in English and tried to continue in Spanish, eventually switching back to English again and ending with a phrase in Spanish and English that included an emoji. This hesitance to
include English in her post may be explained by the fact that she was completing these Facebook interactions as a part of an assignment for a Spanish language class or a connection back to the envoicing strategies of trying to fit in with the other members of this affinity space. It should be noted that Olivia was the outlier in this group as the only HLL participant who used both Spanish and English in her Facebook posts. This may be due to her proficiency in the HL. In her LCP she noted that English was her native language and did not rate herself as “native/nativelike” in reading (Good), writing (Average), listening (Very good), or speaking (Average) in Spanish.

Canagarajah (2013) described the final component of PC, “reconfigure your norms and expand your repertoire” (p. 175), to align with entextualization strategies. “The speaker/writer has to sequence the semiotic resources in such a way that the interlocutor can process them effectively for meaning...Translinguals have the ability to constantly monitor and adjust their text and talk to structure them to suit the alignment needs of their interlocutors” (p. 176). This aspect of PC was demonstrated by the HLLs’ use of technology as an entextualization strategy. The participants monitored and adjusted their output in order to best be understood by the other members of their affinity space.

**Chapter Summary**

While Canagarajah’s (2013) negotiation strategies for translanguaging and contexts of language contact provide a starting point to identifying the strategies that make up translinguals’ PC, they were conceptualized for F2F contact amongst learners of English. In order to appropriately describe the PC of HLLs of Spanish in digital contact
zones, such as Facebook affinity spaces, the definitions of these four strategies needed to be expanded to take into consideration non-linguistic elements as well as the process itself of translanguaging in asynchronous environments. By expanding these definitions, the practices observed in this study can be better described and understood.

The research questions can be answered in part by drawing on the data presented in this chapter.

*RQ1: How do students of Spanish utilize, or not utilize, translanguaging within affinity spaces in the SNS Facebook?*

The HLL participants’ use of translanguaging was evident within the digital affinity spaces in Facebook. These translanguaging practices took many forms and served various functions. For one participant (Olivia), these translanguaging practices were manifested in the use of multiple languages (English and Spanish) in her written output within Facebook. For others, the use of non-linguistic output, such as emojis (Olivia, Eva, and Isabela) and reactions, such as likes (Olivia, Diego, Sara, and Isabela), formed a part of their translingual output. Outside of their written output in the affinity spaces, several of the participants also relied on translanguaging to help them narrate their thought processes in the TAPs and/or to express themselves in their written reflections, which was evidenced through their use of more than one language and/or the use of semiotic resources and digital tools. The incorporation of their digital literacy skills, such as the use of online dictionaries, was helpful to some of the participants in navigating the multilingual contexts of the affinity spaces. To summarize, HLL did show the use of
translanguaging while navigating the multilingual, digital context of affinity spaces within Facebook, which manifested itself in various forms.

In order to answer the second research question, the language attitudes and translanguaging negotiation strategies used by the HLL participants were examined.

*RQ2: How does the participants’ use of alignment and other negotiation strategies of PC affect their communication in the Facebook affinity spaces?*

The way in which the HLL participated in the Facebook affinity spaces was clearly affected by their PC (as evidenced in their use of the four types of previously discussed translanguaging negotiation strategies) as well as by their language attitudes. The main function of the stimulated recall interviews in the present study was to go beyond the published output created by the participants and to understand their language attitudes and their thought process and rationale for the language choices they made while navigating the Facebook pages. In line with the tenets of online ethnography, this study elicited data through contact with the participants, reaching past the static data from Facebook posts and comments. This data lead to several findings that implicated the role that the HLLs’ language attitudes and ideologies played in their translanguaging practices.

The disparity between these students’ articulated and embodied language attitudes and their preference for a linguistic purism approach to language use which favors the separation of languages led to written output that was produced primarily in Spanish. The HLL participants’ various facets of PC, which were described vis-á-vis translanguaging negotiation strategies, demonstrated the importance of technology as a tool for mediation
in their interactions in multilingual, digital contexts. Their use of digital resources served as a type of alignment that allowed them to effectively understand and communicate with the other members of their affinity spaces. The second facet of each research question, which compares the L2 and HLL learners, will be addressed in chapter six. In the following chapter the PC and negotiation strategies of the L2 participants will be analyzed.
CHAPTER 5
SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNERS’ USE OF TRANSLANGUAGING AND PERFORMATIVE COMPETENCE

Following the same data analysis procedure that was used to analyze the HLL data, as explained in the previous chapter, themes were identified in the L2 data by means of open coding. The use of open coding allowed for multiple rounds of coding that both identified themes in the data and informed the research questions. The present chapter will explore the themes present in the data collected from the four instruments (LCPs, TAPs, stimulated recall interviews, and written reflections) for the five L2 participants. Three principal themes became evident in the data through several rounds of coding. First, the participants displayed a heavy reliance on outside digital resources (e.g., online dictionaries) within their negotiation strategies, comprising 78% of non-linguistic semiotic resources used by L2 participants. Second, the activation of previous knowledge played a crucial role in their communication within the affinity spaces. Finally, while these participants displayed a wide array of translanguaging practices, these practices were more openly embraced for the purposes of content comprehension in spoken or more informal contexts. In published and/or written content, the L2 participants were resistant to translanguaging practices and aligned themselves more closely with the ideals of linguistic purism. These main findings will be discussed in terms of the participants’ language attitudes and ideologies and their resulting effects on the negotiation strategies employed by these language learners.
Following the structure of the data analysis of the HLL data in the previous chapter, this data analysis is organized in order to describe the (i) language ideologies, (ii) envoicing strategies, (iii) recontextualization strategies, (iv) interactional strategies, and (v) entextualization strategies of the L2 participants. As in the HLL data analysis, several of these operational definitions (Canagrajah, 2013) have been expanded in order to incorporate digital, asynchronous communication in multilingual environments.

Four different data collection instruments were utilized to collect the L2 participant data. When analyzing the five main themes, different combinations of the instruments were used in order to describe and analyze the data in the most comprehensive manner possible. See Table 5 for a breakdown of which instruments were used in order to analyze each theme. Owing to the parallels in the themes between the HLL and L2 participants, the instruments used to analyze each theme in the data are comparable for both groups of participants. The instruments used for each theme in the L2 data closely mirror the ones used in the analysis of the HLL data. The LCP data was not incorporated in the analysis of the envoicing, recontextualization, and interactional strategies sections due to the focus that these strategies have on the actual behavior of the language user, rather than their self-reported linguistic history. The written reflections were incorporated in all of the analysis with the exception of the entextualization strategies; this was due to the fact that entextualization strategies are process-oriented and therefore the participant-reported data that explained their personal reflections on their language choices were not relevant to the understanding of these strategies.
Table 5

*Data Collection Instruments for L2 Data Themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Data collection instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes and ideologies</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envoicing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recontextualization</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entextualization</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* X indicates that the data collection instrument was used with reference to the respective theme. The use of a 0 indicates that this instrument was not used with the corresponding theme.

**General Findings**

The first striking finding in the L2 data was the use of digital resources when navigating the affinity spaces within Facebook. As seen in Table 6, four of the five participants used outside digital resources, such as online dictionaries or translators, in order to help them understand the content within these multilingual contexts as well as to aid in their production of output. In their TAPs, stimulated recall interviews, and written reflections the students attributed the use of these digital resources to several motivating factors: to check the spelling of a word in Spanish, to check a verb conjugation, and to learn the pronunciation of a word. These will all be explored in more depth in the entextualization strategies section of this chapter.

The participants’ prior knowledge also played a central role in their interactions within the Facebook affinity spaces. Prior knowledge, often coupled with subject interest,
has been shown to have an additive effect on the comprehension of texts (Entin, 1981; Weber, 1980). Accordingly, the data from the stimulated recall interviews and the written reflections and their prior knowledge on a subject, or lack thereof, affected the posts with which they chose to interact as well as their ability to comprehend the content of their chosen pages. For example, David was an avid soccer fan who regularly followed the teams in the European leagues before participating in the study. Therefore, he chose to interact in the Real Madrid soccer team’s page for this assignment and said that his knowledge of the team helped him to understand the Spanish language content of the page. This theme will be explored in more depth in the following sections.

The final general finding was the acceptance of translanguaging practices as a mediation tool in spoken output, but an adherence to the ideals of linguistic purism in more formal written and/or published output. As seen in Table 6, the L2 participants made 70 written comments in total over the course of five weeks. Of those 70 comments, 61 used only Spanish. This will be explained further in the language attitudes and ideologies section of this chapter.
Table 6

*Frequency Counts for L2 Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Linguistic Semiotic Resources</th>
<th>Non-linguistic Semiotic Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish comments</td>
<td>English comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>16 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>13 (87%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariah</td>
<td>14 (93%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>14 (93%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61 (87%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The percentages for Spanish comments, English comments, and Spanish/English comments are taken from the total number of Linguistic Semiotic Resources. The percentages for Reactions, Emojis, and Digital Resources are taken from the Total non-linguistics resources.
Language Ideologies of L2 Learners

Through the analysis of the LCPs, stimulated recall interviews, and written reflections, as with the HLL data, these instruments allowed the researcher to delve deeper into the learners’ thoughts and internal processes before, during, and after their interactions in the Facebook affinity spaces, answering Canagarajah’s (2011b) call to go beyond product-oriented research and into process-oriented research in an attempt to understand the translanguaging practices of students. This process-oriented research uncovered the prevalence of the participants’ language ideologies and the way that they inform the learners’ languaging practices. As previously described, language ideologies are defined as “beliefs, or feelings, about language as used in their social worlds” (Kroskrity, 2004, p. 498). In a context such as the use of Spanish in the United States, a context in which the participants of this study were immersed, ideologies such as linguistic purism, which conceptualize the mixing of languages as a deficient practice, is prevalent (Martínez et al., 2015). This understanding of language mixing as deficient and as a practice that should be avoided is often perceived, inaccurately, as the social norm (Brunstad, 2003).

While the L2 participants’ ideologies toward translanguaging and their subsequent effect on aspects of the learners’ PC were a central theme present in the data, three sub-themes were identified: (i) the description of language choice as an active decision, (ii) an acceptance of translingual practices as a mediation tool, and (iii) an adherence to the ideals of linguistic purism in their written output.
First, three of the five (Mariah, Mary, and David) actively used both English and Spanish in their verbal output during the TAPs, displaying an ecological linguistics approach in which they involved their entire linguistic repertoire in order to communicate in the oral mode. However, when it came time to produce written output in the Facebook affinity spaces, 32 of the 39 total comments for those three participants were produced in Spanish. Spanish language comments comprised 87% of the total comments by the L2s. Only six of the 39 comments were in English. English comments made up 9% of the total comments made by L2s, leaving one of the 39 that used both English and Spanish within the same post. During the stimulated recall interviews and within their written reflections, the participants all described their language use as an active choice in which they chose between English and Spanish.

“Decidí al principio que iba a participar en español y he elegido estas páginas para lograr esto./[I decided at the beginning that I was going to participate in Spanish and I have chosen these pages in order to achieve that.]” Charlotte, Reflection 1

Alex followed this line of thinking when he explained that he makes a decision about which language through which he “filtrar esas ideas/[filters these ideas]” (Reflection 2) when faced with content in the affinity spaces. Although the L2 participants reported a wide range of Spanish language proficiency in their LCP, all five participants listed English as their native language. Their conscious decisions about when to use English and/or Spanish may be a direct result of their status as an L2 learner of Spanish; regardless of their proficiency level they were acutely aware of the presence of each language and their ability and/or willingness to interact in Spanish. This sentiment
was echoed by Mary when she expressed her frustration at navigating the mostly Spanish language Facebook page that she had been engaging with.

“I am trying to use as much Spanish as I can, but sometimes I just don’t know, or cannot think of, the correct word or words that I need at that time…” Mary, Reflection 1

While Mary expressed frustration with the limitations that using Spanish put on her communicative abilities, she did not view the incorporation of English into her output as a viable communication strategy; she actively chose to keep her languages separate. Similarly, Alex’s explicit decision to keep these two languages separate in his written output also stemmed from an emotional response to the Spanish language. However, while Mary’s response was one of frustration, Alex felt a high level of confidence in his ability to effectively communicate his ideas in Spanish.

“Utilicé más español, porque estoy acostumbrado a pensar, escribir, y hablar en este idioma./[I used more Spanish, because I’m used to thinking, writing, and speaking in this language.” Alex, Reflection 1

The data gathered from the LCPs is of paramount importance in understanding this theme. For example, while Mary expressed frustration and, as a result, chose to comment five times in English (55% of her total comments) compared to four times in Spanish (45%), she spoke exclusively English in her personal life and was taking a Spanish course for the first time since 1982. She self-reported her proficiency in Spanish in all areas as average (writing) or less than average (reading, listening, and speaking). Conversely, Alex, who made the decision to use Spanish in all his 16 comments because he felt comfortable in the language, spoke Spanish at home with his roommate and worked as a Spanish language teacher in a high school. He self-reported his Spanish
language proficiency as very good (writing, listening, and speaking) and native-like (reading).

Although the L2 participants voiced that they made an active choice between languages in creating their written output in the Facebook affinity spaces, the acceptance of translanguaging practices as a mediation tool in less formal output, such as their vocal narrations in the TAPs, was evident in the data. Although this oral output during the TAPs was mandated by the instructions of the task, these narrations often took the form of private speech. This practice, based in sociocultural theory, is conceptualized as the self-regulatory speech that is used by a speaker when the cognitive load of the task-at-hand is exceptionally difficult (Winsler, Fernyhough, & Montero, 2009). The participants’ narrations in the TAPs, did not consist exclusively of private speech, but rather much of their narration was used as a self-regulating method that helped them to navigate the multilingual contact zones within the affinity spaces. Two of the participants (Alex and Charlotte) explained that they had made a conscious choice to use only Spanish as a means to practice the language more during these tasks. However, both also expressed that it would have been fine to use English due to the apparently multilingual nature of the other group members.

