

## **Pragmatic translanguaging: multilingual practice in adolescent online discourse**

Richard Nightingale & Pilar Safont

LAELA Research Group, Universitat Jaume I

### **Abstract**

This study puts forward the term ‘pragmatic translanguaging’ to refer to consciously outcome-oriented language switch motivations. The study focuses on the translanguaging practices of adolescents in their online discourse and explores what Jørgensen (2008) calls the ‘designing mind’ behind such practices; that is, an awareness of both the practices themselves and the motivations for them. With this in mind, the aim is to ascertain whether online translanguaging practices are intentional and to identify the functions they perform. In order to do so, semi-structured interviews were carried out involving 97 high-school students from the Valencian Community, Spain. The resulting data were analysed to see how the participants described their online translanguaging practices and their reasons for engaging in these practices. The results show translanguaging across a range of digital media and online platforms which is consciously targeted at producing a specific effect and is frequently motivated by awareness of this potential effect; that is, an enhanced pragmatic awareness. Furthermore, the data revealed that online translanguaging practices covered three main pragmatic functions, namely those of marking humour, marking identity, and modifying requests. The study indicates that multilingual adolescents translanguaged for more than simple communicative reasons, and that online platforms give them an extended opportunity to engage in multilingual interaction. While recognising the limitations of this purely qualitative study, the authors offer the term ‘pragmatic translanguaging’ as a focal point for further contributions to this under-researched area of multilingual pragmatics.

**Key words:** Translanguaging, Pragmatics, Online discourse, Adolescents, Multilingual practices, Digital media

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

A number of voices from within multilingualism research have called for further research on issues involving online communication. Such issues include: the manifestation and negotiation of multilingualism in the 'cultural spaces' provided by virtual communities (Radein Initiative, 2011), multilingual interactions in digital environments (Canagarajah & Wurr, 2011) especially among young people (Franceschini, 2009), and out-of-school multilingual and multimodal practices (Gorter & Cenoz, 2011). Furthermore, results from existing studies call for further work on pragmatics in multilingual contexts (Nightingale, 2016; Safont, 2012). The current chapter aims to further consolidate our knowledge of multilingualism in these areas by presenting a qualitative analysis of adolescent translanguaging practices in online discourse. In this sense, we not only explore the online multilingual practices of adolescents but also the interactional goals of such practices. In this study, the authors use the term 'pragmatic translanguaging', which is operationalised as consciously outcome-oriented language switch motivations.

The current study takes an emic perspective and focuses on excerpts from interviews with high-school students who comment on their online translanguaging practices in out-of-school contexts. The aim of the study is twofold: 1) to ascertain if there is any evidence to suggest that adolescent translanguaging in online contexts is intentional and linked to specific interactional goals; and 2) to identify which pragmatic functions may be covered by these translanguaging practices.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

Pragmatics focuses on situated language behaviour, specifically 'how people comprehend and produce a communicative act or speech act in a concrete speech situation' (Liu, 2000: 382). According to Félix-Brasdefer (2012), pragmatic research has two main branches: cognitive-philosophical, which includes classic concepts such as deixis, speech acts (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1976), and conversational implicature (Grice, 1975); and sociocultural-interactional, which tends to focus more on message and response between interlocutors in contexts of social interaction. Under the latter view,

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

pragmatics concerns the use of language in specific social contexts and how those contexts affect communication (Alcón, 2013), it is also understood as ‘social action’ where meaning is negotiated and co-constructed using linguistic and non-linguistic resources during ‘socioculturally organized activities’ (LoCastro, 2003:15). Stemming from L1 pragmatics research, Interlanguage Pragmatics (ILP) focuses on how the pragmatic component of the construct ‘communicative competence’ develops in language learners, or, in other words, ‘how L2 learners learn how to *do things with words* over time’ in instructed or natural settings (Félix-Brasdefer, 2012: 2801 - emphasis in original). A great deal of ILP research tends to focus on appropriate requestive behaviour and thus draws heavily on Brown and Levinson’s (1987) Politeness Theory (LoCastro, 2003; Safont, 2007). However, despite the corpus of work on ILP (see Alcón, 2008), there is still relatively little work which considers the multilingual background of language learners (Safont, 2012). In this sense, ILP is extended by research on pragmatic competence in multilingual contexts. Such work has so far focused on speech acts (Cenoz, 2003; Safont, 2005a, 2005b, 2007), learning context (Dewaele, 2007), and honorifics (Fouser, 1997). Of particular interest to the current study is Safont’s work on request modifiers (Safont, 2005a, 2005b, 2007) which focused on pragmatic production and awareness and showed that L3 learners outperformed L2 learners in this regard; thus providing more evidence of a qualitative difference between bilinguals and multilinguals (Herdina & Jessner, 2002; Jessner, 2006; Hufeisen & Marx, 2007). As mentioned above, previous findings (Safont, 2012: 4512) called for further research on multilingual pragmatics, specifically on ‘other speech acts and pragmatic aspects’ in order to ‘address the complex nature of multilingualism’. It is in this regard that the current study makes a contribution; here we present data concerning the pragmatics of translanguaging practices which relate to the interactional goals and the functions performed in online discourse.

Translanguaging (Williams, 1994; Baker, 2001; García, 2009) is a quintessentially multilingual characteristic. It explicitly rejects fractional conceptualisations of bilinguals (Grosjean, 2010) and the compartmentalisation of languages which has been a prevalent feature of bilingual education programs and even

bilingual child-rearing (i.e.: one-parent one-language policies). Baker (2011: 39) defines translanguaging as ‘the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, [and] gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages’. García (2009: 41) moved the concept beyond pedagogical theory describing it as ‘multiple discursive practices used as a “norm” in which bi/multilinguals engage in order to communicate effectively and make sense of their bilingual worlds’. Cenoz and Gorter (2011) consider translanguaging to be an important multilingual practice which shows creative and strategic interaction among language systems, and heightened metalinguistic awareness. These authors also understand translanguaging as fundamentally involved in the transmission of knowledge, information, and values, as well as the negotiation of identity and relationships in multilingual contexts. Wei (2011) concurs that translanguaging not only involves the transmission of information but also the representation of relationships, identities, and values. In earlier work, Auer (2005: 406) similarly argued that translanguaging itself, rather than individual acts of alternation, may symbolise hybrid social identities, which are ‘multiple, flexible, changeable [and] malleable’. Age has been shown to be a factor influencing translanguaging; it is a common practice among young people in order to mark their identity (Gardner-Chloros *et al.*, 2005). There is already a solid base of research on translanguaging as an educational practice (García, 2009; Baker, 2011; Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012) but there is less work on translanguaging in out-of-school contexts. In this regard, the current study contributes to and consolidates existing research on translanguaging by focusing on the online discourse of multilingual adolescents.

## **2.1. Online discourse and young adolescent language learners**

There exists a wide range of research extolling the virtues of online media in terms of language learning. For example, regarding learning via Instant Messaging, Lu *et al.* (2006: 575-576) point out the following beneficial characteristics. Online discourse promotes autonomy, encourages collaborative learning, promotes communication skills (i.e.: negotiation of meaning), promotes social and socialization skills (i.e.: politeness), facilitates and promotes different types of authentic and intercultural interaction, exposes

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

learners to native language forms, fosters meaningful inter-peer communication, balances and increases student participation, reduces student anxiety, and provides transcripts (chat-logs) for further analysis or study. Existing research on digital/online language learning has examined the potential of online environments over a range of different ages and contexts, such as: high-school, undergraduate, postgraduate, and adult professionals. However, this work generally takes a SLA perspective, focusing mainly on L2 learners’ acquisition of English. The current study takes a holistic, multilingual perspective and focuses on the translanguaging practices of youths who are learning English as a foreign language in a context where they may already use two or three other languages in their daily lives.

