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Today linguistic hybridity is often conceptualized as translanguaging. The present study of translanguaging was a linguistic ethnography, which meant investigating cultural issues as well as linguistic practices. The focus was on bilingual speakers of Vietnamese and English, two “named” languages that differ considerably in morphology, syntax, and orthography. This study, conducted over four and a half months, was situated in the Vietnamese Student Organization of a U.S. university, and it included 37 participants. The research was intended to answer two questions: what forms of translanguaging did these bilinguals use? and what reasons did they provide for instances of translanguaging? In capturing the language use of this community, my role was participant-observer, which entailed observing and audio-recording conversations in three kinds of settings: group meetings, social gatherings, and Facebook communications. Additional insights came from discourse-based interviews, focused on instances of translanguaging by 10 individuals.

In the group meetings and Facebook conversations, it was conventional for the major language to be English, whereas in the social gatherings it was Vietnamese. My attention in analyzing these interactions was on patterns of translanguaging that occurred within sentences and those occurring outside sentence boundaries. Overall, most translanguaging occurred intra-sentententially, as single words from one language were segmented within a sentence being spoken or written in the other. As to extra-sentential forms, this translanguaging in the group meetings mainly took the form of
Vietnamese honorifics, and Facebook conversations included some extra-sentential double postings. Participants provided reasons for translanguaging that included community factors, discourse-related factors, and individual-related factors.

This inquiry provides further insights into the multi-competences of bilingual individuals. The Vietnamese-English bilinguals drew flexibly from their linguistic repertoires, merging two languages that are quite different. Use of hybridized language was conventional for them and was central to their practices. This linguistic hybridity was a mutuality—one of the ways in which these students were, in fact, a community.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

To open this chapter, I provide an illustration of translanguaging that I noted during my life in Vietnam. While I was at a coffee shop in a downtown area in Ho Chi Minh City, a conversation between two teenagers attracted my attention. These young people were inserting many English words into their Vietnamese. The teenager sitting behind me asked her friend: "Này, đã nhận gift nào của boyfriend chưa đây?" (Hey, have you received any gift from your boyfriend?). The other teenager sitting on the other side of a small coffee table responded: "Chưa, chắc là Christmas này hả mới tặng" (Not yet, he will probably give me one this Christmas). The conversation went on with language mixing. At that time, I did not have any intention to conduct research on translanguaging; however, I wondered why these young people were alternating language. That question came back to me when I noticed a similar language use among some Vietnamese students with whom I socialize in the United States. The language employed by the teenagers in the coffee shop in Vietnam and the Vietnamese students with whom I have interacted in the United States is language that is situated. Thus, to understand how this type of language is used, one would need to understand the nature of the community and its linguistic practices.

After many additional years of education in Vietnam and in the United States, I have continued to be interested in language alternation, and this interest has led to the study reported here. Through linguistic ethnography, I sought to collect and analyze language as it is used by bilingual English-Vietnamese speakers. I intended the study to accord with the approach described by Rampton, Tusting, Maybin, Barwell, Creese, and
Lytra (2004), in which a linguistic ethnography has ethnography’s "commitment to particularity and participation, holistic accounts of social practice and openness to reinterpretations over time" as well as linguistics' "more formalist framework from linguistics, with its powerfully precise procedures and terminology for describing patterns within communication" (pp. 2-3).

Whereas much research over the years has examined bilingual individuals' mixing of named languages, such as English and Spanish, many scholars who study language have begun to employ a new term, translanguaging, for this linguistic practice. The previous terms, code-switching and code-mixing, which are still in use, are being replaced to some extent. The term translanguaging reflects a change in thinking about the linguistic alternation or combination that occurs in the language of bilinguals and multilinguals. Translanguaging has been described by Otheguy, García, and Reid (2015) as “the deployment of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named (and usually national and state) languages” (p. 283). Canagarajah (2011a) explained:

For multilinguals, languages are part of a repertoire that is accessed for their communicative purposes; languages are not discrete and separated, but form an integrated system for them; multilingual competence emerges out of local practices where multiple languages are negotiated for communication; competence doesn't consist of separate competencies for each language, but a multicompetence that functions symbiotically for the different languages in one’s repertoire. (p. 1)

In this study, I investigated the translanguaging instances that a group of Vietnamese college students made of their “multicompetencies” as they communicated with one another in the context of their student organization, whose members are speakers of both Vietnamese and English. Since 2008 Vietnamese individuals
constitute one of the largest minorities in the U.S., including in American universities; and according to 2014 data, Vietnam has been among the top ten countries having the most students studying in higher education sectors (Institute of International Education, 2015).

This introductory chapter begins with a brief discussion of the move from the code-switching/code-mixing perspective to the translanguaging perspective. More detail on that important shift in thinking is provided in the next chapter. Following this initial overview of the nature of translanguaging, I present the problem that my study addressed and its significance. The next section describes the approach I took to the study, which is described in more detail in Chapter 3. I conclude with more information about the chapters that follow this one.

The Translanguaging Perspective

Translanguaging, which is a fairly new way to think about facility with multiple languages, builds on prior work in code-switching and code-mixing, even as it is distinguished from these other concepts.

Distinction between Code-Switching/Code-Mixing and Translanguaging

Code-switching and code-mixing are terms that have traditionally been used for the linguistic blending and alternation that plurilinguals (bilinguals and multilinguals) employ in their communications. Long ago, the term code-switching was defined rather generally by Hymes (1974) as “a common term for alternate use of two or more languages or language varieties or even speech styles” (p. 70). Over the years, as
code-switching has been theorized and researched, distinctions have been made between various kinds of alternations. One distinction often made is between code-switching and code mixing, with *code-switching* referring to inter-sentential changes across sentences or clauses in a speech event or stretch of discourse and *code-mixing* referring to intra-sentential switches (Kamwangamalu, 1992; Muysken, 2000). However, because distinctions are often difficult to make and because sentence divisions are often arbitrary, some people use *code-mixing* to include both code-mixing and code-switching (e.g., Nelson, Barrera, Skinner, & Fuentes, 2016; Paradis, Genesee, & Crago, 2011, Wardhaugh, 1986/2006). For them, mixing refers to "the use of elements from two languages in the same utterance or in the same stretch of conversation" (Paradis et al., 2011, p. 88).

These terms, *code-switching* and *code-mixing*, are based on the idea of discrete categories for languages. In other words, when one uses two languages concurrently in communication, moves are made from one distinct language system to another. As Ofelia García explained recently in an interview with Grosjean (2016), the way of thinking associated with these terms takes an externalist perspective: linguists look at language use and see that an individual goes across boundaries between these named languages.

In contrast, a translinguaging perspective takes an internalist perspective, focusing on the language-user’s own internal grammar. García affirmed Grosjean’s (1982) point that bilinguals are not comprised of two monolinguals with two systems of named languages. The two language systems are parts of bilinguals’ repertoire that enables them to employ any linguistic elements within their multi-competence for their
communication. These elements can be from either one language or a mixed one. In other words, bilinguals may alternate some linguistic elements of one language with the others from another language to obtain their communication purposes. One should note that these repertoires are cultural as well as linguistic—with culture and language so strongly linked that Agar's (1995) term languaculture might be used. García and Wei (2014) pointed to a major difference in thinking about language acquisition:
"translanguaging goes beyond having to acquire and learn new language structures or the structures of named languages" (p. 80).