On the other hand, Mariah, Mary, and David used both English and Spanish interchangeably during their TAPs. This use of their L1, English, during the TAPs demonstrated their acceptance of translilingual practices as a mediation tool to help them understand the content of the Facebook pages. This is demonstrated in the following
example in which Mariah explained why she orally translated posts written in Spanish to English as she read them.

Researcher: “As you’re kind of going through and reading the other comments, like this next comment is written in Spanish but you’re reading it out loud in English. What were you thinking, or what kind of goes through your head when you do those translations?”
Mariah: “Um, I just think it’s easier for me to read it out loud in English. It can get a little confusing so I try to piece together as much as I can.” Interview 2

Research on the use of private speech for L2 learners is divided. While some scholars have argued that the use of private speech as a tool for self-regulation can be employed in a speaker’s L2, the cognitive processes will relate back to the speaker’s L1 (Ushakova, 1994); others (Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000) argued that in cases of migrants, their L1 identity may be lost in favor of an L2 identity, thus allowing for private speech in the speaker’s L2. However, both of these findings conceptualize each language as an entirely separate system that does not allow the speaker to rely on their entire linguistic repertoire for private speech. However, other investigations have claimed that both the L1 and L2 can be used during private speech (e.g., Appel & Lantolf, 1994; Centeno-Cortés & Jiménez Jiménez, 2004; Jiménez Jiménez, 2015; McCafferty, 1994). The majority of the participants engaged in translingual practices that incorporated both their L1 and L2 in their private speech as a mediation tool to help them to successfully navigate the Facebook pages and to, as Mariah stated, help them to “piece together” the content; however, their attitudes toward translanguaging were drastically different when it came to written comments and posts.

The third sub-theme within the L2 participants’ language attitudes and ideologies toward translanguaging was their adherence to linguistic purism in their published written
output within the Facebook pages. As described in the previous chapter, linguistic purism is the belief that languages should be kept separate and that the mixing of languages is seen as deficient (Martínez et al., 2015). Of the 70 posts and comments made by the L2 participants, three of them used a mixture of Spanish and English (4%). Although all five of the participants acknowledged the multilingual nature of the Facebook affinity spaces, the vast majority of their comments adhered to the parameters of one language. In the following excerpt, Mary explains why she made an effort to post a specific comment completely in Spanish (with the help of Google Translate).

Researcher: “So you just wanted to make sure that your message was understood, kind of?”
Mary: “Right. And also just let them know that you’re not an illiterate Spanish person.” Interview 2

Although Mary used both English and Spanish frequently in her TAPs and written reflections, here she expressed that using anything other than Spanish in her post may have caused her to appear linguistically deficient to the other members of this online community.

Alex also expressed a preference for the separation of languages when he navigated the Univision, a Spanish language television network, affinity space. After describing in depth the use of both English and Spanish both on the air for this television network and within their Facebook page, he hypothesized that at least half of the members of the affinity space were bilingual (English and Spanish).

“Even on the local broadcasts, on Univision, when they’re interviewing somebody from the public they might not always translate into Spanish. The person they’re interviewing might be speaking in English and they’ll leave it in English.” Alex, Interview 2
In spite of this observation he made all of his comments exclusively in Spanish. As was discussed in the previous chapter, written language holds a more prestigious position in discourse (Halliday, 1994). Consequently, the participants likely felt more pressure when producing published, written output to utilize more formal language, resulting in the separation of their languages. It should also be noted that because these tasks took place in Spanish language course, it is possible that students felt compelled to produce Spanish-language output in spite of the fact that the assignment instructions encouraged them to use whatever language(s) they felt were appropriate.

In short, within the group of L2 participants a divide between their embodied and articulated ideologies about translanguaging was evident. While they embraced the use of translanguaging, which involved their L1 as well as digital resources, in their private speech as a mediation tool to help them to make sense of the content of the affinity spaces, they resisted the use of the same tools in their written output. Similarly, although they acknowledged the multilingual nature of the affinity spaces and the widespread use of multiple languages and communicative practices, they adhered to the ideals of linguistic purism in their written output, preferring to separate the linguistic systems that they had at their disposal in order to produce seemingly more formal linguistic output.

**Envoicing Strategies**

As seen in the previous chapter, envoicing strategies allow a language user to present themselves to the other interlocutors. This macro-level translingual negotiation strategy, as explained by Canagarajah (2013), is a facet of a speaker’s PC. By employing envoicing strategies in discourse, speakers are better equipped to navigate the complex
underpinnings of a multilingual, digital interaction. Three main sub-categories arose within the envoicing strategies of the L2 participants: (i) the use of non-linguistic, semiotic resources as a means of envoicing, (ii) the avoidance of controversial and/or political conversation topics, and finally (iii) the acknowledgement of their position as a learner of Spanish.

The first of these subcategories, the use of non-linguistic, semiotic resources as a means of envoicing, is made possible by the affordances of Facebook as a communicative platform. This SNS allows users to include images, emojis, reactions, GIFs, and videos within their posts and comments. Zappavigna (2012) noted that the availability of these non-linguistic facets of communication is important in that “The language used in social media...is under significant interpersonal pressure...it is deployed in a modality where interpersonal meanings that might otherwise be expressed paralinguistically must be expressed via other means” (p. 11-12). Three of the five participants took advantage of the use of emojis in their Facebook interactions. Mariah used emojis seven times in her fifteen total posts and explained the importance of these emojis in presenting her approachability and personality to the other group members.

“I also used smiley faces every time to seem friendly, especially since the people I commented back to asked questions and I didn’t have the answers and said sorry.”
Mariah, Reflection 2

The use of these emojis allowed Mariah to add emotional context to her written output that attempted to take the place of the non-verbal cues that are a natural part of F2F communication (e.g., facial expressions, gestures, tone of voice) that would otherwise be lacking in text-based computer mediated communication (Derks, Fischer, &
Bos, 2008; Walther & D’Addario, 2001; Wei, 2012). It should be noted that the use of emojis or other semiotic resources were not a required aspect of the tasks (see Appendix B for the assignment description that the participants received). This added emotional context helped her to present an image of herself to the other members of the group and gave her “an identity and voice” (Canagarajah, 2013, p.89). The use of semiotic resources such as these “... support the basic function of social media to connect with others in convivial, friendly and generally interpersonally positive ways” (Zappavigna, 2012, p.71). The apparent importance to these users of presenting themselves as approachable and “nice” vis-à-vis the use of emojis, in particular the use of emojis that were positive in nature such as a smiley face, demonstrated their desire to become an accepted member of these affinity spaces.

The second sub-theme present in the envoicing strategies of the L2 participants was the avoidance of interactions that they viewed as controversial or political. This tendency goes hand in hand with the previous finding: the learners want to be accepted into the affinity space. Therefore, they made an attempt to interact in positive manners and to interact with content that they felt linguistically equipped to attend to.

“Hay unos puestos de Habitantes que son muy políticos, acerca de la política de México, pero no voy a comentar porque no soy experta en el tema de la política de México, por eso busco otro puesto que me interesa./ [There are some posts in Habitantes that are really political, about the politics in Mexico, but I’m not going to comment because I am not an expert on the theme of Mexican politics, for that reason I am looking for another post that interests me.]” Charlotte, TAP 5

In the previous excerpt from Charlotte’s fifth TAP recording, she explained an aversion to interacting with content with which she was not familiar. This sentiment of avoiding content that was political or potentially controversial was echoed by Mariah
who stated that she preferred to comment on posts that she agreed with in order to avoid conflict. This behavior supports findings in SNS research that have recognized the intent of communication within social media to be generally positive and friendly in nature, rather than combative (Zappavigna, 2012).

Finally, the L2 participants acknowledged their position as learners of Spanish in various ways. One such manner of envoicing as a non-expert of Spanish was the use of technology as a mediation tool, which will also be discussed in the interactional strategies section. For example, Mary used outside digital resources, such as Google Translate, to help her to communicate with the other Spanish-speaking members of the affinity spaces; the use of these outside digital resources constituted 50% of her non-linguistic semiotic resources. She acknowledged the gaps in her Spanish linguistic ability that could be compensated for with the use of digital resources in order to, as she stated, “not seem illiterate.” Again, this desire to produce output that seemed more native-like demonstrated her desire to fit in with the other members of this digital community.

Similarly, Charlotte noticed the gaps in her language. However, after unsuccessfully turning to technology as a resource, she deferred to the other members of her affinity space. As she described an art piece that she had created, Charlotte used an online dictionary to look up the Spanish word for “clip art,” which did not yield any translations. She chose to turn to the other members of her affinity space for linguistic support.

“Este es una obra pequeña de 6 X 4 pulgadas. Es un collage hecho a mano por varias fotos he tomado por los años además de otros elementos de libros de "clip-art". No se como se dice "clip-art" en español. ¿Puede un miembro del grupo me avisa? He aumentado un poco con efectos digitales de mi ordenador. Se llama <<Esperanzas
This positioning of herself as the non-expert reflects the poststructuralist approach to critical theories on identity that emphasizes the relations of power that are interwoven in language use (Bourdieu, 1977, 1982, 1991). By acknowledging that she was seeking linguistic support from her fellow group members, Charlotte positioned herself as the non-expert, and consequently was able to envoice herself as a non-threatening, open-minded member of this affinity space.

The L2 participants’ use of envoicing strategies, as discussed in this section, exemplify two components of Canagarajah’s (2013) description of PC. Through their use of technology-based non-linguistic resources such as emojis, their avoidance of potentially controversial topics, and acknowledging their position as learners of Spanish, the L2 students were able to both start from their positionality and to negotiate on equal terms with the other interlocutors. This aspect of their PC allows them to take into consideration their positionality when presenting themselves and interacting within the affinity spaces in order to facilitate successful communicative encounters.

**Recontextualization Strategies**

While engaging in the multilingual digital affinity spaces, the L2 participants engaged in recontextualization strategies in order to frame their interactions. By using recontextualization strategies, these participants were able to determine which language(s) and cultural framing would be applied to each interaction in order to
successfully communicate (Canagarajah, 2013). In exploring this aspect of the L2 learners’ PC, their awareness of their audience was strikingly evident in the data. The awareness of their audience’s language(s) as well as their potential cultural differences affected the posts with which these participants chose to engage, which is interwoven with the envoicing strategies outlined in the previous section, and what they chose to communicate.

The participants often cited the alignment of their language use to the use of other interlocutors in their explanations of which languages they chose to use, or following the language lead of the user’s post with which they interacted. For example, if the other user posted in Spanish, the participant engaged in Spanish as well.

“I replied [to the post] all in Spanish because I only saw comments in Spanish or emoji faces.” - Mariah, Reflection 1

This alignment is one aspect of showing the participants’ awareness of their audience. However, in some cases, the participants conceptualized someone other than their fellow affinity space members as their audience, such as in the case of Alex and David. For example, when David wrote a post congratulating the recently retired coach of the Real Madrid soccer team on a successful career, he explained that he wrote the message in Spanish because the message was directed to the former coach himself, rather than to the other group members. Similarly, as seen in Figure 4, David commented in Spanish on a post in the Real Madrid Facebook page even though the other visible comments were in English as his intended audience was the team itself and their Spanish fans.
Figure 4. David’s Spanish comment on the Real Madrid Facebook page.

Alex took a similar approach when posting on the Spanish Chef José Andrés’ Facebook affinity space. Alex observed that most of the posts and content on the page were in English; however, he chose to write his post in Spanish; for him his choice of language was dependent on his audience, whether that be one individual or an entire group.

“Yeah um, it was mainly directed to Jose Andres, almost personally, and so I wanted to write it in Spanish. And even though I know most of the comments on the page are in English, I have seen Spanish language used widely on the page before. So that’s why I decided to use Spanish.” Alex, Interview 2
Another example of this awareness of the audience and its connection with envoicing strategies that reflected the learners’ desire to be accepted as a part of this digital community was Charlotte’s use of the vosotros form in her written output. This pronoun, and its associated verb conjugations and parts of speech, which may be known to students as words common to the variety of Spanish spoken in Spain. While she never used this second person, informal plural pronoun in her own speech, she used it when interacting in the Facebook group and explained that she incorporated it into her output because she had seen other group members use it.

“Espero que os guste el imagen. Porque es España, uso, "os”, porque veo, "os" muchísimo en la página./[I hope that you all like the image. Because it’s Spain, I use, “os”, because I see, “os” a lot on the page.]” Charlotte, TAP 5

Here Charlotte assumed that most, or all, of the group members are Spanish as she has seen widespread use of os, the indirect object pronoun for the vosotros form. By incorporating this into her own output she not only made an attempt to blend into this affinity space, but also framed the interaction as one having a base in the variety of Spanish from Spain.

This awareness of their audience led to many different reactions in the output and recontextualization strategies employed by the L2 participants. As explained in the previous chapter, three different components of PC are exemplified by the recontextualization strategies used by these L2 participants. The concepts of “negotiate on equal terms,” “co-construct the rules and terms of engagement,” and “be responsive to joint accomplishment of goals” all address the learners’ overall goal of communicating effectively in a digital contact zone such as the affinity spaces in Facebook. For example,
by demonstrating their awareness of who the audience of each post or comment was and modifying their language practices accordingly, they acknowledge the difference linguistically among the group members in these multilingual environments and modified their output to facilitate successful communication. All of these translanguaging negotiation strategies are linked as a part of the speakers’ PC; the interactional strategies will be discussed in detail in the following section.

**Interactional Strategies**

The interactional strategies employed by the L2 participants, which Canagarajah (2013) describes as principally strategies of alignment that allow the speaker to create meaning by employing their entire ecology of communicative resources, centered on the importance of their prior knowledge in order to successfully communicate in the digital affinity spaces. Prior knowledge, along with topic interest, have been shown to positively affect learners’ comprehension of a text (Baldwin, Peleg-Bruckner, & McClinktock, 1985). Therefore, the fact that the participants chose the affinity spaces in which they interacted, implying their interest in the content, was in and of itself an interactional strategy that helped these learners comprehend the content of these multilingual environments.