Any study concerning the online activities of adolescents must take as an axiom the concept of ‘digital natives’ (Prensky, 2001); that is, young people (so-called ‘post-millennials’ or ‘Generation Z’) for whom being online is an almost constant, ever-present, and completely normalised practice. For adolescents, life online moves pretty fast. From their point of view, email now seems quite formal and somewhat antiquated, and most high-school age youths (at least when this chapter was published) have by and large rejected *Facebook* in favour of alternative social media such as *Instagram*, *Twitter*, *WhatsApp*, and *Snapchat*. Currently, some of the most common online practices for adolescents involve networking and media sharing using the social media mentioned above, as well as video messaging (i.e.: *Skype*, *FaceTime*), watching vlogs, vlogging and commenting (for example, on *YouTube*), and online gaming (with associated game-chat). In fact, two of the most salient environments in which adolescent online discourse takes place are social media, including instant messaging, and online video games.

On the one hand, in terms of language learning and development, social media appears to promote autonomy and control, help learners build friendships and acclimate to new situations, experiment with new languages, and improve (inter)cultural competency (Harrison & Thomas, 2009; Mitchell, 2012). Use of social networking is pervasive and plays a role in the formation of language attitudes as well as providing

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

opportunities for minority language use (Cunliffe, Morris & Prys, 2013). In fact, adolescent engagement with online digital media has been shown to be one of the most significant factors regarding positive attitudes towards minority and foreign languages (Nightingale, 2016). On the other hand, online games combine pleasure, agency, and meaningfulness with a user-controlled learning environment (Gee, 2007), and are thus highly motivating. In this context, the motivational impact comes from the fact that gaming is a ‘self-affirming’ activity which provides intense experiences and a sense of ownership and control (Henry, 2013). Text- (and, increasingly, voice-) based chat constitutes an integral part of online gaming. Such interaction appears to be socioemotional in nature (Peña & Hancock, 2006) and aimed at maintaining interpersonal relationships rather than being directly related to aspects of gameplay (Thorne *et al.*, 2009). Commercial off-the-shelf games adapted for language learning can develop confidence and motivation, lower anxiety, increase enthusiasm and willingness to communicate, and provide language practice outside the classroom (Reinders & Wattana, 2010). Furthermore, online game-chat constitutes a ‘social action’ which may awaken linguistic and intercultural curiosity between players (Thorne, 2008). Finally, seen as ‘arenas’ of language learning, online games help develop sociocultural, pragmatic, and communicative competences, as well as provide opportunities for risk-taking, collaborative dialogue, and linguistic negotiation and self-repair (Peterson, 2010).

From a sociolinguistic perspective, online activities provide opportunities to index alignment with ‘imagined communities’ (Anderson, 1983). Norton (2013: 3) describes an imagined community as ‘a desired community that offers possibilities for an enhanced range of identity options in the future’, she argues that imagined communities assume an imagined identity and can be used to understand a learner’s ‘investment’ in a TL. This notion also ties into the concept of future orientations as language users, encompassed in the theory of ‘L2-selves’ (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009). This theory puts forward the idea of the ‘ideal L2 self’, the speaker we want to become, and the ‘ought-to L2 self’, the speaker we believe we should be in order to meet external expectations. In concrete situations, ideal self images can be realised through the notion of imagined communities (Dörnyei, 2005)

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

because although such communities are not ‘immediately tangible and accessible’ language learners are able to connect with them ‘through the power of the imagination’ (Norton, 2013: 8). Thus, in spite of no real contact, limited contact, or the language community being difficult to define in a concrete way, learners can project their ideal selves in order to emotionally and psychologically identify with an imagined TL community. Furthermore, research using L2-self theory has indicated that how learners feel about language learning may not necessarily be related to how they feel about becoming TL speakers (Henry & Apelgren, 2008); thus highlighting the important difference between what are perceived as institutional and noninstitutional (i.e.: out-of-school) language learning contexts. Finally, in terms of youth identity, we should consider translanguaging in online discourse as incipiently politicised (Pujolar, 2008) and as a symbolic site of struggle (Harklau, 2007).

In Nightingale's (2016) study of adolescent language attitudes and multilingual practices, the participants (aged 12-17 years) commented on their online discourse, expressing the following aspects of language use: ‘user-agency in multilingual literacy practices, terminological innovation in linguistic repertoires, the transmission and maintenance of cultural heritage, the maintenance of long-distance and trans-border relationships, strategic use of language on social networks, carrying offline socialisation practices into online environments, and socialisation processes within virtual communities of practice’ (Nightingale, 2016: 345). In line with earlier work by Cunliffe, Morris and Prys (2013), results from the study indicate continuity between offline and online sociolinguistic practices. Furthermore, in line with existing research (Gee, 2007; Henry, 2013), the study indicates that agency, autonomy, and empowerment are fundamental factors in the online communicative practices of adolescents. The study also provided further evidence of a marked awareness in adolescents’ perception of differences between institutional and noninstitutional language learning contexts, as well as indications of their future orientations as language users and the realisation of ideal selves in their affiliations to online imagined communities.

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

## **2.2. Translanguaging vs. Codeswitching**

‘There is clearly much overlap between codeswitching and translanguaging, the former is a term from linguistics which analyses the speech of bilinguals, while translanguaging is essentially sociolinguistic, ecological, and situated’ (Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012: 659). With these words in mind, the current authors have deliberately chosen to use the term translanguaging, as such it is important to disentangle this concept from codeswitching (CS). This study takes a multilingual perspective, thus translanguaging is a more appropriate term because it constitutes a holistic conceptualization of multiple language use. In contrast to CS, which understands language choice as the alternation of two or more discrete language systems, translanguaging understands language choice as the fluid deployment of a speaker's linguistic resources in the act of making meaning in contexts where these same resources, or at least a number of them, are shared. While CS maintains the 'one language at a time', monolingually biased perspective of multiple language use (Cook, 1997; Wei, 2011), translanguaging considers the speaker, the context, and the whole linguistic repertoire (in line with *Focus on Multilingualism* - Cenoz & Gorter, 2011; Cenoz, 2013).

The tendency of CS research to compartmentalise languages means that many of the studies of CS focus on the reasons why one discrete linguistic code has been swapped for another; for this reason, many CS studies are characterised by a conversation analysis approach, in which switching linguistic codes may be indicative of attention grabbing, or negotiating, respecting or transgressing turn-taking sequences; pragmatically, a strategy used to negotiate the language of interaction in bilingual exchanges (see Auer, 1995). On the contrary, research on translanguaging considers the meaning created from the fluid deployment of available linguistic resources. One speaker, one voice, one performance, in which alternate codes are meshed together to create one unique instance of situated meaning. In sum, translanguaging is a concept which signals a ‘shift of focus from linguistic systems to multilingual speakers and practices’, it constitutes a ‘critical view of ‘language’ as an ideological construct; and a move towards theorising ‘fluid’ and ‘flexible’ relations between language, ethnicity and place as well as between linguistic



“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

practice and ownership of language’ (Androutsopoulos, 2015: 186). Wei (2011) eloquently sums up translanguaging as going between and going beyond:

Translanguaging is both going between different linguistic structures and systems, including different modalities (speaking, writing, signing, listening, reading, remembering) and going beyond them. It includes the full range of linguistic performances of multilingual language users for purposes that transcend the combination of structures, the alternation between systems, the transmission of information and the representation of values, identities and relationships. The act of translanguaging then is transformative in nature; it creates a social space for the multilingual language user by bringing together different dimensions of their personal history, experience and environment, their attitude, beliefs and ideology, their cognitive and physical capacity into one coordinated and meaningful performance, and make it into a lived experience. (Wei, 2011: 1223)