The ways in which the L2 participants incorporated their prior knowledge to help them make sense of the content in their chosen affinity spaces and to help them create output varied among users. Several examples will be examined here. First, Charlotte and David chose to interact in spaces that were related to hobbies that they had outside of the language learning context: art and soccer respectively. Charlotte explained that, while she
had never participated in an art-based affinity space (in Spanish or in English), she had learned a lot of the Spanish terminology simply by reading the packaging of art supplies that she purchased that printed the product information in several languages. This personal life experience, coupled with her ability to recognize cognates for many of the art terms that she was familiar with in English, facilitated her ability to understand the output of the other artists in the group and to create her own posts describing the artwork that she posted. Similarly, David was a soccer fan in his spare time and was very knowledgeable about the various European teams that appeared on the Real Madrid Facebook page.

“Being familiar with the game and the players helps with being able to understand the content of the posts and helps in interacting with other fans” David, Reflection 1

The use of images in the pages that Charlotte and David participated in also allowed them to incorporate their prior knowledge. For example, due to the multimodal nature of the SNS, almost all of the posts in the Real Madrid page were accompanied by photos or videos. As David was already very familiar with the team and the goings on of the European soccer leagues, he was able to recognize the people in the posts and surmise the content without having read the accompanying text. For example, when he came across a post with a photo of the recently retired coach from the Real Madrid team, he immediately knew that the post was about the coach’s recent retirement and tenure with the team, as he had heard about it in the news; therefore without reading the text he accurately translanguaged the content of the post by perceiving the accompanying photo to be a communicative device that helped him to understand the text. This type of interaction with multimodal content exemplifies Canagarajah’s (2013) argument that
technological changes have caused language users to interact differently with texts both when reading and writing: the incorporation of semiotic components allow for different types of comprehension and activation of prior knowledge.

Mary and Alex relied on information they had recently learned from other resources to activate their prior knowledge as an interactional strategy to navigate their chosen affinity spaces. After deciding to browse the Facebook page for the well-known Chilean author Isabel Allende, Mary looked up an interview with the author online. This allowed her to understand more about who the author was and what she was known for before diving into the content of the affinity space on the SNS. Similarly, Alex chose to interact with the Spanish language Facebook pages for national news affiliates. He came across several stories that he had already read about in the English language media, allowing him to have a grasp on the content before even beginning to read. Again, here the use of images in conjunction with the text on the posts allowed Alex to understand what the content was about and to activate his prior knowledge before being tasked with navigating the Spanish text.

“Este se trata de un, pues, ya no tan joven, un hombre de 30 años tiene que salir de su casa demandado por sus padres. He visto esta historia en los noticieros. Se me hace muy interesante que todavía siguen pasando eventos relacionados con esto.” [This is about a, well a not so young, a 30 year old man whose parents are demanding that he leave their house. I have seen this story in the news. It seems really interesting to me that events related to this keep happening.] Alex, TAP 5

These findings support the previous research that background knowledge plays an important role in the ability to comprehend a text in a learner’s L2 (Hudson, 1982; J. Lee, 1986).
Canagarjah (2013) described interactional strategies as “practices that are adaptive, reciprocal, and dynamic to co-construct meaning” (p. 175). This description highlights the two components of PC that are woven into the interactional strategies discussed here: “co-construct the rules and terms of engagement” and “be responsive to joint accomplishment of goals.” By employing interactional negotiation strategies such as the let it pass principle, these L2 learners’ PC aids them in achieving successful communication within the affinity spaces. However, again it should be noted that no one aspect of interactional strategies is responsible for a learner’s PC, or lack thereof. All of the negotiation strategies work together to help a learner navigate multilingual environments.

**Entextualization Strategies**

García and Li Wei (2014) described the effects of modern digital platforms on writing when they said “Today new technologies have enabled the production of more fluid language texts. Digital genres such as e-mails, online discussion forums, blogging, and instant messaging have brought translanguaging in multimodal writing to the forefront” (p.27). While exploring translangauging practices in this multimodal writing, such as in SNSs, the entextualization strategies used by the L2 participants during their time in the Facebook groups were examined by means of their TAP recordings. This allowed for the editing process, which is central to entextualization strategies, to be explored, rather than examining only the content that they chose to publish on Facebook vis-á-vis their posts and comments. Canagarajah (2013) explained that his conceptualization of entextualization strategies “are important not only for what they
reveal about language use, but they are also performative. They help translinguals accomplish many other functions, that is: they may prepare interlocutors for unconventional choices; they may test the uptake of interlocutors; and they may elicit particular responses from interlocutors” (p. 85). The entextualization strategies used by the L2 participants were mediated by technology, owing to the digital context in which they were communicating: a SNS.

Entextualization strategies are closely linked to the other negotiation strategies previously described in this chapter. In particular, envoicing and entextualization strategies are closely connected. For example, Mary’s use of digital resources, such as Google Translate, to edit her output in order to make it more native-like was done with the ultimate goal of envoicing herself as a more “literate” Spanish speaker, making an attempt to blend in with the other members of her affinity space. Online dictionaries and translators were used by all of the L2 participants, with the exception of Alex, as a resource for spelling, vocabulary, verb conjugations, and pronunciation. It should be noted that although Alex did not use any of these digital resources, he was the only L2 participant who noted in his LCP that he regularly used Facebook in languages other than English (German, French, and Spanish).

While these resources were extremely helpful for the participants in both being able to craft successfully their written output and to feel more confident in the content of their output, the digital tools at times caused problems with the learners’ translanguaging. For example, all five L2 participants’ Facebook pages were set to the English language. Therefore, even when they participated in affinity spaces that were principally Spanish
language-based, the settings of the SNS platform were in English. This interfered with assistive tools such as the spell check feature that is built into Facebook. For example, while Mariah typed a comment in Spanish, the spell check feature continuously autocorrected cognates to the English spelling of the word.

|“si! bad bunny es muy cantante espectacular spectacular y su voz es muy guapo. me gusta cuando artistas quieren colaborar con el porque la musica es mejor major.”|[yes! bad bunny is a spectacular singer and her voice is really pretty. i like when artists want to collaborate with him because the music is better.] Mariah, TAP 2|

In this example two words (espectacular and mejor) were autocorrected to a word in English. In the case of espectacular, the autocorrect feature changed it to spectacular, the English translation of espectacular. However, in the case of mejor, which means better, the autocorrect feature changed the word to the English major, changing the meaning of the sentence. Mariah corrected this change in meaning several times until the autocorrect feature stopped changing mejor to major. However, she did not make a change when espectacular was changed to spectacular. This may be because she simply did not notice the autocorrected change, or because this did not cause a change in meaning to her message.

One component of Canagarajah’s (2013) conceptualization of PC intersects with the entextualization strategies employed by these L2 learners: “reconfigure your norms and expand your repertoire” (p. 175). This requires that interlocutors are “adopting the best strategy for uptake” (p. 176). Through these participants’ involvement of digital resources as a tool of entextualization to ensure that their messages were understood by their chosen audience, this careful selection and editing process, as it forms a part of PC, is evident in the L2 data.
Chapter Summary

As was evidenced in the previous chapter that examined the HLL data, the L2 data also supports the need for expanded conceptualizations of these negotiation strategies for translanguaging in digital contexts and furthermore for the expansion of models of communicative competence to include digital contexts. Throughout the description of the learner attitudes and ideologies toward translanguaging and the four types of negotiation strategies employed by the L2 participants, three principal themes were explored: the reliance on digital resources for communication, the importance of prior knowledge, and the preference for translingual practices in spoken rather than written communication. By exploring these themes in the data, two of the research questions were answered.

RQ1: How do students of Spanish utilize, or not utilize, translanguaging within affinity spaces in the SNS Facebook?

The L2 participants utilized translanguaging extensively throughout their Facebook interactions. For two participants (Charlotte and Mariah), this translanguaging took the shape of the use of multiple languages (Spanish and English) in their written output in the affinity spaces. For others (David and Mary), this ecological approach to language use was evident in their oral output during the TAPs rather than in their written output, evidencing the attitude that written language serves as a more formal medium of communication and therefore students often adhered to the ideals of linguistic purism and the separation of languages when writing.
Translanguaging goes beyond the interwoven use of languages such as Spanish and English to include semiotic and non-verbal communication resources. These semiotic resources, such as emojis used by Alex, Mariah, and David, were used as a means of envoicing themselves as approachable and as an attempt to be accepted by other members of their affinity space. Technology also, similar to the HLL participants, served a central role in the translanguaging of the L2 participants. Digital resources, such as the spell check affordance housed within Facebook and online dictionaries and translators, were used as a mediation tool that assisted the learners in both understanding the content of other members of the affinity spaces and in creating their own communicative output.

*RQ2: How does the participants’ use of alignment and other negotiation strategies of PC affect their communication in the Facebook affinity spaces?*

The L2 learners’ participation and communication within the Facebook affinity spaces and the related tasks demonstrated the effect that their language attitudes and their PC had on their communication in this digital context. With reference to the learners’ attitudes toward translanguaging practices, their general adherence to linguistic purism and a preference for the separation of languages in written output led the majority, 67 of 70 total comments and posts, of the written output to be produced in one language. However, the L2 participants were more accepting of translanguaging practice in less formal output, such as their verbal output during the TAPs, in which many participants’ use of Spanish and English was interwoven.

The use of digital resources as a mediation tool and a means of alignment was also central in the L2 participants’ Facebook interactions. These digital tools served many
purposes. For example, emojis were used as a means of envoicing and self presentation. Online dictionaries served as a grammar verification tool, to check spelling, and to look up unknown words and phrases. This reliance on digital resources played a pivotal role in the PC of these learners, as explained in the sections on the four translinguaging negotiation strategies in this chapter. Furthermore, they affected the way in which the participants communicated in this digital space. As the use of these digital tools was interwoven into the various facets of the learners’ PC, it allowed them to effectively understand and communicate in the affinity spaces.

The present study has investigated both HLL and L2 students within Facebook affinity spaces. Thus far, both have been analyzed separately. However in order to understand the similarities and differences in the HLL and L2 translinguaging practices and negotiation strategies, the two groups need to be compared and analyzed in conjunction with one another. The following chapter will discuss both sets of data and their pedagogical implications.
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

As discussed in the previous chapters, the rise of Web 2.0 technologies has impacted the way in which people communicate as well as the ways languages come into contact (Blake, 2013; Thomas et al., 2013). It is paramount that SLA and CALL research intersect in order to “understand these new ways of using language in our lives, the new worlds of words they entail in turn provide new means of understanding who we are and how we connect through language” (Tannen & Trester, 2013, p. ix). Thus far the present study has separately analyzed the data from five HL students of Spanish and five L2 students of Spanish and their translanguaging practices and PC, as evidenced by their use of translanguaging negotiation strategies, within digital affinity spaces housed in the SNS Facebook. In order to more comprehensively understand students’ use of translanguaging and its consequences on their digital communicative practices, this chapter will compare the two groups followed by a discussion of the potential theoretical and pedagogical implications of these findings.

Comparison of HLL and L2 Data

Quantitative Comparison

Due to the high frequency of mixed classrooms in which both HLL and L2 learners are present (Carreira, 2016), the HLL and L2 data are compared in this chapter in order to understand better the translangaging practices of learners of Spanish. First the frequency counts of both groups were analyzed to identify patterns and themes in the data. Here, this quantitative aspect of the data will be analyzed in conjunction with
qualitative data analysis methods. This analysis will be separated into three themes that will be addressed in this section: (i) the distribution of language use, (ii) the use of semiotic resources for communication, and (iii) the use of outside digital resources.

**Distribution of use of linguistic semiotic resources.** First, when placed side by side, one of the most striking aspects of the HLL data in comparison with that of the L2 participants is the nearly identical distribution of Spanish, English, and Spanish/English comments and posts, as seen in Table 7. In total, the HLL participants produced 68 total comments while the L2 participants produced a total of 70; 61 of those comments were made in Spanish both in the HLL group (90% of total comments) and in the L2 group (87% of total comments). The HLL group made five comments in English (7% of total comments) while the L2 group made six (9% of total comments); the HLL group produced two comments (3% of total) that used both Spanish and English while the L2 group made three (4% of total). Therefore, comments that used exclusively Spanish comprised 90% (61/68) and 78% (61/70) respectively of the output produced by the HLL and L2 learners in the digital affinity spaces; this preference for Spanish-only comments in both groups is supported by the previously discussed linguistic alignment that all participants reported feeling which caused them to follow the language use patterns of other group members.
Table 7

*Frequency Counts for HLL and L2 Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Spanish comments</th>
<th>English comments</th>
<th>Spanish/English comments</th>
<th>Total comments</th>
<th>Reactions</th>
<th>Emojis</th>
<th>Outside digital resources</th>
<th>Total non-linguistic resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
<td>5 (46%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>7 (54%)</td>
<td>5 (39%)</td>
<td>13 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>16 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>17 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 (43%)</td>
<td>13 (57%)</td>
<td>23 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>8 (80%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61 (90%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30 (41%)</td>
<td>25 (34%)</td>
<td>18 (25%)</td>
<td>73 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L2 Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (100%)</td>
<td>13 (87%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17%)</td>
<td>(83%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mariah</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (93%)</td>
<td>4 (45%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(93%)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td>(41%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(59%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (93%)</td>
<td>14 (93%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(93%)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7%)</td>
<td>(41%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(93%)</td>
<td>(93%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(41%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Overall totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 (87%)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 (13%)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52 (78%)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Outside digital resources include any electronic resources that were outside of Facebook (e.g., Google Translate). Percentages for Spanish, English, and Spanish/English comments are taken from the total number of comments (linguistic semiotic resources). Percentages for Reactions, Emojis, and Outside Digital Resources are taken from the total number of non-linguistic semiotic resources.
While Spanish was the language used in the vast majority of their written output, the HLL and L2 groups wrote 7% (5/68) and 9% (6/70) respectively of their written output in English, a percentage drastically lower than both groups’ use of Spanish. This disparity is explained in large part by the envoicing and recontextualization strategies utilized by both the HLL and L2 participants. The participants explained frequently that their choice of Spanish for their comments was rooted in part in the idea that the use of English might be “rude” (HLL Diego, Interview 1) or “weird” (L2 Mariah, Reflection 2) if other members were interacting in Spanish, as seen in the excerpt below. This sentiment was echoed by other participants who viewed the use of the majority language as the most appropriate.