### **2.3. Translanguaging in online contexts**

Translanguaging is a common multilingual practice in Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) (Wei, 2011) and there is ‘ample evidence that CMC is a site for the meaningful use of language alternation’ (Androutsopoulos, 2013: 668). As a shared context is required for language switches to be interpreted (Gumperz, 1982), online forums, gameworlds, social networking sites, and especially instant messaging applications lend themselves to translanguaging as they presuppose belonging to a group or affiliation to an interest or activity. One reason for mixing languages in these online contexts is to establish cultural authenticity by demonstrating ‘familiarity with either high or popular culture in the other language’ (Paolillo, 2011: 11). In this sense, translanguaging can be understood as a form of symbolic social capital (Bourdieu, 1977). Other reasons may include the construction of more satisfactory identities outside traditional academic and literary ‘spaces’ (Lam, 2000; Thorne *et al.*, 2009; Thorne & Black, 2011), or the provision of a safe way for users to experiment with languages by using short words and phrases which reduce the risk related to ‘creating novel expressions in a language in which they may not be fully fluent’ (Paolillo, 2011: 12). Moreover, there is evidence that mixing languages on social media, especially multilingual social networking sites, is ‘driven by style and choice’ rather than a need for comprehension, and constitutes a way of maintaining or transgressing group sociolinguistic norms (Caulfield, 2013: 210). It has also been noted that, in the online language practices of

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

young people, translanguaging involving short formulaic routines (‘greetings and farewells, interjections and discourse organisers, requests, [and] slogans’ among others) may be used to index group lifestyle orientations (Androutsopoulos, 2013: 678-679).

As mentioned above, many studies of online CS tend to take a conversation analysis approach (Androutsopoulos, 2013), translanguaging approaches which analyse instances of discourse and ask the subject to reflect on their language choice are more recent and less common (i.e.: Schreiber, 2015). Schreiber’s (2015) case study showed the translingual language practices and attitudes of a Serbian youth who used a range of linguistic and semiotic resources to express a unified identity. For this youth, accomplishing communicative goals via the multimodal affordances of online discourse was a natural and unremarkable practice. However, while his online textual practices constitute sophisticated translanguaging, they were undervalued in EFL writing contexts. Thus, the study highlighted the chasm between formal, monolingual learning contexts and informal, multilingual, out-of-school contexts which are more representative of young people’s daily experiences. The current study does not focus on individual textual practices, instead it only asks the participants to reflect on their language choice in order to reveal their own perceived motivations as well as indicate their metalinguistic awareness. Jørgensen (2008:162) points out that conversation analysis ‘plays down the intention of speakers’, arguing that although it gives insights into the ‘mechanical structures of conversational interaction’ it only focuses on choice of features under given circumstances and not *why* the speakers do what they do, thus ignoring intentionality

One recent study of the Facebook translanguaging practices of German-Greek bilinguals, (‘Networked Multilingualism’ - Androutsopoulos, 2015) focused on ‘fluidity and fixity’ in the deployment of available linguistic resources in this form of online discourse. The study found that while Greek and German were the ‘cornerstone’ languages, other languages were also present ‘associated with particular individuals, genres or thematic occasions’. In terms of ‘fixity’, the data revealed many ‘monolingual moments’ which were put down to ‘situated orientation to particular addressees or topics’,

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

while in terms of ‘fluidity’, participants ‘smoothly shift from language to language in their moment-to-moment orientations to networked publics and network resources’. Moreover, relating online translanguaging to issues of identity and multimodality, the study showed that the genres (and associated language choices) posted by adolescents on their social networks constitute a way to ‘perform the self to their networked audience and engage in dialogic exchange with particular ‘friends’, therefore being overheard by their networked audience’ (Androutsopoulos, 2015: 196).

Androutsopoulos (2013: 681) lists the most frequently documented functions of switching languages in CMC as: 1) formulaic discourse, 2) culturally specific genres, 3) reported speech, 4) emphatic repetition, 5) selecting a particular addressee or responding to/challenging the language choice of others, 6) contextualizing topic or perspective shift, distinguishing between fact/opinion, information/affect, etc., 7) marking a move as jocular or serious, mitigating face-threatening acts, and 8) indexing consent/dissent, alignment/distancing, etc. In the current study, we will focus specifically on certain aspects of the last three functions; that is, distinguishing between information and affect, marking a move as jocular (‘humorous CS’), mitigating face-threatening acts, and indexing alignment.

#### **2.4. Pragmatics in online contexts**

Responding to a previous call for further research on multilingual pragmatics (Safont, 2012), the current study focuses on online discourse contexts; that is, translanguaging in the online discourse of multilingual adolescents. Pragmatic issues in CMC have been studied since the mid-1990s. Early work in this regard included a focus on politeness behaviours and the negotiation of interaction (in terms of turn-taking and topical coherence among others); such work also indicated enhanced metalinguistic awareness which allowed for language play and linguistic creativity in online environments (Herring, Stein & Virtanen, 2013). The inception of *Web 2.0*, that is, on-demand access to content which is unregulated, generated in real-time, and characterised by interactive user feedback and creative participation, changed the focus of pragmatic

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

research in CMC. This is due to what must be considered in terms of *new content* (multimodal, user generated), *new contexts* (mass and/or multilingual audiences), *new usage patterns* (joint production of discourse and meaning), *new affordances* (tagging, friending, liking, collaborative editing, etc.) and novel *user adaptations* to constraints of the medium (emoticons, hashtags, retweets, etc.) (see Herring, Stein & Virtanen, 2013). When exploring the pragmatics of online translanguaging, numerous factors relating to the CMC/Web 2.0 medium should be taken into account. For example: the extent to which interaction is synchronous (game chat, instant messaging) or asynchronous (email, Facebook, forums); the extent to which the audience is public (forums) or private (WhatsApp); and the extent to which the message is planned (email, Facebook, forums) or spontaneous (WhatsApp, instant messaging, game chat). Any combination of the above factors could serve as either a constraint or an affordance in online translanguaging practice and the situated meaning it generates.

Research on the pragmatics of online communication has considered various speech acts, and has paid attention to aspects like the illocutionary force involved, the negotiation of face, and related politeness issues (Blyth, 2012). One phenomenon that has received much attention in the literature is the use of ‘emoticons’, which Dresner and Herring (2010) point out serve to indicate illocutionary force; that is, to index the relevant speech act being performed. For example, a smiley face icon may allow an interlocutor to interpret an utterance as a ‘humorous complaint’ which indexes a friendly attitude, instead of what could otherwise come across as a ‘selfish gripe’ (Dresner & Herring, 2010; Blyth, 2012). By the same token, a similar strategy to index that a potentially conflictive comment should not be taken at face value makes use of the winking face icon; commonly referred to in internet forums as a ‘safety wink’. Such strategies essentially mitigate the impact of face-threatening acts and constitute novel user adaptations to overcome constraints of the CMC medium. As Golato and Taleghani-Nikazm (2006: 318) point out, emoticons are ‘graphical representations of affiliative nonverbal behaviours in ordinary conversation’.