“I decided to use Spanish as in my post because most of the people that I saw on the Facebook page were using Spanish. I just thought it would be more appropriate.” HLL Isabela, Reflection 1

Mary had the highest frequency of English comments within the L2 group (5/9 55% of her comments). In her TAPs, stimulated recall interviews, and written reflection Mary often expressed frustration at trying to express herself fully in Spanish; she wrote both of her written reflections in English and sometimes composed her Spanish comments completely in English within Google Translate, ultimately copy and pasting the Spanish output from the translator into Facebook. Her low self-reported proficiency in the written mode of Spanish (Average) coupled with her frustrations in confronting the gaps in her linguistic knowledge in Spanish may explain her more frequent use of English in the Facebook posts. Priming did not appear to play a role in Mary’s use of English and Spanish; while engaging in Isabel Allende’s, a famous Chilean author, Facebook affinity
space for fans, which housed a majority of English language content, she made comments in both English and Spanish. However, even when commenting in Spanish, she used English to type out her comment into Google Translate and simply copy and pasted the Spanish content in to the Facebook page. Therefore, the function of English for Mary was simply as a more efficient means of communication for her due to her self-perceived lack of proficiency in Spanish.

“Is this book available in English and Spanish? Someone mentioned it is going to be made into a movie?” L2 Mary, TAP 5

David was the only other L2 participant to leave a comment in English. His one English comment (7% of his total comments) was an active choice on his part. In his TAP, he explained that he was going to try leaving a comment in English to see if it received more interaction from other group members than his Spanish comments. Here, he was feeling out the language use within the page; he had noticed both English and Spanish being used and wanted to maximize his interactions with other participants.

“Let’s see, I’ll put something in English this time, see if I get any more [comments].” L2 David, TAP 4

Similarly, both groups demonstrated very low usage of both English and Spanish within the same post in Facebook with these posts comprising 3% (2/68) of the total posts for the HLLs and 4% (3/70) of the L2s.

The use of a combination of languages was the least common way for participants in both groups to produce written output in spite of the fact that participants from both groups expressed regularly that they thought many or most of the other group members of their affinity spaces were bilingual and that they saw English or other languages at play
within the groups. This aversion to using more than one language in their post is likely due to the same previously mentioned envoicing and recontextualization strategies that explained the low number of English posts and the preference for Spanish-only comments. Another contributing factor is likely the type of communication: written language. It is probable that the participants viewed written output as requiring a more formal type of language use (Halliday, 1994), therefore steering themselves away from the ecological use of combining elements within their entire linguistic repertoire.

While each participant was unique in their use of translanguaging and the purposes that it served for them, overall both HLLs and L2 learners utilized translanguaging practices to help them navigate the digital affinity spaces. The previous research that has examined these translanguaging practices in digital contexts have focused principally on the linguistic semiotic resources used by the multilingual (Androutsopoulous, 2015; Schreiber, 2015), or emergent bilingual (L2) participants (Blyth & Dalola, 2016; Kulavuz-Onal & Vásquez, 2018; Oliver & Nguyen, 2017), rather than the non-linguistic semiotic resources which were also incorporated into the present research. The involvement of these elements of communication allowed for an understanding of the incorporation of the participants’ entire communicative repertoire by involving non-linguistic semiotic resources such as emojis and the use of the reactions feature on Facebook. The participants in both groups also utilized outside digital resources as a mediation tool to help understand the content of the affinity spaces as well as to mediate their written output. However, both groups demonstrated a preference to keep their languages separate in written output more than in the oral mode; this
preference was reflected in their embodied ideologies toward translanguaging. This finding is strikingly different than Kulavuz-Onal and Vásquez’s (2018) findings, in which students readily incorporated the use of their L1, Spanish for some students and Arabic for others, into their output in a Facebook group designated for use of the target language (English). However, the principal difference at play here is in the linguistic makeup of the interlocutors within this Facebook group. Unlike the present research in which the participants, learners of Spanish, were interacting, for the most part, with native speakers of Spanish and other bilinguals in their chosen Facebook pages, in Kulavuz-Onal and Vásquez’s research, the participants in the Facebook group were all learners of English. They also were engaging in a Facebook page specifically created for pedagogical purposes, rather than an affinity space that existed outside of an academic context.

The context may have been a contributing factor the participants’ employment of translanguaging practices as it differed from the present research in much of the other existing research as well: Androutsopoulos (2015) and Schreiber (2015) examined Facebook output that was not part of the participants’ academic coursework. While Blyth and Dalola (2016) also found Facebook to be a space that fostered the use of translanguaging, their data came from within a Facebook group meant for learners of English rather than in authentic affinity spaces that included native speakers as well as emergent bilinguals. These three studies also investigated participants within a different group of languages than the present research: HLLs of Greek studying at a Greek school in Germany (Androutsopoulos, 2015), a bilingual speaker of Serbian and English (Schreiber, 2015), and multilingual speakers of Aboriginal English and Standard
Australian English (Oliver & Nguyen, 2017). As the present research focused on Spanish and English, the findings of these other investigations can serve as a starting point for investigation into the present context, but the findings cannot be directly compared due to the difference in the native and target languages and the previously mentioned contexts of the participants.

Olivia was the only HLL participant who used English and English/Spanish in her written output on Facebook. She was one of two HLL participants (including Eva) who listed English as her native language in the LCP. She also consistently rated her proficiency in English as higher than in Spanish and explained that sometimes she commented in English simply because it was easier and faster for her. The English comments that she made (5/11 46% of total comments) were made on pages with prevalent English use. Three of the five English comments were made on the LUCHA (Living United for Change in Arizona) Facebook page, an affinity space dedicated to social justice in the Southwest. The page addresses a wide breadth of Latinx issues, however the majority of the content is published in English, at times with Spanish translations included. However, Olivia did also use English in comments on pages that contained a majority of Spanish content. In these cases, her tendency to revert to English when it is “easier” and “faster” for her was likely at play (TAP 2; Interview 1). Two of her eleven comments included both English and Spanish (18%); these two comments were mostly Spanish with English used to reinforce what had been said (“Me encanto sus voces; I love their voices.”) or as a simple code switch (“Que pretty.”), frequently seen at the end of the utterance, as seen in the following example.
The two L2 participants who had written output containing both English and Spanish, Charlotte (2/15 13% of total comments) and Mariah (1/15 7% of total comments), used the combination of languages differently than Olivia. Charlotte and Mariah both used English in posts that were principally composed in Spanish to compensate for gaps in their linguistic knowledge. For example, Charlotte used English to explicitly ask for input on vocabulary from her fellow group members, utilizing English as a request for clarification.

Mariah (L2), on the other hand, did not use English to ask for feedback from her fellow group members. Rather, her use of English as a type of code switch within a post that was primarily Spanish compensated for gaps in her linguistic knowledge. It should be noted that in the following example we see another example of technological affordances working against multilinguals at times; Mariah originally typed “si ozuna es mi favorito/[yes ozuna is my favorite]”, however the autocorrect feature in Facebook changed her use of the Spanish word “favorito” to the English “favorite”. Mariah either
did not notice this change or, because the words have the same meaning, did not feel the need to correct it.

“si ozuna es mi favorite y muy talentoso. Yo quiero ver en concierto algun dia tambien. Yo nunca miro artistas de reggaeton live. Yo creo que el viene a Colombia, google las fechas de conciertos. /[yes ozuna is my favorite and very talented. I want to see a concert someday as well. I never see these reggaeton artists live. I think that he is coming to Colombia, google the dates of the concerts.]” L2 Mariah, TAP 2

This clear preference to keep their languages separate may be due to two factors, or a combination of the two: linguistic priming and an adherence to the ideals of linguistic purism on the part of both groups. With reference to the effect of linguistic priming on the language use of the participants, some research has pointed to topical similarities as an indicator of priming (Branigan, Pickering, & Cleland, 2000). Due to the nature of these digital affinity spaces, a common topic and interest was always at play in the communicative interactions of the participants. In their TAPs, stimulated recall interviews, and written reflections the participants in both the HLL and the L2 group also frequently cited the language use of other participants as a deciding factor in their own decision of what language(s) to use in a given post, such as the excerpts from Eva (HLL) and Mariah (L2) in the two previous chapters. HLL Eva indicated that the use of Spanish in the comments by other group members “forced” her to use Spanish in her own comments. Similarly, L2 Mariah followed the language use patterns of other group members when choosing which language(s) to use in her comments.

An adherence to the ideals of linguistic purism may also act as an underlying component in these participants’ choice of language use. The role of linguistic purism in the day-to-day language use of these students is explained by Brunstad (2003): “The
notion of 'pure' versus 'impure' language, as we find it in linguistic purism, therefore refers to a mental construct. Yet, by achieving a special status in society this mental construct may be operative as a norm phenomenon” (p. 52). Therefore, many of the participants may have felt pressure to adhere to the use of only one language in their written language due to their mental construction of the practice of language separation as a societal norm (Brunstad, 2003; Martínez et al., 2015). For instance, HLL Sara explicitly explained a preference for the use of one language in order to avoid the social stigma associated with the mixing of languages and the profiling she had experienced in the past when she had been called pocho, a derogatory term for the speakers of a variety of Spanish used widely in the United States that includes borrowings and calques from English.

In general, the use of Spanish and English served a wide array of purposes. Spanish was used to reply to posts principally when the majority of the content of the page was also in Spanish. At times, English was also used based on an alignment when the majority of the page’s content was in English. On the other hand, English was used within Spanish comments in order to explicitly ask for linguistic support, to reinforce what was already said in Spanish, or to compensate for gaps in the Spanish linguistic repertoire of the learner. When English and Spanish were used together in a comment, English was often found at the end of a sentence or post.

**Distribution of use of non-linguistic semiotic resources.** As seen in Table 7, the HLL participants’ use of the non-linguistic semiotic resources available within Facebook (emojis and reactions such as ‘likes’) far outnumbered those of the L2s.
The HLLs utilized the reactions feature 30 times (41% of the total number of non-linguistic semiotic resources used) compared with the L2s’ use of them six times (9% of that total). Of the non-linguistic semiotic resources used by participants in the HLL group, 34% (25/73) were emojis compared with 13% (9/67) of those used by the L2s. While the use of emojis has been documented to be widely used, women and people under the age of 30 are the most frequent users (Marengo, Giannotta, & Settanni, 2017). One potential explanation for this disparity between the use of emojis and reactions is the age difference between the two groups. Both groups had a mean age that was higher than might be expected in a university course: 31.6 years for the HLL group and 43.2 years for the L2 group. The online degree program in which these students were enrolled often attracts adults who may have families or other commitments, such as full time jobs, for whom the flexibility of an online degree program is more feasible than traditional F2F coursework. With this in mind, the HLL group’s mean age was more than ten years lower than the mean age for the L2 group. The fact that younger people tend to make greater use of semiotic resources such as emojis may be one explanation for this group’s higher usage.

While the HLL group tended to use more emojis than the L2 group, within each group there were differences in the frequency of use of each of these non-linguistic semiotic resources. The HLL group used more reactions than emojis, comprising 41% (30/73) and 34% (25/73) respectively of their total non-linguistic resources. Conversely, the L2 group used a greater number of emojis (13%, 9/67) than reactions (9%, 6/67). However, the differences in these percentages of use did not vary greatly within each
group; the HLL group demonstrated only seven percentage points difference between the reactions and emojis (41% vs. 34%) while the L2 group differed by only four percentage points (9% vs. 13%).

Table 8

*Participants’ Self-Reported Proficiency Levels in Spanish*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HLL Participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego</td>
<td>Native/Nativelike</td>
<td>Native/Nativelike</td>
<td>Native/Nativelike</td>
<td>Native/Nativelike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabela</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Less than average</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L2 Participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Native/Nativelike</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariah</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Less than average</td>
<td>Less than average</td>
<td>Less than average</td>
<td>Less than average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Participants chose from *Native/Nativelike, Very good, Good, Average, Less than average,* and *Poor* for each skill. The complete LCP can be seen in Appendix A.

**Use of digital resources.** While the HLL students tended to use more semiotic resources, such as emojis and reactions, the L2 students’ use of digital resources as a
mediation tool (the use of outside digital resources comprised 78% (52/67) of their non-linguistic resources) far outnumbered those of the HLLs (25%, 18/73). In their recorded Facebook interactions, the HLL participants had 18 (25%) instances of the use of outside digital resources (e.g., online dictionaries) whereas the L2 participants had 52 (78%). This was likely due to the L2 participants’ lower proficiency levels and/or lower level of confidence regarding their demand of the Spanish language, as seen in Table 8.

The self-reported written proficiencies shown in Table 8 indicate that HLL participants consistently rated their written proficiency levels as being higher than the L2 participants (with the exception of Alex). Due to their lower written proficiency levels, or at least their self-perceived lower written proficiency levels, the L2 participants used these digital resources to compensate for the gaps in their linguistic repertoire (range was 50%-96%; Mary [Less than average]=50% 2/4, Mariah [Average]=59% 10/17, Charlotte [Good]=83% 19/23, and David [Good]=95% 21/22). It should be noted here that, within the L2 group, Alex reported his proficiency as the highest overall in the L2 group (Very good). He was also the only L2 participant who never utilized digital resources in his Facebook communication, thus supporting the theory that outside digital resource use is linked to self-perceived proficiency level. Therefore, the L2s may have felt a greater dependency on these digital resources in order to effectively communicate in the affinity spaces.