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

The pragmatic effect of translanguaging in online discourse may be ‘created through the situated contrast between the codes involved’ (Androutsopoulos, 2013: 681 - citing Hinrichs, 2006). To contextualise this in offline contexts, Auer (1995: 122) cites a study by Gal (1979) showing how Austrian bilinguals switched from Hungarian to German to mark the culmination of disagreement or even hostility because, in that context, German has connotations of ‘prestige, urban sophistication, and authority, but also social distance’. Auer (1995: 122) states that the ‘attitudinal values of German are indexed and invoked by switching into this language in turn and contribute to its conversational meaning’. This must logically also stand true for any other language which has prestige in a specific context, such as English on the Internet. From these notions, the current study puts forward that the multilingual practice of translanguaging *per se*, that is the juxtaposition of linguistic resources, is what creates the pragmatic effect. In this sense, the illocutionary force does not stem from the discrete lexical items involved in the language alternation but rather from their fluid meshing in the act of multilingual discourse. In fact, in Jørgensen’s (2008) paper on child and adolescent polylingual languaging, he points out the intentionality of language use, stating ‘[i]t is crucial that we understand that what people do with language they do for a reason [... i]f a speaker chooses one word or another word at her or his disposal, it happens with a purpose’ (Jørgensen, 2008:162). He continues, ‘[t]here is a designing mind behind all language production, and we have no chance of understanding the production processes or the social processes if we disregard the speaker’s intentions’, and concludes ‘[l]anguage is the means with which we form and change our social structures’, through language ‘[w]e negotiate hierarchies, group memberships and status’ (Jørgensen, 2008:163).

### **3. THE STUDY: TRANSLANGUAGING IN ADOLESCENT ONLINE DISCOURSE**

#### **3.1. Research questions**

The current study focuses on the ‘designing mind’ behind translanguaging practices in online discourse, specifically exploring adolescents’ awareness of both the

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

practices themselves and the motivations for them. As has been previously mentioned, it is the aim of this study (i) to ascertain whether translanguaging practices are intentional; and (ii) to identify the functions that these practices may perform. On that account, the following research questions have been formulated:

RQ1: Are translanguaging practices intentional in multilingual adolescent online talk?

RQ2: Which pragmatic functions does multilingual teenagers’ online talk cover?

### **3.2. Sociolinguistic context**

In order to provide an answer to the above-quoted research questions, we have collected data on a multilingual setting. More specifically, the current study is set in the Valencian Autonomous Community (*el País Valencià*), located on the east coast of Spain. Sociolinguistically, this region is characterised by the everyday use of two official languages: Spanish, the majority language, and Catalan (Valencian), the minority language. There is also ubiquitous contact with English in both public and private education sectors, and, furthermore, a number of heritage languages (Rumanian, Arabic, Chinese, among others) are used by immigrant communities. The Valencian Community is made up of three regions *Alacant*, *València*, and *Castelló*; the greatest use of Catalan is in the region of Castelló where this study is based. Aside from linguistic contact, the community is also characterised by linguistic *conflict* (Pradilla, 2001; Casanova, 2004) as minority, majority, and foreign languages jostle to assert themselves to varying degrees in varying contexts. Moreover, this conflict is exacerbated by the unequal social prestige that exists between, on the one hand, Spanish and English (more prestigious languages), and on the other, Catalan and specific community languages (less prestigious languages). Thus, this community provides a rich linguistic context but it has not been fully investigated by existing research on multilingualism (Safont, 2007, 2015). For the above reasons, multilingualism is a crucial issue at all levels within the community and requires further ongoing research in order to be fully understood in this context.

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

### **3.3. Sample**

The sample consists of 97 high-school students from the region of Castelló in the Valencian Community. The participants were chosen from two different high-schools. The students all learn English as part of their obligatory secondary education. They are also in constant contact with Spanish and Catalan both in and out of school, and a number of them also bring heritage languages to this multilingual context. The age range of these participants is 12 to 17 years ( $M = 14.09$ ;  $SD = 1.329$ ); the gender breakdown was 65% ( $n = 64$ ) female and 35% ( $n = 33$ ) male.

### **3.4. Instrument and data analysis**

Data for the qualitative analysis were gathered by means of a semi-structured oral interview conducted with 97 students. In total, 38 individual interviews took place over four separate sessions in the participants' high-schools and involved groups of 2-4 students. The interviews from all sessions were digitally recorded for later transcription and codification. As the current study does not take a conversation analysis approach, the interview extracts presented have been edited and generally cleaned up to remove unnecessary non-verbal elements (umms and ahhs, false starts, stutters, etc.) and make the comments more concise and reader friendly. The extracts are marked with line numbers to make it easier to highlight certain comments. The participants in the interaction are the researcher – marked as ‘R’ – and the students – marked as ‘S’ and a number. When all students speak together this is marked by ‘Ss’ and where it is not clear which student is speaking this is marked by ‘Sx’. Finally, all extracts are presented in the original language, separated from the main text, inline translations are included in parenthesis, and any actual instances of translanguaging in the students' comments are underlined.

## **4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

In our first research question, we wondered whether translanguaging in multilingual online discourse was intentional. The students' comments regarding their

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

online discourse practices show that translanguaging across a range of digital media and online platforms is consciously targeted at producing a specific effect and in many cases is actually motivated by this potential effect. Therefore, we see that their translanguaging practices try to meet specific interactional goals.

Example 1

01 S3: y no sé, en vez de buenas noches, **na nit** porque es más corto  
02 R: ah sí? más corto  
03 S3: claro  
04 R: pero es sólo porque es más corto? no- no  
05 S3: porque es más rápido, sí, no sé

In example 1, line 01, S3 mentions using the phrase *na nit*, which is a colloquial shortening of the Catalan *bona nit* (good night). She says that she uses this phrase because it is shorter. In line 04, the researcher asks if this is the only reason, to which she replies, in line 05, that it is faster. While it is true that the phrase is quicker than the Spanish equivalent, *buenas noches*, it is likely to have an identificatory function as well. In fact, many Spanish-dominant bilinguals in the Valencian Community will often use Catalan salutations such as *bon dia* (good day) or *adéu* (goodbye) even though the rest of the interaction is in Spanish; this is a common translanguaging practice in offline contexts which carries onto online discourse as well. In this specific example, the student could have opted for ‘good night’ or ‘night-night’, which would be equally as short as *na nit* and also carry the international prestige embodied in the English language. However, the student has made the conscious choice to switch to Catalan. This is an example of we-code (Gumperz, 1982), which ‘ascribe[s] values such as solidarity, warmth, and closeness’, and thus makes the minority language phrase a *signal* ‘which refer[s] to these values in interaction’ (Jørgensen, 2008: 166). In this case, the illocutionary force is to mark insider identity.

Example 2

01 S1: principalmente castellano pero **algunas veces cuando**  
02 **haces bromas** y eso en inglés

In example 2, the student says that he mainly uses Spanish online, but *algunas veces cuando haces bromas* (but sometimes when you make jokes) he will translanguage



“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

and use English. As in example 1, we see a clear interactional goal in this student’s translanguaging practices. For both students, there is an intention in using their multilingual resources to meet their interactional goals. The pragmatic functions performed by these intentional translanguaging practices are further explored in our second research question.

Our second research question focused on the extent to which teenagers’ translingual practices would cover specific pragmatic functions. According to our data and the qualitative analysis of the transcripts, we have identified three main pragmatic functions, namely those of marking humour, marking identity, and modifying requests. We shall now examine each function in turn.

#### 4.1. Marking humour

Marking an interactional move as jocular or serious has been mentioned in earlier research as a frequent function of online codeswitching (Androutsopoulos, 2013). In the current study, it became apparent from the interviews that this was one of the reasons behind translanguaging in adolescent online discourse. We propose that using another language jokingly is an illocutionary act and is indicative of the linguistic playfulness and creativity attributed to multilinguals (Baker, 2001; Todeva & Cenoz, 2009; Dewaele, 2010; Cenoz & Gorter, 2011). We will attempt to illustrate this with the following examples:

Example 3

01 S1: yo no suelo hacerlo, a veces, no sé, **en plan broma** o  
02 algo así pero de normal no  
03 R: tú lo haces en plan broma? a veces cambias-  
04 S1: sí, pero **con alguien de mucha confianza**

In example 3, S1 reports, in line 01, not usually alternating languages online but when he sometimes does it is usually *en plan broma* (as a joke). The researcher asks S1 to confirm this which he does, adding, in line 04, that these language choices are *con alguien de mucha confianza* (with someone he feels very close to).

Example 4

01 S1: lo de mezclar frases y eso en escrito con el español no

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

02 me suele pasar y con el valenciano pero por ejemplo hablando  
03 con amigos y eso sí que a lo mejor, entre español y  
04 valenciano no suele pero en inglés sí que sueltas una frase y  
05 eso **por a lo mejor un videojuego que has jugado que todos han**  
06 **jugado o por una frase que han visto en algún video** o algo sí  
07 que sueltas alguna frase así, **siempre en plan broma** y eso  
08 **pero al final lo estás usando**  
09 S2: **porque quedas bien con el amigo, no es lo mismo decir ok**  
10 **que bien** (1.0) porque digamos es más- es mejor, no sé

In example 4, S1 says that he often translanguages into English in online conversations with his his group of friends. They often use words and phrases in English from video games (line 05) or other videos (line 06) that they have all experienced and, therefore, all understand. In lines 07 and 08, he says that the codeswitching is *siempre en plan broma* (always as a joke) and adds *pero al final lo estás usando* (but in the end you are using [the language]). In lines 09 and 10, S2 also gives his reason for this type of language choice, saying *porque quedas bien con el amigo* (you make a good impression with your friend), and points out *no es lo mismo decir ok que bien* (it’s not the same saying ‘ok’ as saying *bien*).

Example 5

01 S3: en todas  
02 R: en todas? en inglés también?  
03 S3: sí  
04 R: explicame un poco de eso  
05 S3: no sé, con los amigos [...] **para gastar bromas** y eso

In example 5 above, S3 reports using English on his mobile phone when joking around: specifically, in line 05, the student admits to using English *para gastar bromas* (to make jokes). This example is not isolated, students in other interviews also mentioned using English or English words in order to have fun or joke around when communicating with their friends on their mobile phones. ‘Injecting humour’ by translanguaging has been recognised in previous research (Baker, 2001), and Dewaele (2010) includes alternating languages for comic effect as one of a range of affective functions of translanguaging practices. However, in the current study we recognise injecting humour as a pragmatic function of translanguaging.

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

In the examples above, we can see how external influence from a foreign language is deployed in online discourse in order to maintain and reinforce relationships between a group of friends who share the same L1s. We argue that it is not the specific foreign word or phrase used which implies the intention, although such words or phrases must necessarily be relevant to the interlocutors, rather it is the translanguaging itself that creates situated meaning. In this case, reinforcing the cohesion of a close peer-group (*de mucha confianza* - example 1, line 04) through humorous use of a language that represents a phenomenon to which there is shared affinity (online games and videos). Furthermore, the fact that one student comments on using the language choice to ‘make a good impression’ within the group and that ‘it is not the same’ expressing something in the L1 as it is in the foreign, pragmatically meaningful, language (example 4, line 09) is evidence of the effect of this language choice being recognised as a motivational factor. From a multilingual perspective, these comments are in line with Cenoz and Gorter (2011: 340) who point out that ‘bilingual and multilingual speakers of a language can also manifest creativity and language playfulness’ owing to their ‘richer experience with languages’. We are now able to add to this perspective with evidence that suggests that there is also an illocutionary force that emerges from this type of translanguaging.

#### **4.2. Marking identity**

The participants’ comments revealed that translanguaging in online discourse is used for the purpose of identification. Indexing alignment or distance was originally assigned as a discourse function of online codeswitching (Androutsopoulos, 2013); that is, aligning with or distancing from the proposition of an interlocutor. However, the current study reframes this notion in a multilingual sociolinguistic context as a function of pragmatic translanguaging. In so doing, we invoke the concepts of ‘we-code’ and ‘they-code’ (Gumperz, 1982), imagined communities (Anderson, 1983; Norton, 2013), and future orientation in terms of L2-selves (Dörnyei, 2005). Thus, when it comes to the conscious practice of translanguaging to mark an online identity stance we should take into consideration ‘insider’ identities and ‘projected’ identities, as well as future orientations as language users. The following interview extracts will put these notions

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

into context:

Example 6

01 R: vale, puedes cambiar entre castellano y valenciano, y con qué  
02 motivo, por qué cambias?  
03 S1: porque **suelo hablar en valenciano con mis amigos entonces**  
04 **hay uno que habla en castellano y tenemos que hablar en**  
05 **castellano**, lo que pasa es que como estoy hablando en valenciano  
06 todo el rato me escapa alguna  
07 R: pero una palabra suelta también puede ser, como hablando en  
08 castellano y de repente pones mone o algo así? o i avant?  
09 S1: sí, así  
10 R: sí, eso es lo que quiero saber, por qué puede salir una frase  
11 en valenciano al final de una conversación en castellano?  
12 S1: porque, o sea, la utilizamos mucho y eso  
13 R: vale, puede ser una forma de decir soy de aquí?  
14 S1: bueno, **no soy de aquí pero llevo bastante aquí y se me queda**  
15 **alguna palabra**

In example 6, line 01, the researcher asks about alternating between majority and minority languages in online discourse. In lines 03 to 05, S1 comments *suelo hablar en valenciano con mis amigos* (I usually speak in Catalan with my friends) but when a Spanish speaker joins the group *tenemos que hablar castellano* (we have to speak in Spanish). In lines 07 and 08, the researcher asks about inserting single words or phrases from Catalan into discourse which is principally in Spanish; he offers the examples *i avant* (that’s it) and *mone* (let’s go – from the Catalan *anem-nos-en*) which are both common colloquialisms specific to Castelló. In line 09, S1 confirms that this kind of language alternation happens frequently. In line 13, the researcher asks S1 if this could be a way of stating that he is *de aquí* (from here). To which, in lines 15 and 15, S1 responds *no soy de aquí pero llevo bastante aquí y se me queda alguna palabra* (I’m not from here but I’ve been living here for quite a long time and I’ve picked up some words). While the comment in lines 03 to 05 is indicative of a codeswitch respecting a ‘double monolingualism norm’ (Jørgensen, 2008), the later comment on using minority language colloquialisms in primarily majority language discourse is indicative of translanguaging. Although S1 does not actually reveal where he is from, his earlier comment *suelo hablar valenciano* implies that he is from another Catalan speaking area. The fact that he has picked up some colloquial phrases from conversations with his peers and now uses them in online discourse indicates status and identity marking. If S1 usually speaks Catalan

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

with his Catalan speaking friends then using *mone* and *i avant* would constitute status marking within that group; not only is he a Catalan speaker but he is marking his authenticity in the adopted context with his language choices (social capital - Bourdieu, 1977). However, using these colloquialisms even though the primary language of the discourse is Spanish marks an identity to the Spanish speaker(s) that he is a Catalan speaker and that he will not allow that identity to be undermined by the majority language. In a way, it constitutes a politicised symbolic act of resistance (see Harklau, 2008; Pujolar, 2008); either he knows that the Spanish-speaking interlocutor knows Catalan and thinks that they should use it (or at least pay respect to it) or he knows that they do not know Catalan and thinks that they should. In this way, S1 is transgressing group sociolinguistic norms (Caulfield, 2013); that is, the double monolingualism norm. It is for the above reasons, we consider this example to be a meaningfully situated juxtaposition between we-code and they-code and, as such, an illocutionary act which functions outside any illocutionary force that the individual minority language phrases may have in themselves.