Similarly, in the HLL group Sara and Diego self-reported their written proficiency as Very good and Native/Native-like (respectively) and neither one used any outside digital resources. Concomitantly, Olivia and Eva rated themselves Average (lower than
Sara and Diego) in terms of their written proficiency and were the only two HLL participants to use outside digital resources (Olivia=5/13 [39% of total non-linguistic resources] and Eva=13/23 [57% of non-linguistic resources]). These data support the proposed trend that higher self-perceived proficiency leads to lower use of outside digital resources as a mediation tool. However, one participant did not fit into this hypothesis. HLL Isabela, who identified Spanish as her native language in her LCP, rated her proficiency as *Less than average* for writing in Spanish (see Table 8), the skill used most prominently in the output produced by the learners in the affinity spaces. In spite of this lower self-reported proficiency, she did not use any outside digital resources. While she did not use any digital resources as a mediation tool when communicating in Spanish on Facebook, she did report in her written reflections that she used a physical copy of a Spanish-English dictionary to check the spelling of words. Therefore, lower self-reported proficiency levels do indicate a tendency toward the use of outside resources, principally digital in nature, as a tool used to navigate these multilingual environments.

This section has examined the comparison of the frequency counts of the HLL and L2 groups. However, this study is principally qualitative in nature. Therefore, the following sections will examine the effect of the participants’ translanguaging ideologies on their communication in the Facebook affinity spaces.

**Translanguaging Ideologies**

The underlying ideologies that these students have toward language use and translanguaging played a central role in the decisions they made about language use within the digital affinity spaces and the ways in which they communicated. Although
these underlying ideologies affected both the HLL and L2 participants’ language use, there was one striking difference. The five HLL participants consistently described their choice of language(s) and their language use as a subconscious switch between languages. One participant explained the use of both Spanish and English as something “automatic” while another explained it was something she “didn’t even notice.” For these HLLs it appears that incorporating their entire ecology of linguistic resources to communicate in multilingual environments was second nature to them. In contrast, the L2 group described their language choices as overt, explicit decisions. They “decided” to use one language or the other in order to reach their chosen audience and to present themselves in less threatening manners.

In line with the HLLs’ ideologies toward their translanguaging practices as something subconscious, many scholars have argued that translanguaging for bi/multilinguals is a natural process (García & Li Wei, 2014; Shohamy, 2006). Although the L2 participants may be considered emergent bilinguals, one explanation for this distinct separation in their ideologies toward their use of translanguaging may be their level of proficiency in the language (see Table 8 for a breakdown of the participants’ self-reported proficiency levels in Spanish). For the L2 participants, with the exception of Alex, the high school Spanish teacher who also spoke Spanish regularly at home with his roommates and used social media in Spanish, they did not self-report their abilities in Spanish (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) as native-like. This lower overall proficiency in Spanish may have led to greater noticing of the gaps in their language abilities (Schmidt, 1990) for which they compensated with the use of English and/or
outside digital resources, such as in the cases of HLLs Olivia and Eva whose lower self-reported proficiency in Spanish correlated with a higher usage of outside digital resources. As previously mentioned, although at first glance HLL Isabela is an outlier to this theory due to her low self-reported proficiency levels and lack of use of outside digital resources, she did report using non-digital resources as a mediation tool when communicating in Spanish.

While there was a visible discrepancy between the HLL and L2 groups’ ideologies toward the origins of their translanguaging practices, both groups displayed disparities between their articulated and embodied translanguaging ideologies. A distinction between these two features of ideologies is common and results in differences in what the language user articulates their language ideologies to be and what they put into practice (Kroskrity, 2004). The exact differences between articulated and embodied ideologies were unique to each participant. However, in general, the HLL participants displayed an articulated ideology that paralleled the ideals of linguistic purism as they expressed resistance to the mixing of their languages in writing in their affinity space; yet, both groups’ embodied ideologies showed an acceptance of translanguaging practices. In the case of the HLL group, participants used both languages and semiotic resources to communicate in Facebook, to narrate their TAPs, for private speech in their TAPs, and in their written reflections; this use of both languages in conjunction with other resources was more present in the oral mode than the written mode. Similarly, the L2 group also used both English and Spanish along with semiotic resources, such as emojis, to communicate in the Facebook groups, in their TAPs, and in their written
reflections. Participants from both groups who self-reported their proficiency in the written mode of Spanish to be lower also embraced the use of other resources, both digital and in the case of HLL Isabela, non-digital, available to them, such as online dictionaries, to foment the linguistic resources available in their repertoire.

For both the HLL and L2 participants, their ideologies toward translanguaging affected their communication in the Facebook affinity spaces. In general, the participants avoided the use of multiple languages in written output even when they acknowledged that their fellow affinity space members were likely multilingual. However, they were more willing to incorporate translanguaging as a mediation tool in a medium that is frequently considered less formal than written output: spoken language (Halliday, 1994). The implications of these practices will be further discussed in the pedagogical implications section of this chapter.

**Translanguaging Negotiation Strategies**

In order to understand the PC of these learners of Spanish, their use of translanguaging negotiation strategies was examined and, consequently, the definitions and descriptions of each expanded in order to encompass their translanguaging in digital contexts. All four of the translanguaging negotiation strategies discussed here need to be expanded to include the use of digital resources as a mediation tool for communication in multilingual environments. Thus far, all of the negotiation strategies were analyzed separately for the HLL and L2 groups. Here, we will examine both together in order to compare the findings of the two learner groups and to identify any overall themes in the translanguaging negotiation strategies of these Spanish students.
**Envoicing strategies.** One of the most common themes throughout the data for both the HLL and L2 participants was their use of the semiotic resources afforded to them by Facebook as a means of envoicing. This took the form of the use of the reactions feature (e.g., giving a post a “like”) and the use of emojis. As discussed in the previous two chapters, the participants stated that their use of emojis was meant to present themselves as friendly and open to interaction within the affinity space. Overall, the HLL and L2 participants’ use of those semiotic resources as a means of envoicing supported the findings of previous research which demonstrated that interlocutors use a greater quantity of *positive politeness*, also known as positive face strategies, over time within CMC (Morand & Ocker, 2002; Simmons, 1994). Positive politeness addresses how these communicative interactions relate and may take the form of “suggesting that they like the hearer as a person or share the same likes and desires, or by indicating that they view the hearer as part of an in-group with the speaker” (West & Trester, 2013, p. 135). The use of these semiotic resources in order to effectively communicate in a digital affinity space demonstrates these participants’ use of translanguaging strategies; they incorporated resources in their communicative repertoire that extended beyond their conceptualization of languages (Spanish and English).

Both groups also employed envoicing strategies that served to defer to the expertise of other members of the affinity spaces (Canagarajah, 2013). However, this took different forms for the HLL and L2 groups. For the HLL, their choice of language was used as a deferential strategy in that they frequently chose to follow the language use patterns of the other group members on a given post in order to not seem “rude” or in an
attempt to show their willingness to interact. On the other hand, the L2 participants deferred to the other group members in a more explicit manner; they avoided topics on which they did not feel well-informed. In the case of Charlotte, she openly asked her fellow group members for linguistic support when she noticed gaps in her language abilities.

Although the envoicing strategies of the HLL and L2 differed in some aspects (see Table 7 for frequencies of emoji, reaction, and outside digital resources use), the underlying goal of their envoicing strategies was the same: to present themselves as open to interaction and to seem friendly and respectful. This finding supports previous research that demonstrated a tendency for CMC environments to create a “friendly translanguaging atmosphere” (Melo-Pfeifer, 2015, p. 109).

**Recontextualization strategies.** When making decisions regarding the language and cultural framing of their interactions, the language ideologies of the participants played a key role. This interaction between different components of the learners’ language competence demonstrates the ecological nature of language use in translanguaging; no one aspect can independently define or describe a speaker’s language use. As previously mentioned, the HLL participants described their choice of language as a more subconscious process while the L2 participants explained the decisions that contributed to their language use as a conscious choice. This played directly into their recontextualization strategies as a means of translanguaging; both the HLL and L2 groups showed a disposition to aligning their language use to that of other members of the
affinity space as well as an awareness of their audience; both were contributing factors to their language use.

Although the HLLs acknowledged that the language use of the other group members played a part in their communicative output, they still expressed their selection of a linguistic code (English vs. Spanish) as a subconscious choice. This indicates that for HLLs, their recontextualization strategies, while still playing a key role in their translanguaging practices, are second-nature, supporting García and Li Wei’s (2014) argument that translanguaging is a natural process for multilinguals.

As very little has been investigated about the translanguaging practices of L2 learners, the discrepancy in the recontextualization strategies of the HLL and L2 students is a key finding in this study. As opposed to the naturalness of translanguaging strategies for HLL speakers, for the L2 participants, the recontextualization strategies that they employed in the digital affinity spaces were a conscious process informed by active decision-making regarding the intended audience of their written output as well as by the language used by other group members.

**Interactional strategies.** The asynchronous, digital nature of the type of communication facilitated by the SNS Facebook impacted the type of interactional strategies that interlocutors could rely on for communication. As evidenced in their TAPs, participants from both groups utilized digital resources as an interactional strategy and as a means of alignment that allowed them to interact effectively in the Facebook groups. However, the L2 group used those resources, such as online translators, far more frequently than the HLL participants (see Table 7). It should be noted that while the
overall frequency of these outside digital resources for the L2 group was higher, the
general trend here is not a divide between HLL and L2; rather it is a perceived
relationship between lower self-reported proficiency in the written mode in Spanish and a
higher use of outside digital resources. Again, although HLL Isabela appears to be an
outlier in this finding, she did utilize physical dictionaries as a mediation tool. This paper-
based resource was not included in the outside digital resources category.

As previously discussed in this chapter, the greater use of digital resources by the
L2 group is likely explained by their lower proficiency in Spanish. The L2 participants’
reliance on digital resources as an interactional strategy demonstrates a major
implication: the importance of DL for learners of a language, in particular within online
contexts. With the advent of distance language learning and CALL in the academic realm
and the availability of multilingual spaces via SNSs and Web 2.0 technologies, learners
are communicating via digital mediums more than ever (Blake, 2013; Lenhart, Madden,
& Hitlin, 2005; Oliver & Nguyen, 2017). As evidenced by the present study, students rely
on online resources to light a communicative path through these language contact zones.
This shift to the ubiquitous use of digital resources in multilingual communication has
implications for language teaching that will be discussed in depth in the Pedagogical
Implications section of this chapter.

As previously discussed in Chapter 4, the interactional strategies for
translanguaging were conceptualized with F2F communication in mind (Kirkpatrick,
2010). However, as seen in the present study, many of those strategies are not easily
facilitated in a context of digital, text-based communication. Therefore, I propose that the
use of digital resources must be added as an interactional strategy for translanguaging. This strategy would be relevant both in CMC, such as the communication in this study, and also in F2F communication. The ubiquitous nature of mobile phones and other mobile technologies now make translation applications and multilingual dictionaries available at the fingertips of the interlocutors. These may be used as a mediation tool even when the communication takes place in a traditional, F2F context.

The L2 participants relied more heavily on digital resources in order to communicate in the digital affinity spaces and also demonstrated the importance of prior knowledge in their communication. All five of the L2 participants referenced the previous knowledge they had on the topics they chose to interact with in the affinity spaces and described that this knowledge helped them to understand as well as respond to the content, supporting the findings of previous research that highlights the role that prior knowledge has on learners’ ability to interact in the target language (Hudson, 1982; J. Lee, 1986). Prior knowledge was not a theme that appeared in the HLL data; while the L2 participants explicitly expressed an aversion to interacting with content with which they were not familiar with, none of the HLL participants stated such an avoidance to unfamiliar or potentially controversial topics.

**Entextualization strategies.** Finally, the entextualization strategies employed by the HLL and L2 participants both demonstrated the important role of technology-mediated resources in their communication. The affordances of Facebook, such as the spell check feature, heightened students’ noticing of errors. However, tools such as spell check are not all that they appear: while they can enhance students’ noticing, they do so
only in one language. For example, if the learner has their Facebook language set to English, Spanish words will be highlighted as erroneous, and at times autocorrected to an English word, even when spelled correctly. This can be frustrating to learners, as was previously demonstrated by Mariah in the HLL data chapter when she tried to type a comment in Spanish that was repeatedly, and incorrectly, changed by the autocorrect feature. Other participants who were faced with this same issue, such as Isabela, compensated for the issue by using the setting on her computer for a Spanish and an English keyboard and alternating between the two simply by clicking the associated icon at the top of her screen depending on her language use. This is a useful work-around for communication in multilingual settings in which the users may be moving in and out of languages. However, without the knowledge that this feature of their computers exists or how to employ it, learners like Mariah continued to struggle against the autocorrect feature in Facebook. This is a perfect demonstration of the importance of educating students on the repertoire of digital resources available and the significance of supporting the development of their DL.

For platforms, such as SNSs, that are home to multilingual spaces in which language contact and an ecological use of linguistic resources are common, affordances such as spellcheck and autocorrect should be modified to facilitate more than one linguistic system. Other online systems, such as the gamut of platforms housed within Google, have made steps toward this. For example, within Google Docs, languages are automatically sensed by the platform and the spell check feature is applied accordingly. However, this feature is currently lacking in Facebook.
Performative Competence of HLL and L2 Participants

While Celce-Murcia et al.’s (1995) model described the communicative competence of language users, it does not take into account multilingual speakers nor modern digital contexts, such as SNSs, that experience high levels of language contact. In order to address these increasingly important aspects of multilingual speakers’ communication, Canagarajah (2013) put forth PC as a means to describe the how aspect of translinguaging; PC attempts to explain the components of a speaker’s communicative competence as it relates to “plural language norms and mobile semiotic resources” (p. 173). The previously described translinguaging negotiation strategies fall beneath the umbrella concept of PC. Here, the overall PC of the participants will be explored in two different facets: the distinction between use and non-use of translinguaging in their communication and the role that technology-mediated resources played in the translinguaging practices of the participants.

Both groups of participants showed a preference for the separation of their languages in their written output, although they often still included the use of semiotic resources, such as emojis (see Table 7 for the differences in frequencies of these resources for each group). This observation leads to multiple implications. First, these language learners adhere to the norms of linguistic purism and prefer to keep their languages separate in written output, even in contexts that are arguably less formal (e.g., Facebook affinity spaces) than other written mediums (e.g., academic essays, work-related emails). As discussed in the HLL and L2 data analysis chapters, this is likely due to the conceptualization of written language as more formal than spoken language.
The second implication is that the participants did not view the semiotic system of emojis to be a language although they considered it separate from English and Spanish.

“It’s kind of a way to express what I’m feeling or an emotion. It doesn’t matter what language I’m using I think I always use emojis.” HLL Sara, Interview 2

In this excerpt from Sara’s second stimulated recall interview she describes Spanish and English as “language,” and expresses that her use of emojis is separate from her conceptualization of those languages. This conceptualization of emojis as a system separate from her conceptualization of a language was echoed by other participants who described this semiotic system as “universal” (Mariah, Interview 1). Their conceptualization of emojis as separate from their understanding of a “language” allowed them to stay within the confines of a linguistic purist ideology, in which the mixing of languages is seen as deficient, while still utilizing the contextual support that emojis offer in written communication in this context (Derks et al., 2008; Walther & D’Addario, 2001; Wei, 2012).

Therefore, while the participants may have been, unbeknownst to them, actively trying to avoid engaging in the translingual practices (by separating their use of English and Spanish) that would involve the use of their entire linguistic repertoire in order the communicate, the inclusion of semiotic resources, such as the reactions and emojis used by the participants, demonstrates the use of alignment, one of the key components of PC. The interlocutors employed resources at their disposal that were outside of their language systems in order to communicate effectively and to compensate for the restrictions of an
asynchronous digital communication platform such as a SNS (e.g., lack of vocal intonation and facial expressions).

As is evidenced by the previous discussion of the inclusion of emojis in their Facebook communication, the technology-mediated resources available to learners in digital contexts such as this had a great impact on the participants’ PC. Aside from the use of semiotic resources afforded by the SNS, the participants also utilized digital resources outside of Facebook. Online dictionaries and translators made up the majority of these resources, which were more widely used by the L2 learners than the HLL (see Table 7). While both HLL and L2 did utilize these resources, the participants’ lower self-reported proficiency tracked with a greater reliance on technology-mediated resources.

This indicates that the use of these tools, such as online dictionaries, is of greater importance for successful communication in multilingual environments for HLL and L2 learners who self-perceive their abilities in writing the target language as low. Again, here HLL Isabela seems to fall outside of these parameters as she did not utilize any outside digital resources and ranked her written proficiency in Spanish as Less than average. However, she did report the use of a physical, non-digital, dictionary as a mediation tool. Therefore, although she did not use outside digital resources, she still relied on an outside source as a tool to help her navigate this digital context. For the participants who ranked their Spanish proficiency as higher but still utilized some outside digital resources, their TAPs, stimulated recall interviews, and written reflection indicated that their use of these tools was often a “double-check” or for confirmation of the spelling of a word. However, for the learners with lower reported proficiency, the use
of these resources was vastly different. They relied on online dictionaries to understand the output of the other affinity space members, to conjugate verbs, and to look up words that were missing from their linguistic repertoire. Therefore, these participants would have had a far more difficult time communicating in these language-contact zones without the aid of digital resources. In order to understand the consequences of these findings in CALL and SLA research, the following section will address the theoretical implications of the findings discussed in this chapter.

**Theoretical Implications**

Throughout this discussion, the effects of digital, multilingual contexts on the languaging practices of both HLL and L2 have been evidenced. In order to take these effects into consideration when addressing the communicative competence of language learners, Celce-Murcia et al.’s (1995) model of communicative competence (see Figure 2) must be expanded to take into consideration the effects of contexts that experience high levels of language contact, such as SNSs (see Figure 3).
Figure 2. Celce-Murcia et al.’s (1995) model for communicative competence.

While this model does take into account the strategic competence of language users, a component of communicative competence that accounts for the negotiation strategies of interlocutors and consequently can encompass much of the ideals of PC, alignment, and translanguaging negotiation strategies, it lacks the specific aspects of modern communication. Therefore, I propose that the conceptualization of strategic competence needs to be expanded in order to take into consideration translanguaging practices and an ecological linguistics approach. As seen in Figure 5, strategic competence should also highlight the importance of digital literacies (DL) for language users as well as translanguaging negotiation strategies. This expansion will allow for a more full description of the competencies needed for language users to communicate in
the dynamic and often multilingual spaces that are widely available in Web 2.0 technologies.

Figure 5. Expanded model of communicative competence from Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) that includes DL and translinguaging negotiation strategies.

First, the addition of *Digital Literacies* (DL), or the communicative practices that are facilitated by technology (Hafner et al., 2015), into the conceptualization of Communicative Competence and specifically into Strategic Competence, will allow for the impact of Web 2.0 technology on modern language learners to be considered as a part of interlocutors’ ability to communicate both in F2F and digital contexts. With the ubiquitous nature of mobile technologies and the involvement of technology in language pedagogy, including fully online courses such as the ones investigated in the present research, it is paramount that language learners know how to most effectively and critically use the technology at their disposal to communicate.
Second, the inclusion of Translanguaging Negotiation Strategies as a component of Strategic Competence includes the four types of strategies discussed previously: envoicing, recontextualization, interactional, and entextualization (Canagarajah, 2013). Due to the growing presence of language contact zones in digital contexts, such as SNSs, these strategies must be understood as a part of learners’ abilities to communicate when more than the target language is involved in communication. Translanguaging negotiation strategies also contribute to explaining the role that learners’ L1 can play in helping them to develop their skills in the target language, helping to scaffold their language learning (Antón & DiCamilla, 1999). The use of students’ L1 as a means of learning the target language will be discussed further as a part of the pedagogical implications in the following section.

**Pedagogical Implications**

The goal of the present research is to first understand the translanguaging practices of HLLs and L2 students of Spanish in online affinity spaces housed within the SNS Facebook, and, consequently, to determine the implications of these findings for language pedagogy. Two major pedagogical implications will be discussed here: the need for educators to address the bias toward linguistic purism in order to help students reap the cognitive benefits offered by translanguaging practices and the need to embrace and support the development of learners’ DL. By fomenting learners’ DL, instructors will facilitate students’ ability to use a repertoire of digital resources available to them as communicative tools when engaging in CMC.
As previously discussed, both the HLL and the L2 groups showed a preference for the separation of languages and therefore aligned themselves with the ideals of linguistic purism (Martínez et al., 2015). It is important to note that I do not argue that there is not a time and place for the use of individual languages. Rather, my argument here is that in contexts where interlocutors share multiple languages in common and/or in educational settings and where the use of the learner’s other language(s) may offer support in the acquisition of the target language, students should be allowed to embrace their entire linguistic repertoire when communicating.

Within contexts where multiple language use is appropriate, such as in informal writing in SNSs, it is the responsibility of educators to make students aware of the potential cognitive benefits that can be supported by translanguaging (Lewis et al., 2012; Oliver & Nguyen, 2017). In order to do so, educators must employ a critical pedagogy that brings learners’ attention to concepts and ideologies, such as linguistic purism, in order to help them make decisions about their language use that are well-informed and not dictated by restrictive social practices. Beaudrie et al. (2014) purported that the inclusion of Martínez’s (2003) “classroom-based critical dialect awareness, which focuses on awareness of the social and political dimensions of dialectal variation” (p. 62) is already a critical part of the structure of heritage language teaching practices, this focus on critical awareness must also be expanded into L2 language curricula. As textbooks tend to focus on formal registers of the target language, this critical awareness may take the form of involving other forms of media in the classroom to bring the varying dialects and registers of the target language and their legitimacy to the learners’ attention. In HL
courses, Beaudrie et al. (2014) called for the incorporation and validation of the learners’ home variety of the language into the classroom. This same concept can be extended to L2 courses. Although the target language may not be spoken in their homes, it may be spoken in their community. For example, institutions which are located in areas with large Spanish-speaking communities, such as in the Southwest of the United States where the present research took place, instructors may turn to their own community for examples of this type of content in the form of blogs or social media that utilize the local dialect of Spanish that often involves translanguaging practices between English and Spanish.

The second pedagogical implication of this research is the need to support the development of students’ DL. The importance of DL for learners has been widely advocated by scholars as a means to support the acquisition of the target language (Baralt & Gurzynski-Weiss, 2011; Chun, 1994, 1998; Gurzynski-Weiss & Baralt, 2015; Kern, 1995; C. Lee, 2013; Payne & Whitney, 2002; Warschauer, 1995, 1997). At first glance, allowing students to use online dictionaries and translators as tools in the language classroom may seem counterintuitive or even seem to be a type of cheating. However, with the proper awareness of the tools at our students’ disposal and how they can be used to aid in their learning, Groves and Mundt (2015) explain the potential benefit to learners by drawing on a technology-mediated tool that changed the course of mathematics pedagogy.

There is a parallel to be drawn with the teaching of mathematics and the introduction of the electronic calculator. The calculator did not remove the need
for the teaching of maths – instead it allowed students to go further, quicker. It
minimised the need for endless practice of long division, and cumbersome and
slow aids such as slide rules and logarithmic tables. However, students and
teachers use the calculator to assist the students’ fundamental understanding of
maths, and their ability to apply it in the real world. (p. 120)

This example, along with the use of digital resources for language learning, falls
in line with the principles of Vygotsky’s (1978) Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)
which is conceptualized as “the distance between the actual developmental level as
determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as
determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more
capable peers” (p. 86). Originally, the ZPD was conceptualized with a teacher or a peer as
the “expert” that facilitates scaffolded learning. However, in distance language learning
courses, such as the ones that the participants of the present study were enrolled in, the
presence of a teacher and/or peers may be greatly reduced. In such a case, the use of
digital tools can compensate in part and act as a pedagogical resource; as seen with the
participants in this study who reported a lower Spanish proficiency level, they could not
have achieved independently the level of communication that they did within the affinity
spaces without the use of digital resources (Vygotsky, 1978, 1987). Research has shown
that the use of a student’s L1 can act as a sort of scaffolding to help them achieve a task
in the L2 (Antón & DiCamilla, 1999), supporting the conceptualization of
translanguaging as an ecological process that incorporates a learner’s entire linguistic
repertoire. Similarly in the digital context of the present study, the use of the L1 can
provide scaffolded support to the student through their use of digital resources that provide information in both languages.

It is imperative that students understand not only how to use the resources at their disposal, but how to use them critically and effectively. For example, commonly used resources, such as Google Translate, have been shown to be highly accurate in translating words or small phrases; however, longer sentences or extended texts tend to be riddled with sentence structure and word choice errors (Groves & Mundt, 2015). Therefore, if students are made aware of the shortcomings of a tool such as Google Translate, they can implement its use in appropriate contexts which are more likely to yield accurate and error-free results. Students should also be aware that the affordances of digital resources simply cannot serve as a replacement for linguistic proficiency. As these digital resources are constantly changing and improving, educators must not only be aware of which tools are available, but also how those tools change and what implications they have for their students.

**Chapter Summary**

In conclusion, the present chapter has answered research questions comparing data from the HLL and L2 student groups that had not yet been addressed in the previous chapters.

*How does the use of translanguaging (or lack thereof) in these affinity spaces by L2 learners compare with those of HLLs of Spanish?*

The findings of this research demonstrate that while HLL and L2 learners have similar language use patterns (in terms of English and Spanish use) when interacting in
Facebook affinity spaces, the way in which they achieve that communication varies notably among individual participants. This reflects an important tenet of translanguaging: a focus on how interlocutors communicate rather than what they communicate. The HLL students utilized more semiotic resources (reactions and emojis) in their SNS communication, while the L2 students as a whole evidenced a much higher usage of outside digital resources, such as online dictionaries and translators. However, the factor that contributed most to their use of outside digital resources was self-reported proficiency for written Spanish, rather than their place within the HLL or L2 group.

*How does the L2 participants’ use of alignment and other negotiation strategies of PC and their effects on communication in FB affinity spaces compare to those of HLLs of Spanish?*

In general, several similarities were found between the HLL and L2 groups in terms of their PC and its effect on their communication in this context. First, both groups relied on envoicing strategies to present an open and friendly self to their fellow group members, both involved non-linguistic, semiotic resources in their communication, and both avoided the mixing of languages in the majority of their written output. However, even within these similarities, the HLL and L2 groups differed in other ways. For example, although both groups involved semiotic resources in their communication, HLLs used a much higher quantity of emojis (34% of non-linguistic resources) and reactions (41%) than the L2 group whose emoji use constituted 13% of their total non-linguistic resources and reactions made up 9%. It warrants mentioning again here that the HLL group had a mean age of 43.2 while the L2 group’s mean age was 31.6. This age
disparity may have acted as a contributing factor to their use of emojis as younger people tend to have a higher rate of emoji use (Marengo et al., 2017).

In terms of the recontextualization strategies used by the participants, the language ideologies coupled with factors such as linguistic priming affected the way in which both HLL and L2 participants framed their interactions. The role of prior knowledge in selecting and participating with content in the affinity spaces was also a factor that affected the communication of the L2 learners.

The interactional and entextualization strategies employed by both groups of participants highlighted the role that their self-reported proficiency levels played in their communication. With the exception of HLL Isabela, both HLL and L2 participants with lower self-perceived proficiency in their Spanish writing abilities utilized a higher amount of outside digital resources in order to effectively communicate. While Isabela did not use any outside digital resources, she did utilize a physical dictionary to check for spelling mistakes in her posts.

While the previously mentioned trends existed between the HLL and L2 groups, much of the negotiation strategies and translangugaging practices employed by the participants were dependent on individual experiences. For example, L2 Mary often felt frustrated at the gaps in her Spanish linguistic repertoire, and compensated for these gaps by using English. However, HLL Olivia’s use of English in her posts was explained as simply easier and quicker for her than producing output in Spanish. Therefore, the unique experience of each language learner, regardless of their characterization as a HLL or an L2 learner, is crucial in understanding their translangugaging practices. A more
comprehensive discussion of the alignment, negotiation strategies, general PC, and the relative use of outside resources of these two groups can be found in the *Translanguaging Negotiation Strategies* and *Performative Competence of HLL and L2 Participants* sections of this chapter.