Example 7

01 R: y la diferencia entre por favor y please, qué te parece?  
02 S2: no sé, a mi es que please me gusta, es que por favor lo veo, no  
03 sé, lo veo muy normal, me gusta más please  
04 R: ah, vale, por favor es muy normal y please me imagino que no es  
05 muy normal  
06 S2: claro que no porque la gente- claro que decir por favor- si te  
07 vas por ejemplo a Londres, sabes? allí sí que te dicen please no sé  
08 qué tal, sabes, por qué? porque  
09 **hablan please**  
10 R: sí  
11 S2: aquí que hablan- que dicen por favor, entonces me gusta más  
12 please

The student in example 7 says that she prefers the word *please* to the Spanish equivalent *por favor* (lines 02 and 03). To her, *por favor* sounds normal and perhaps a bit mundane, whereas *please* is less normal, it is cooler, it is what the people in London say, and, thus, she likes it more. In line 09, she goes so far as to say that the people in London *hablan please* (speak ‘please’), using the word as a synecdoche for the English language. To this student, the word clearly has symbolic cultural value (Bourdieu, 1977); therefore, we also see this comment as a case of projection into an imagined language community (Norton, 2013), S2 is using language as a symbolic resource to ‘try on’ a new identity

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

(Harklau, 2007). In contrast to the previous two examples which are indicative of we-code, this case of identity marking is more complex. S2 is identifying outside her sociolinguistic community into a projected community. The illocutionary force of the translanguaging is either staking a membership claim to the imagined/projected community or marking to other insiders (S2’s peers) that she has control over the cultural capital necessary to do so. By inserting foreign language words into majority language discourse, S2 may be marking her identity as a ‘facilitator’ (Auer, 2005) and will probably be looking for a peer-validation of this identity. In this sense, we argue that the translanguaging act constitutes a way to ‘perform the self’ to networked friends while also being ‘overheard’ by the wider networked audience (Androutsopoulos, 2015).

Example 8

01 R: y me puedes explicar por qué please, por qué no por favor?  
02 S2: **suena mejor**  
03 R: suena mejor?  
04 S2: sí suena no sé, es una sensación, bueno [una sensación-]  
05 S3: **sientes anglosajón**

Example 8 provides a further indication of projecting identity through translanguaging. In this example, the students are referring to the use of WhatsApp. In line 02, S2 reports using words like please because *suena mejor* (it sounds better). When asked to explain this further he does not really know what to say, describing it as a kind of sensation, at which point (line 05) S3 interjects saying *sientes anglosajón* (you feel Anglo-Saxon). We propose that this constitutes evidence of projection into an imagined community with which the speaker does not have any real-life contact (Norton, 2013). This could also be projecting an ‘ideal L2 self’ (Dörnyei, 2005), the outcome being that the student’s peers identify him within this ‘Anglo-Saxon’ framework. Furthermore, existing research indicates that translanguaging involving short formulaic routines may be used by young people to index group lifestyle orientations (Androutsopoulos, 2013); in the case of the above examples, the orientation is towards an ‘Anglo-Saxon’ or even a ‘London’ lifestyle.

### 4.3. Modifying requests

Earlier research has shown that a common function of codeswitching in online discourse involves the mitigation of face-threatening acts (Androutsopoulos, 2013). In the current study, the interview data revealed that one particularly salient form of translanguaging in adolescent online discourse involved the use of English for request modification, specifically involving the classic external peripheral request modifier *please* (Alcón, Safont & Flor, 2005). Interestingly, in Safont (2007) this request modifier showed the greatest difference in production between second language learners and third language learners, favoring the latter.

Example 9

01 S2: es que por favor, no sé  
02 S1: **por favor suena muy-** ((serious tone of voice))  
03 S2: [please] ((sweeter tone of voice))  
04 S1: muy serio, no?  
05 R: muy serio, y please suena menos serio?  
06 S1: sí

Example 10

01 R: sí, y por qué pones please?  
02 S2: porque es una palabra bastante habitual para hablar porque te,  
03 **es más corta, más cómoda**  
04 R: sí  
05 S3: parece que please es un poco- como **más cariñoso**  
06 R: ah, sí más cariñoso  
07 Ss: sí sí  
08 S3: como si dices- **si usted dice por favor es como si se está**  
09 **dirigiendo a una persona que la tiene respeto, y mientras tanto si**  
10 **usted dice please, pues es como a los amigos, familiares**  
11 R: ah sí sí, entonces queda más familiar  
12 Ss: sí

In example 9, lines 02 and 03, the students explain, using their tone of voice, that the Spanish *por favor* sounds really serious while the English equivalent, *please*, sounds much sweeter. Previous research has already recognised the use of translanguaging to ease tension in a conversation (Baker, 2001), but here, as the specific word being alternated is a request modifier, we propose that the translanguaging is more consciously outcome-oriented; that is, tactically deployed in order to mitigate the imposition of a request. In example 10, S2 suggests a utilitarian motive for using *please*, saying, in line 03, *es más corta, más cómoda* (it's shorter, more comfortable). However, in line 05, S3 suggests a more emotional motive, saying that *please* seems *más cariñoso* (more

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

affectionate). S3 goes on to explain this further in lines 08-10, saying *si usted dice por favor es como si se está dirigiendo a una persona que la tiene respeto, y mientras tanto si usted dice please, pues es como a los amigos, familiares* (if you say *por favor* it's like addressing a person courteously, while if you say *please* it's like addressing friends, or family members). In this way, S3 appears to be suggesting that the use of the English word *please* is a conscious pragmalinguistic strategy to lessen social distance; similarly to the previous example, the effect is to mitigate the imposition of the request. These two examples show that this case of translanguaging is meaningful because of the perceived characteristics of the languages involved in the contexts in which they are juxtaposed (similar to Auer, 1995); Spanish is seen to be serious and courteous, while English is sweeter and more affectionate and therefore lessens social distance and makes for a more effective request modifier. In both cases the mitigation effect is enhanced by translanguaging using English.

#### Example 11

01 S1: pues por ejemplo, a veces estoy hablando en castellano y suelto  
02 una expresión así en valenciano como por ejemplo i avant que es una  
03 expresión en valenciano y **cuando quiero pedir algo, para que me**  
04 **hagan un favor, pues sí lo digo en inglés, o please**

#### Example 12

01 R: y no provoca ninguna- ningún sentimiento decir mm, please en vez  
02 de por favor o decir hello en vez de hola  
03 S3: please es como más (1.0) no sé, como **más cariñoso, para que te**  
04 **lo deje antes**  
05 R: sí, más cariñoso erm, comparado con por favor?  
06 3: sí, no sé, suena mejor

#### Example 13

01 R: y te ha salido alguna vez un please o algo así al final de pedir  
02 algo?  
03 S1: ((laughs))  
04 R: sí?  
05 S1: **muchas veces sobre todo cuando quiero algo mucho mucho**  
06 R: por qué? por qué please en vez de por favor?  
07 S1: porque please es como please me das esto? quiero eso pero **con**  
08 **muchas ganas**

#### Example 14

01 S2: puede que sea **en vez de hacer pucheros** pues pongo ple::::ase, y  
02 cosas así  
03 S1: suena mejor  
04 S2: sí suena mejor, suena más agradable



“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

In the four examples above, we can see that the interactional goal underlying translanguaging practices is the driving factor behind the language alternation. In example 11, lines 03 and 04, S1 says *cuando quiero pedir algo, para que me hagan un favor, pues sí lo digo en inglés* (when I want something, so that they do me a favour, then yes I say it in English); S1 also mentions simply tagging the word please on to the end of a request for the same reason. In example 12, line 03, S3 comments on using the word please in her requests because it sounds *más cariñoso* (more affectionate). In lines 03 and 04, she goes on to make the interesting comment on the effect of this modifier, *para que te lo deje antes* (so that they give it to you quicker). In example 13, S1 mentions frequent use of the word please in requests. In line 05, he says that he uses the word *sobre todo cuando quiero algo mucho mucho* (especially when I really, really want something). When pressed to explain further, he says in lines 07 and 08 that using the word please is like requesting something *con muchas ganas* (very enthusiastically). Lastly, in line 01 of example 14, S2 reports using a stretched version of ‘please’, something like pleeeeeeease, *en vez de hacer pucheros* (instead of pouting). We propose that what she means here is that asking a favour using the word please is equivalent to making cute faces by pouting so that she is more likely to have her request responded to favourably; in this way, we consider the word please to be a kind of ‘lexical pout’. As can be seen in the example, in the interview S2 actually stretched the word ‘ple::::ase’ to make it sound more emphatic and give the idea of it substituting a ‘cute face’. Used in this way, the word please constitutes a ‘novel user adaption’ to the constraints of the CMC medium (Herring, Stein & Virtanen, 2013), and has an additional illocutionary force, similar to the use of emoticons, of indexing the relevant speech act (Dresner & Herring, 2010; Blyth, 2012).