This chapter has discussed the translanguaging practices of the participants in terms of a quantitative, numerical comparison, the participants’ language ideologies, their use of translanguaging negotiation strategies, and their PC. Finally, a discussion of the pedagogical implications of this research argued for a need to educate students about translanguaging and its benefits in order to maximize their language learning experience and the need to support the development of students’ DL as a means to help them communicate successfully in a growingly multilingual world. The final chapter will address the limitations of the present research and highlight areas for future research.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS

The present exploratory study has examined the translinguaging practices of students of Spanish enrolled in online language courses through their participation in digital affinity spaces housed within the SNS Facebook. By means of content analysis and CDA, the data was first analyzed for each group, HLL and L2 students, separately, and later compared between groups. These findings serve to answer the research questions that were shaped by the themes present in the data through the iterative process common to qualitative research (Ravitch & Mittenfelner Carl, 2016).

How do students of Spanish utilize, or not utilize, translinguaging within affinity spaces in the SNS Facebook?

How does the use of translinguaging (or lack thereof) in these affinity spaces by L2 learners compare with those of HLLs of Spanish?

When the two groups were analyzed together, both groups displayed the use of translinguaging practices within the digital affinity spaces, supporting the findings of previous research that found translinguaging practices to be prevalent in the SNS Facebook (Oliver & Nguyen, 2017) and specifically within affinity spaces (Blyth & Dalola, 2016), although the specifics of how they implemented these practices differed among individuals. The HLLs involved more semiotic resources, while the L2s demonstrated more dependence on outside resources; both of these actions are a form of alignment as they allowed the participants to communicate effectively in these multilingual environments. The participants’ adherence to language ideologies, namely
that of linguistic purism, also affected their translanguaging practices, as noted in their resistance to mixing languages when interacting with other multilingual individuals in a written mode.

Although existing research has shown the potential of Facebook and affinity spaces to foster translanguaging practices, the context and target language at hand in that body of research differed greatly from the present research. First, none of the existing studies discussed here examined Spanish/English bilinguals, specifically HLLs of Spanish, and emergent bilinguals in the United States. The present research is the first study to investigate both HLL and L2 learners’ translanguaging practices in digital affinity spaces within a SNS. Second, the participants’ use of Facebook took place under different parameters. In the present study the students interacted with principally native speakers of Spanish and other bilinguals within pre-existing interest groups in Facebook. Other research used Facebook groups made specifically for pedagogical purposes (Blyth & Dalola, 2016) or investigated the participants’ Facebook languaging practices outside the constraints of coursework within Facebook (Androutsopoulos, 2015; Oliver & Nguyen, 2017; Schreiber, 2015). These studies also focused principally on the linguistic semiotic resources used by the participants, whereas the present research focused on both the linguistic and non-linguistic semiotic resources that the participants utilized within the Facebook affinity spaces. Therefore, the results of the existing research cannot be directly compared to the findings of the present study.

Envoicing, recontextualization, interactional, and entextualization strategies were utilized by participants in both groups to negotiate their interactions within the affinity
spaces. Although both the HLL and L2 groups utilized translinguaging practices in their Facebook interactions, the groups showed different tendencies toward how they utilized their communicative repertoires. The principal difference in their translinguaging practices was a tendency for the HLL group to use more semiotic resources (emojis and reactions) while the L2 group showed higher overall usage of outside digital resources (see Table 7). While these group differences between HLL and L2 learners were demonstrated in their frequencies of use, the individual differences, as summarized below, outweighed those belonging to the groups as a whole.

Although both groups utilized translinguaging negotiation strategies, differences were seen in the specifics of each strategy. For example, while both groups employed envoicing strategies to present themselves as open, approachable, and “nice” members of the affinity space, reinforcing Melo-Pfifer’s (2015) assertion that interlocutors in these environments work toward creating a “friendly translinguaging atmosphere” (p. 109), the HLL group used more emojis whereas the L2 group used more reactions to achieve this outcome (see the Discussions and Pedagogical Implications chapter for a more detailed comparison of the negotiation strategies).

The HLL and L2 participants showed a preference for separating their languages in written output and included a wealth of semiotic resources, such as emojis and the use of the reactions feature, in their communication. The participants, while still preferring language separation in their written output, accepted the use of translinguaging as a mediation tool for effective communication when a language other than their L1 was at
play. This indicates a need for more research into the spoken mode of translanguaging practices in order to better understand this disparity.

*How does the participants’ use of alignment and other negotiation strategies of performative competence affect their communication in the Facebook affinity spaces?*

*How does the L2 participants’ use of alignment and other negotiation strategies of PC and their effects on communication in FB affinity spaces compare to those of HLLs of Spanish?*

In order to answer Canagarajah’s (2011b) call for investigation into the actual processes and strategies used by interlocutors in multilingual contexts, the use of screencast technology coupled with TAPs and stimulated recall interviews allowed for insight into these translanguaging processes. It also allowed for dynamic data to be examined rather than the exclusively static data that was examined in previous SNS research on translanguaging and multilingual practices (Androutsopoulos, 2015; Blyth & Dalola, 2016; Oliver & Nguyen, 2017; Kulavuz-Onal & Vásquez, 2018; Schreiber, 2015). By examining the translanguaging negotiation strategies of the participants, their PC and its consequent effect on their communication in the affinity spaces was explored. For both groups, the role that technology played in the alignment and PC of the learners had a clear effect on their communication. Technology mediated tools were present in all of the translanguaging negotiation strategies utilized by the participants, although its function varied. While the HLL group tended to utilize more of the affordances housed within the SNS, such as emojis and reactions, as a means of translanguaging, the L2...
group relied more heavily on outside digital resources. However, this reliance on outside digital resources was more closely linked to the participants’ self-reported proficiency levels for their writing abilities in Spanish than to their group (HLL or L2). With the exception of HLL Isabela, participants with lower self-reported proficiency used a greater amount of outside digital resources. However, it should be noted that although Isabela did not use any outside digital resources, she did report using a paper dictionary.

Based on these findings, the present study argues that existing models that describe communicative competence of language users and language learners alike must be expanded in order to encompass the digital communication that speakers engage in as well as within F2F communicative contexts. Other pedagogical implications include the need to foment the DL of language learners and a need to bring existing language ideologies to learners’ attention as a first step in order to facilitate educated decision-making about their language use, rather than basing their choices on potentially harmful biases, such as linguistic purism. Efforts to facilitate this awareness may include an explanation of the potential cognitive and social benefits of incorporating translanguaging practices into their learning (Creese & Blackledge, 2015; García & Li Wei, 2014; Lewis et al., 2012; Oliver & Nguyen, 2017; Sayer, 2013). Both the theoretical and pedagogical implications of this research will be summarized later in this chapter.

**Limitations**

While the present study answers Canagarajah’s (2011b) call for research that goes beyond the translanguaging *productions* of interlocutors and into the *processes* themselves, it is not without limitations. First, the data was collected over a five-week
period, which was part of a six-week summer online course. Although this does provide a first glimpse into the translinguaging processes of these HLL and L2 participants, in order to fully understand their potential to develop PC and means of alignment, there is a need for more longitudinal studies that examine the development of these areas of communicative competence over time.

In addition, the population of students who acted as participants in this study were divided only into two groups based on the nature of their prior contact with the target language: HLLs and L2 learners of Spanish. In the future, further demographic characteristics should be taken into account. For example, because age may be a contributing factor to emoji use (Marengo et al., 2017), future research should take age into consideration and include more participants under the age of 30 in order to determine if there is a correlation between age and translinguaging practices. Other factors that could be considered are time spent abroad, languages spoken other than Spanish and English, and whether the participants are enrolled in an online or F2F course.

Another limitation of the present research is the small quantity of participants. With ten total participants, five in each group, the findings cannot be generalized to entire populations of language learners. As some commonalities existed in the data that transcended groups, such as the use of outside digital resources and its basis in self-perceived language ability rather than membership to the HLL or L2 group, these findings and their implications are not meant to define HLL or L2 learners as a whole. Rather, as Palfreyman and Al-Bataineh (2018) stated in their explanation of the goals of their translinguaging research, the findings serve “to explore what is possible in specific
contexts rather than to predict attitudes in a whole section of society” (p. 84). Although qualitative research that examines small populations (such as the present study) is able to offer more detailed descriptions on the individual level, future research should examine larger numbers of students to understand the translanguaging practices of learners in digital contexts in a more generalizable fashion.

The TAPs and stimulated recall interviews used here also have their own limitations. Some scholars argue that TAPs can only access limited parts of cognition. “Only information that is actively processed in working memory can be verbalized, which means that unconscious processing is inaccessible. High cognitive load can also hinder verbalization by using up all the available cognitive resources” (Jääskeläinen, 2010, p. 371). For participants who had little or no previous experience with Facebook, such as Eva, the high cognitive load as a hindrance to verbalization could have limited the amount of narration she was able to produce during her TAP. However, the use of the screen capture recordings allowed for the researcher to see how she navigated the page, even when her narrations may have been lacking.

The stimulated recall interviews were used in the present study to give the participants an opportunity to expand on their thoughts from the TAPs and to explain their actions, such as language use, in the affinity spaces. Stimulated recall interviews as a data collection have been criticized for the potential interference that memory recall may play; “When the delay is long, one often compensates for a lack of memory by ‘filling in’ the memory gap, often based on what is expected” (Gass & Mackey, 2016, p. 46). This was compensated for in the present study by holding the interviews
immediately after the participants completed their TAPs, a consecutive recall, lessening the time gap between the event of interest and the stimulated recall interview. When the interview is conducted immediately, as in the present study, it has been argued that events are still housed in short-term memory and can be accessed (Ericsson & Simon, 1998). However, as Gass and Mackey (2016) noted, no matter how small the gap between the event under study and the stimulated recall, there always remains the potential for participants to answer based on “what is expected” or to “fill in” the gaps in their memory.

Furthermore, the unit of analysis in the present study (individual posts) is holistic in nature and conceptualizes whole units of text and recordings as the unit of analysis. The determination of a unit of analysis is dependent on the purpose of the research (Krippendorf, 2004). Following the lead of Oliver and Nguyen (2017), whole texts (posts) were used as the unit of analysis in order to incorporate non-linguistic communicative aspects, such as photos included in posts, and in order to identify negotiation strategies and PC employed by the participants. Nevertheless, there is much that can be learned about the translanguaging practices of language learners when smaller units of analysis are examined. Future research should take into consideration word counts in order to better understand the use of Spanish and English in this digital context.

**Theoretical Implications**

Existing models of communicative competence, such as Celce-Murcia et al. (1995), have made efforts to incorporate the strategic competence and negotiation strategies necessary to communicate. However, these models are outdated as they do not
take into consideration the wide array of communicative contexts that have arisen with the advent of Web 2.0 technologies. These ubiquitous technologies have made their way into the language classroom and have “facilitated interactions between language groups and offered new resources for meshing languages with other symbol systems (i.e., icons, emoticons, graphics) and modalities (i.e., images, video, audio) on the same ‘page.’ All these developments pose interesting possibilities and challenges for communicating across language boundaries” (Canagarajah, 2013, p.2).

This changing communicative landscape must be met with theoretical development that identifies the current language practices of both mono and multilingual individuals and how they communicate in digital as well as F2F contexts. In order to take these factors as well as the findings of the present study into consideration, I have suggested an expansion of Celce-Murcia et al.’s (1995) model of communicative competence (see Figure 3). Specifically, the strategic competence component should be expanded to also incorporate digital literacies and translanguaging negotiation strategies. This expansion of the understanding of communicative competence will encompass communication that happens both vis-à-vis digital mediums (e.g., SNS) and the use of digital tools in F2F contexts (e.g., the use of a translation app on a smartphone). The inclusion of translanguaging negotiation strategies will allow this model of communicative competence to also take into account the multilingual environments and language contact zones that are typical to many Web 2.0 technologies and, consequently, the ways in which language users navigate communication within these spaces. These
theoretical implications support the pedagogical implications for translanguaging in language teaching which will be summarized in the following section.

**Pedagogical Implications**

One of the principal goals of the present study is to inform language pedagogy by means of gaining a better understanding of students’ translanguaging practices within affinity spaces. Two main pedagogical implications have been discussed in conjunction with the present research: 1) the need to address the bias toward linguistic purism to be addressed in the language classroom in order to allow learners to engage in translanguaging and receive its potential cognitive benefits, and 2) the need to foster the development of language learners’ DL.

First, the bias toward linguistic purism that was evident in both sets of participants in the present study must be addressed by educators. While this has been cited as a central tenant of HL pedagogy (Beaudrie, et al., 2014) in the form of classroom-based critical dialect awareness (Martínez, 2003), this type of critical pedagogy should also be utilized in L2 and mixed classrooms through the use of materials that present different varieties and registers of the target language. Only by bringing such biases to students’ attention can they fully understand their own bias and how it has been informed by their experiences. By understanding that an adherence to the ideals of linguistic purism and the separation of languages is, in fact, not the social norm (Brunstad, 2003; Martínez et al., 2015) they may be more willing to invoke their entire linguistic repertoire in their process of learning and communicating with the target language, opening up the potential for both cognitive, linguistic, sociolinguistic and academic benefits (Creese & Blackledge,
While the inclusion of critical pedagogies, such as Martínez’s (2003) classroom-based critical dialect awareness, has been called upon in HL pedagogy, this practice should be extended into L2 pedagogy as well. With this in mind, students must also understand the elements of the rhetorical situation in which they find themselves in order to determine when multiple language use is acceptable in a given context. This includes an understanding of the identity of their audience, the purpose of their communication, and the context of that communication (Lafford, 2015). For example, while multiple language use and translanguaging practices may be perfectly acceptable in oral communication and within written affinity spaces on Facebook, they may not be acceptable in a professional written genre such as a curriculum vitae, a letter of introduction appropriate for job application contexts, or a medical report containing detailed patient information destined for other medical professionals, i.e., contexts in which only one language may be preferred.