Example 15

01 S1: por ejemplo cuando me pongo en Reddit con alguno o algo así o  
02 me hace algún  
03 favor **digo gracias y escribo I love you o algo así**  
04 R: sí? sí sí cuál es la motivación? por qué usas esas palabras o  
05 esas frases en inglés?  
06 S1: por qué? no lo sé la verdad

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

Finally, in example 15, line 03, S1 says when he goes into the popular online message board *Reddit* and someone does him a favour, *digo gracias y escribo* I love you *o algo así* (I say thanks and I write ‘I love you’ or something like that). The researcher asks what his motivation is for using the phrase in English but S1 says that he does not know. Although this student is not able to offer an explanation, we propose that in responding to the actions of others in this way, the translanguaging is intended as a type of payoff for the favour. This, in this case, we propose that it constitutes a further example of modifying requests assuming that requesting behaviour will imply several turns as in face-to-face communication.

In these extracts we can see examples of what the current authors refer to as pragmatic translanguaging. The choice to alternate to English is a strategy which is consciously aimed at specific purposes; in these examples, to modify or react to the behaviour of others. That a number of these students are explicitly aware of the interactional goals and the effect of their language choices (doing a favour, responding more quickly, sounding more enthusiastic, and the ‘lexical pout’) might also be indicative of the enhanced pragmatic awareness of multilinguals.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The aim of the current study has been to ascertain if adolescent translanguaging in these contexts is consciously outcome-oriented, and which pragmatic functions may be performed by teenagers’ translingual practices. Responding to the first research question, results from the interview data indicate that there is evidence to suggest that multilingual adolescent translanguaging in online discourse is intentional and it seeks to cover specific interactional goals. Responding to the second research question, results from the interview data indicate that translingual practices perform three specific functions, namely those of marking humour, marking identity, and mitigating requests. In this regard, we have seen comments from the students indicating that they are aware of the effect their translanguaging will have on their audience; for example, group cohesion, making a good impression, projecting and protecting identity, and mitigating

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

the imposition of requests. The adolescents in our study have the linguistic and cognitive ability to translanguage, and online communication provides an enhanced means to do so. We believe that although in some cases students do not know how to explain their language choices, there might be an indication of pragmatic awareness in the way they talk about these choices. Moreover, in their comments about translanguageing, these adolescents actually translanguage. They do not say “*siempre les digo ‘gracias’ pero en inglés*”, rather they say “*siempre les digo please*”. This in itself indicates what a normalised and wide-ranging phenomenon translanguageing is in the lives of young multilinguals (in line with Jørgensen, 2008).

We have put forward that translanguageing as any type of oral or written discourse fulfils a series of illocutionary goals and, furthermore, it constitutes an intentional multilingual practice. If one translanguages to *na nit* in a Spanish utterance it is both a leave-taking salutation and a claim to a certain kind of identity, and while the former meaning remains (salutation) there is a second-order meaning which takes precedence (identity). We argue that, were it not so, the translanguageing would not have reason to take place. Finally, if one produces the utterance “*me dejas el libro, please?*”, we see that mitigating the threatening nature of the request head act by means of translanguageing may increase the downgrading effect. In fact, the interactional goal of mitigating the request has been deliberately and premeditatedly deployed by the ‘designing mind’ behind such translingual practice. Nevertheless, this study is subject to a number of limitations, as results from a qualitative study may not be generalised. Hence, we need further research from wider perspectives in order to identify the complex nature of translingual practices and their relationship with language learning processes. In so doing, we shall also contribute to the under-researched area of multilingual pragmatics.

## References

Alcón, E., Safont, M. P., & Martínez-Flor, A. (2005). Towards a typology of modifiers for the speech act of requesting: A socio-pragmatic approach. *RæL. Revista Electrónica de Lingüística Aplicada*, 4, 1-35.

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

- Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Androutsopoulos, J. (2013). Code-switching in computer-mediated communication. In Herring, S., Stein, D., & Virtanen, T. (Eds.). *Pragmatics of computer-mediated communication*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Androutsopoulos, J. (2015). Networked multilingualism: Some language practices on Facebook and their implications. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 19(2), 185-205. DOI: 10.1177/1367006913489198
- Auer, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In Milroy, L. & Muysken, P. (Eds.). *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auer, P. (2005). A postscript: Code-switching and social identity. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(3), 403-410. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2004.10.010
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters.
- Blyth, C. S. (2012). Pragmatics of Chat. In Chappelle, C. (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P. & S. C. Levinson. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S., & Wurr, A. J. (2011) Multilingual communication and language acquisition: New research directions. *The Reading Matrix*, 11: 1-15.
- Casanova, E. (2004) La situación lingüística en la Comunidad Valenciana: el valenciano, caracterización y justificación. In Ridruejo, E. (ed.) *Las otras lenguas de España*. Universidad de Valladolid.
- Caulfield, J. (2013) *A social network analysis of Irish language use in social media (Doctoral dissertation, Cardiff University)*.
- Cenoz, J. (2003). The additive effect of bilingualism on third language acquisition: A review. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 7(1): 71–87. DOI: 10.1177/13670069030070010501

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

- Cenoz, J. (2013) The influence of bilingualism on third language acquisition: Focus on multilingualism. *Language Teaching*, 46(1): 71-86. DOI: 10.1017/S0261444811000218
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). A Holistic Approach to Multilingual Education: Introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3): 339-343. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01204.x
- Cook, V. J. (1997) Monolingual bias in second language acquisition research. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 34: 35-50. ISSN: 0211-5913
- Cunliffe, D., Morris, D. & Prys, C. (2013) Young Bilinguals' Language Behaviour in Social Networking Sites: The Use of Welsh on Facebook. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 18: 339-361. DOI: 10.1111/jcc4.12010
- Dewaele, J. M. (2007). Context and L2 users' pragmatic development. In Hua, Z., Seedhouse, P., Cook, V., & Wei, L. (Eds.). *Language learning and teaching as social interaction*. Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Dewaele, J. (2010). *Emotions in multiple languages*. Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Dörnyei, Z & Ushioda, E. (eds.). *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Dresner, E., & Herring, S. C. (2010). Functions of the nonverbal in CMC: Emoticons and illocutionary force. *Communication theory*, 20(3), 249-268. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2010.01362.x
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2012). Interlanguage Pragmatics. In Chappelle, C. (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Fouser, R. J. (1997). Pragmatic transfer in highly advanced learners: Some preliminary findings. *Center for Language and Communication Studies Occasional Papers*, 50, 1-44.
- Franceschini, R. (2009). The genesis and development of research in multilingualism: Perspectives for future research. In Aronin, L. & B. Hufeisen. (Eds.) *The Exploration of Multilingualism: Development of Research on L3, Multilingualism and Multiple Language Acquisition*. John Benjamins.
- Gal, S. (1979). *Language shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