The second pedagogical implication taken from the present study is the need to support the development of language learners’ DL. Digital literacies are communicative practices that are facilitated by technology (Hafner et al., 2015). Extensive use of non-linguistic semiotic resources coupled with the use of outside digital resources, such as online dictionaries, was observed in both the HLL and L2 groups. While some educators may feel hesitant in involving online translators or dictionaries in their classrooms, Kramsch (2013) explains the necessity of embracing technology for language learning:

Either teachers embrace the new language learning technologies and integrate them in a new pedagogy or they will not only deprive themselves of the enormous
benefits afforded by computer-assisted language learning (CALL), computer-mediated communication (CMC), distance learning, social networking, and language games, but they will be increasingly out of touch with their own students, who are by now wired, networked, and computer-savvy. (Kramsch, 2013, p. xi)

In embracing these technologies for language learning, instructors must not only make them available to learners, but also teach them to use these resources critically. For example, if students understand that a resource such as Google Translate is more often accurate when translating single words than long sentences or phrases (Groves & Mundt, 2015), they can use this tool in their learning more effectively.

This use of digital resources can also serve as an “expert” within the ZPD, scaffolding their learning and allowing them to achieve outcomes they would not be able to achieve without this assistance (Vygotsky, 1978). This is especially important in contexts such as the courses in which the participants were enrolled in the present study; the fully online nature of the course results in little to no student-student interaction and limited student-instructor interaction. Therefore the potential scaffolding usually provided by these fellow interlocutors can be compensated for in part by the use of digital resources.

Future Research

Although the present research has made a step toward gaining a better understanding of HLL and L2 students’ translinguaging practices in digital contexts in an attempt to inform pedagogical practices in an increasingly digital world, there is much
work to be done. First, the present study examined the PC and translanguaging practices of students over a five week period; more longitudinal research must be conducted to gain an understanding of how learners’ PC may develop over time when they are engaged in these language contact zones, such as digital affinity spaces.

Second, SNS use has become widely available in mobile forms. Applications for SNSs such as Facebook, Instagram, and Snapchat are free to download for users with a smartphone. Therefore, although the present research examined the intersection of CALL and SLA, mobile assisted language learning (MALL) must also be taken into consideration. With this in mind, the platforms under study will be constantly updated and changed due to the demands and usage of different applications. For example, Snapchat and Instagram, which are centered around the sharing of images, hold great potential to explore the translanguaging practices of learners. Other MALL technologies such as Whatsapp, a messaging application that allows for the use of emojis, voice messages, text messages, GIFs, images, and videos contains a wealth of information that can inform research of the communicative practices of our language learners.

Finally, the present research focused principally on the translanguaging practices of the participants in their written output in Facebook. A cursory review of the data indicates a potential trend toward a greater use of the mixing of languages in the oral mode, e.g., as shown in the narrations in the TAP recordings. Future research should explore this potential disparity between spoken and written translanguaging practices in more depth.
The present study has explored the translanguaging practices of learners of Spanish in digital affinity spaces within Facebook. The findings have informed both theoretical and pedagogical implications. Canagarajah (2011b) explained the importance of translanguaging for all learners and language users; “translanguaging is not a case of applying a linguistic predisposition. It is a creative improvisation according to the needs of the context and local situation. It is an interactive achievement that depends on aligning one’s language resources to the features of the ecology to construct meaning. We have to give greater importance to translanguaging as a form of social practice” (p.5). It is imperative that translanguaging practices and their potential benefits to language learners be understood so that they can maximize the language learning of students in an expanding digital world that experiences high levels of language contact.
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APPENDIX A

LANGUAGE CONTACT PROFILE
Modified Language Contact Profile

Part I: Background information

Number: ______________________
Gender: ______________________
Age: ______________
Birth place (country): ______________
What is your native language(s)? __________________
As a child did you speak any languages other than English at home? Yes  No
   If yes, which language(s)? __________________
As a child did you hear any languages other than English at home? Yes  No
   If yes, which language(s)? __________________
Do you currently speak any languages other than English at home? Yes  No
   If yes, which language(s)? __________________
Do you currently hear any languages other than English at home? Yes  No
   If yes, which language(s)? __________________
What language do you speak at your current place of residence in the U.S.? ________________
For all that apply, indicate the percentage of time you speak this language:
   English ____% Spanish ___% Other(s) ___________________ ____%
Have you spent time in any Spanish speaking country? Yes  No
   If yes, where? __________________
      For how long? __________________
      What was the purpose of your travel? __________________
Have you ever traveled to a Spanish speaking country for the purpose of studying Spanish? Yes  No
   If yes, where and for how long? __________________
      How old were you at the time of travel? __________________
Have you ever traveled to another country for the purpose of studying a language other than Spanish? Yes  No
   If yes, where and for how long? __________________
      How old were you at the time of travel? __________________

Part II: Education

Have you studied Spanish in school? Yes  No
   If yes, for how long? __________________
      At what age(s) did you study Spanish at school? __________________
Have you studied any language(s) other than Spanish at school? Yes  No
   If yes, which one(s)? __________________
      For how long did you study each language? __________________
      At what age(s) did you study the other language(s)? __________________
In what language(s) did you receive your K-12 education? __________________
What year are you at ASU? (circle one)
Freshman       Sophomore       Junior       Senior       Graduate
Student
Other (please specify): ______________
What is your major(s)?: __________________________________________________
What is your minor(s) or certificate concentration(s), if any?
________________________________________________________________________

Please list all of the university-level Spanish courses you have taken prior to this
semester. This includes Spanish language courses as well as content area courses taught
in Spanish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course name and number</th>
<th>Semester (e.g. Fall 2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional: Is there any other background information about yourself that you would like
to share?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Part III: Language Abilities and Use

Outside of your Spanish class, on average, how many hours per day do you communicate
orally with native or fluent speakers of Spanish?
0  0-1  1-2  2-3  3-4  4-5  more than 5

Outside of your Spanish class, on average, how many hours per day do you communicate
in writing with native or fluent speakers of Spanish?
0  0-1  1-2  2-3  3-4  4-5  more than 5

How many hours per day do you do the following activities in Spanish?
Read books or newspapers in Spanish:
0 0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5 more than 5

Listen to music in Spanish:
0 0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5 more than 5

Watch videos/movies in Spanish:
0 0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5 more than 5

Talk to friends in Spanish:
0 0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5 more than 5

Talk to family members in Spanish:
0 0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5 more than 5

Read Spanish on social media sites (i.e.: Twitter, Facebook):
0 0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5 more than 5

Communicate in Spanish on social media sites (i.e.: Twitter, Facebook):
0 0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5 more than 5

Communicate orally in Spanish using a digital tool (i.e.: FaceTime, Googlehangouts):
0 0-1 1-2 2-3 3-4 4-5 more than 5

List any other activities that you do in Spanish and how often you do them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>How often?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your abilities in **Spanish** for each of the following categories:

**Reading:**
Native/Nativelike Very good Good Average Less than average Poor

**Writing:**
Native/Nativelike Very good Good Average Less than average Poor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Native/Nativelike</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Less than average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native/Nativelike</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native/Nativelike</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native/Nativelike</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native/Nativelike</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your abilities in **any other language(s) you speak** for each of the following categories: Language A ____________

Reading:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native/Nativelike</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Less than average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Speaking:
| Native/Nativelike | Very good | Good | Average | Less than average |
| Poor              |           |      |         |                  |

Please rate your abilities in **any other language(s) you speak** for each of the following categories: Language B ____________

Reading:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native/Nativelike</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Less than average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Speaking:
| Native/Nativelike | Very good | Good | Average | Less than average |
| Poor              |           |      |         |                  |
**Part IV: Technology Use**

How many hours per day do you use the following technologies? Please also indicate which languages you use for each technology. (min = minutes; h = hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Language(s)</th>
<th>0 min</th>
<th>1-5 min</th>
<th>5-15 min</th>
<th>15-30 min</th>
<th>30-45 min</th>
<th>45-60 min</th>
<th>1-1.5 h</th>
<th>1.5-2 h</th>
<th>2-2.5 h</th>
<th>2.5-3 h</th>
<th>3+ h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook (mobile device)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook (computer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email (mobile device)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email (computer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snapchat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaceTime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google hangouts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skype</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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With whom do you communicate via each of these technologies? What do you communicate about via these technologies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>With whom? Please include which language you use with each person indicated. (ex: Mom, Spanish)</th>
<th>What do you communicate about? (ex: social activities, academic activities, work-related activities, etc.) Please include which language you use for each topic. (ex: social activities, Spanish &amp; English)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook (mobile device)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook (computer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email (mobile device)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email (computer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snapchat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaceTime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google hangouts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skype</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

FACEBOOK ASSIGNMENT INSTRUCTIONS
Tarea de Facebook
Este semestre, cada semana vas a participar en un grupo de interés en Facebook. Si ya tienes un cuento de Facebook, tendrás que crear una cuenta nueva de Facebook y usar un seudónimo.

Cada semana, vas a participar en la página que escojas. Aquí hay algunas sugerencias. Si te interesa otra página, la tiene que aprobar la instructora.

Living United For Change in Arizona: https://www.facebook.com/lucha.arizona/
Amantes del Reggaeton: https://www.facebook.com/amantesdelreggaetonoficial/
Political & Cultural page for Catalonia: https://www.facebook.com/pg/omniumcultural/posts/?ref=page_internal
Real Madrid: https://www.facebook.com/RealMadrid/
Amantes del Gym: https://www.facebook.com/AmantesdelGym.OFICIALCM/
Libros: https://www.facebook.com/LibrosInfinite/

Una vez (¡o más!) a la semana, tienes que:
- Comentar por lo menos 2 posts en el grupo (mínimo de 50 palabras cada uno)
- Hacer un post nuevo (puede ser un post en forma de texto, compartir una imagen, video, etc.) (mínimo de 50 palabras cada uno)
- Grabar y subir su interacción en el grupo usando Screencast-O-Matic
- Narrar el proceso de interactuar en el grupo. Este proceso se llama un Think-Aloud Protocol (TAP); este proceso de narrar tu entendimiento del contenido y de lo que añades a la página te va a ayudar a entender tus procesos internos del aprendizaje de español. (mínimo de 5 minutos de comentarios; mira el video en Bb para entender cómo hacer esto)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semana</th>
<th>Tipo de tarea</th>
<th>Tarea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>Grabar TAP práctica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TAP + Escrito</td>
<td>Grabar TAP + reflexión escrita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>Grabar TAP + Entrevista*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TAP + Escrito</td>
<td>Grabar TAP + reflexión escrita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>Grabar TAP+ Entrevista*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indica una tarea que solo hacen los participantes de la investigación
Reflexiones escritas: Completarás dos reflexiones escritas, que se entregan en Bb en formato de .doc o .docx. Deben ser 1-2 páginas, en inglés, español, o una combinación de las dos lenguas. Deben explicar lo que has hecho en Facebook esa semana y cualquier observación sobre el uso de la lengua por los otros usuarios y/o por sí mismo. También, puedes comentar las dificultades con que te enfrentaste o de herramientas que usaste para comunicar con los otros usuarios.

**Facebook Assignment**
Each week of this semester you will participate in an interest group on Facebook of your choosing. If you already have a Facebook account you will need to create a new Facebook account using a pseudonym.

Here are a few suggestions for interest group Facebook pages. If you are interested in a different page, it needs to be approved by the instructor.

Living United For Change in Arizona: https://www.facebook.com/lucha.arizona/
Amantes del Reggaeton: https://www.facebook.com/amantesdelreggaetonoficial/
Political & Cultural page for Catalunia: https://www.facebook.com/pg/omniumcultural/posts/?ref=page_internal
Real Madrid: https://www.facebook.com/RealMadrid/
Amantes del Gym: https://www.facebook.com/AmantesdelGym.OFICIALCM/
Libros: https://www.facebook.com/LibrosInfinite/

Once (or more!) per week, you need to:
- Post comments on at least two posts in the group (minimum of 50 words each)
- Do a new post (this can be a post in the form of text, sharing a photo, video, etc.) (minimum of 50 words each)
- Record and upload your interaction in the group using Screencast-O-Matic
- Orally narrate the process you go through when interacting in the group affinity space. This process is called a Think-Aloud Protocol (TAP); this process of narrating your understanding of the content and what you add to the page will help you to understand your internal processes in learning Spanish. (minimum of 5 minutes of commentary, see the video on Bb to understand how to do this)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Task Type</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>Recorded practice TAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TAP + Written</td>
<td>Recorded TAP + written reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>Recorded TAP + interview*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TAP + Written</td>
<td>Recorded TAP + written reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Indicates an assignment that only the participants of the research will complete

Written reflections: You will complete two written reflections, which will be turned in on Bb as .doc or .docx files. They should be 1-2 pages (double spaced) in English, Spanish, or a combination of the two languages. They should explain what you have done in Facebook that week and any observations about the language use of other users or your own language use. You may also comment on any difficulties you were confronted with or tools that you used in order to communicate with other users.
Written Reflection Instructions

After completing your interactions in Facebook and the Think Aloud Protocol, you will complete a written reflection that will be turned in via Blackboard. Your reflection should be 1-2 typed, double spaced, pages in length. You are free to write in English, Spanish, or a combination of the two: whatever you feel allows you to best express your thoughts on the experience. Your written reflection should address the following points:

- What did you do within Facebook?
- How did you decide what to post and/or comment on?
- What were you thinking when you decided to use English, Spanish, or another form of communication (such as a photo, emoji, sharing, or ‘liking’) in specific interactions?
- What were some of the difficult aspects of navigating this page?
- What were some of the things you enjoyed about navigating this page?
- Did you use more English or more Spanish? Why?
- Did you use any outside resources (an online dictionary, translator app, etc.) to help you understand the content on the page? If yes, how did you use it? How did you choose which resource to use?