- García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In Skutnabb-Kangas, T., Phillipson, R., Mohanty, A. K. & Panda, M. (Eds.) *Social justice through multilingual education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Gardner-Chloros, P., McEntee-Atalianis, L. & Finnis, K. (2005) *Language Attitudes and Use in a Transplanted Setting: Greek Cypriots in London*. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 2(1): 52-80. DOI: 10.1080/17501220508668376
- Gee, J. P. (2007) *Good video games and good learning*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Golato, A. & Taleghani-Nikazm, C. (2006). Negotiation of face in web chats. *Multilingua*, 25 (3): 293–322. DOI: 10.1515/MULTI.2006.017
- Gorter, D., & Cenoz, J. (2011). A Multilingual Approach: Conclusions and Future perspectives: Afterword. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3): 442-445. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01203.x
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. In Cole, P. & Morgan, J. L. (Eds.) *Syntax and Semantics volume 3: Speech Acts*. New York : Academic Press.
- Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and Reality*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harklau, L. (2007) *The Adolescent English Language Learner: Identities Lost and Found*. In Cummins, J. & C, Davidson (Eds.) *International Handbook of English Language Teaching*. Springer.
- Harrison, R. & Thomas, M. (2009) *Identity in Online Communities: Social Networking Sites and Language Learning*. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies and Society*, 7(2): 109-124. ISSN: 1835-8780
- Henry, A. (2013). Digital games and ELT: Bridging the authenticity gap. In E. Ushioda (Ed.). *International perspectives on English language teaching: Motivation*. Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Henry, A. & Apelgren, B. M. (2008) *Young learners and multilingualism: A study of learner attitudes before and after the introduction of a second foreign language to the curriculum*. *System*, 36: 607-623. DOI: 10.1016/j.system.2008.03.004
- Herdina, P. & Jessner, U. (2002) *A Dynamic Model of Multilingualism. Perspectives of Change in Psycholinguistics*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

- Herring, S., Stein, D., & Virtanen, T. (Eds.) (2013). *Pragmatics of computer-mediated communication*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hufeisen, B. & Marx, N. (2007) How can DaF/E and EuroComGerm contribute to the concept of receptive multilingualism? Theoretical and practical considerations. In Thijs, J. & Zeevaert, L. (Eds.) *Receptive, multilingualism: Linguistic analyses, language policies and didactic concepts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jessner, U. (2006) *Linguistic Awareness in Multilinguals: English as a Third Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Jørgensen, J. N. (2008). Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 5(3), 161-176. DOI: 10.1080/14790710802387562
- Lam, W. S. E. (2000). Literacy and the design of the self: A case study of a teenager writing on the Internet. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 457–482. DOI: 10.2307/3587739
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 655-670. DOI: 10.1080/13803611.2012.718490
- Liu, S. (2000). Pragmatics. In Byram, M (Ed.). *Encyclopedia for Language Teaching and Learning*. London: Routledge.
- LoCastro, V. (2003). *An introduction to pragmatics: Social action for language teachers*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Lu, C. H., Chiou, G. F., Day, M. Y., Ong, C. S., & Hsu, W. L. (2006). Using Instant Messaging to provide an intelligent learning environment. In *Intelligent Tutoring Systems* (pp. 575-583). Springer Berlin/Heidelberg.
- Mitchell, K. (2012) A Social Tool: Why and How ESOL Students Use Facebook. *CALICO Journal*, 29(3): 471-493. DOI: 10.11139/cj.29.3.471-493
- Nightingale, R. (2016). *The effect of out-of-school media contact on language attitudes in multilingual adolescents: a complex psychosociolinguistic system*. (Doctoral dissertation, Universitat Jaume I).
- Norton, B. (2013) *Identity and Language Learning: Extending the conversation*. 2nd Edition. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Paolillo, J. C. (2011). conversational codeswitching on usenet and internet relay chat. *Language@ Internet*, 8(3), 1-2.

"This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009)."

- Peña, J., & Hancock, J. T. (2006). An analysis of socioemotional and task communication in online multiplayer video games. *Communication Research*, 33(1): 92-109. DOI: 10.1177/0093650205283103
- Peterson, M. (2010). Massively multiplayer online role-playing games as arenas for second Language learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 23(5): 429-439. DOI: 10.1080/09588221.2010.520673
- Pradilla, M. A. (2001) The Catalan-speaking Communities. In Turell, M. T. (Ed.). *Multilingualism in Spain: Sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic aspects of linguistic minority groups*. *Multilingual Matters*.
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants part 1. *On the horizon*, 9(5): 1-6. DOI:10.1108/10748120110424816
- Pujolar, J. (2008). Els joves, les llengües i les identitats. *Noves SL.: Revista de sociolingüística*, 1-11. ISSN-e 1695-3711
- Radein Initiative (2011) = Aalberse, Suzanne, Jasone Cenoz, Vivian Cook, Kees de Bot, Rita Franceschini, Durk Gorter, Marilyn Martin Jones, Melissa Moyer, Pieter Muysken & Colin Williams. *The Radein Initiative: Some Directions in Research on Multilingualism* [http://groupcien.uab.es/documents/Radein\\_initiative\\_v2.0.pdf](http://groupcien.uab.es/documents/Radein_initiative_v2.0.pdf) (accessed 19th June, 2017).
- Reinders & Wattana (2010) Learn English or Die: The effects of digital games on interaction and willingness to communicate in a foreign language. *Digital Culture & Education*, 3(1): 3-29. ISSN: 1836-8301
- Safont, M. P. (2005a). Third language learners: Pragmatic production and awareness (Vol. 12). *Multilingual Matters*.
- Safont, M. P. (2005b). Pragmatic production of third language learners of English: A focus on request acts modifiers. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 2(2), 84-104. DOI: 10.1080/14790710508668378
- Safont, M. P. (2007). Pragmatic Production of Third Language Learners: A Focus on Request External Modification Items. In Soler, E. A., & Safont, M. P. (Eds.). *Intercultural language use and language learning*. Berlin: Springer.
- Safont, M. P. (2012) Pragmatic competence in multilingual contexts. In Chappelle, C. (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Safont, M. P. (2015). The promotion of multilingualism in a Catalan-speaking area. Familial challenges in the Valencian Community. In Jessner, U. & Kramersch, C. (Eds.). *The Multilingual Challenge: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.



“This is an original postscript version of a manuscript published by Brill in V. Codina & P. Salazar (eds.), *Investigating the learning of pragmatics across ages and contexts*. ISBN: 978-90-04-26872-2, available at: [https:// 10.1163/9789004409699\\_009](https://10.1163/9789004409699_009).”

Schreiber, B. R. (2015). “I Am What I Am”: Multilingual identity and digital translanguaging. *Language Learning & Technology*, 19(3), 69-87. DOI: 10.125/44434

Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1): 1–23. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404500006837

Thorne, S. L. (2008) Transcultural communication in open Internet environments and massively multiplayer online games. In Magnan, S. (Ed.) *Mediating discourse online*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Thorne, S. L., & Black, R. W. (2011) Identity and interaction in Internet-mediated contexts. In Higgins, C. (ed.) *Identity Formation in Globalizing Contexts*. *Language Learning in the New Millennium*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Thorne, S. L., Black, R. W. & Sykes, J. M. (2009) Second Language Use, Socialization, and Learning in Internet Interest Communities and Online Gaming. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93: 802–821. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00974.x

Todeva, E., & Cenoz, J. (Eds.). (2009). *The multiple realities of multilingualism: Personal narratives and researchers’ perspectives*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Wei, L. (2011) Moment Analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 1222–1235. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035

Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wales, Bangor).