An early use of the term translanguaging (but in Welsh) came from Cen Williams (1994), who used the word trawsieithu to describe children’s taking advantage of their bilingualism to maximize the effectiveness of their communication. Now that numerous scholars are building on the translingual perspective, new words are entering linguistic terminology. Wei (2011b) provided the notion of translanguage space referring to multilinguals' ability to use "the full range of their social-cultural resources" creatively and critically (p. 1222). Other terms referring to bilinguals’ and multilinguals’ linguistic systems, such as integrated system and linguistic repertoire. This new perception enables researchers to address the phenomenon of linguistic knowledge and use from an internalist perspective, focusing on language users’ integrated resources, as opposed to code-switching or code mixing, which investigates the linguistic performance. The translanguaging perspective moves beyond the underpinnings of the previous concept.
Reasons for Language Mixing/Translanguaging

It is important to note that research conducted in the name of code-switching or code-mixing examines the same behaviors as research now being conducted in the name of translanguaging. A major focus of much of the research conducted under contrasting conceptual frames has been on bilinguals’ reasons for alternating or combining languages (e.g., Callahan, 2007; García & Wei, 2014; Muysken, 2000). These research studies, which are particularly relevant to the present study, are reviewed in the next chapter.

Gardner-Chloros (2009) has pointed to three major kinds of factors uncovered thus far as to reasons for alternating or combining: (1) sociocultural factors that go beyond the speakers and circumstances and that affect the whole community, (2) factors associated with the language users as individuals and as members of subgroups within the community, and (3) factors associated with a particular conversation. With respect to the first factor on Gardner-Chloros’s list, some research (e.g., Blom & Gumperz, 1972) has shown how bilinguals might use a particular language, usually the majority language, for academic purposes or for government-related purposes, whereas they use their minority language or their mother tongue for informal occasions, such as personal communications with other local residents. These findings raised the power issue between the minority and the majority language in a society. With respect to the second, some studies have shown that translanguaging is a means to mark identity and communicate values (Canagarajah, 2011b; Johnson, 2013; Langman, 2014). With respect to the third, some studies have shown how individuals in particular situations interacting with certain others use translanguaging to clarify meaning and make their
communications more comprehensible (Canagarajah, 2011a; Creese & Blackledge, 2010). Meshing the languages in those cases does not cause confusion but makes one's expression more effective and efficient.

**Major Translanguaging Concepts**

The study that I conducted builds on concepts that have long been important in language studies but have been re-thought for the research in translanguaging. Three that are central are competence, repertoire, and community.

**Multi-Competence**

The concept *competence* in this study refers to *communicative competence*. This term was used by Hymes (1967) to emphasize the social aspects of language use, which were not considered by Chomsky (1965) in his conception of *linguistic competence*. Hymes has explained that *communicative competence* enables speakers to "know when to speak and when to remain silent, which code to use, when, where, and to whom" (p. 13). These external factors affect speakers' code choice and reveal a wide spectrum of code variation within speakers' linguistic repertoire. This perspective has been extended by Gumperz (1972). He explained the distinction between *communicative competence* and *linguistic competence*:

Whereas linguistic competence covers the speaker's ability to produce grammatically correct sentences, communicative competence describes his ability to select, from the totality of grammatically correct expressions available to him, forms which appropriately reflect the social norms governing behavior in specific encounters. (p. 205)

*Communicative competence* in Hymes's work emphasizes the speaker's active
role in selecting linguistic items that are relevant to what he called “social norms.” This kind of competence is comparable to Chomsky’s (1965) notion of linguistic performance: the observable or external part of linguistic competence that can be accessed through the speaker's language use. The two terms refer to the speaker's pragmatic language skills. The concept of communicative competence turns attention to the speaker's deliberate choice of language to attain his/her communication goals, whereas linguistic performance focuses on the divergences or variations of linguistic features found in the speaker's language use.

Although one might continue with Hymes’s concepts to study translinguaging, it is important to note that some scholars studying translingualism have introduced yet another way to think about competence: linguistic multi-competence. This term is often credited to Cook (1991), who first used it as "the compound state of a mind with two grammars" (p. 112). His most recent definition draws attention to social and systematic aspects of multi-competence: "the overall system of a mind or a community that uses more than one language" (Cook, 2016, p. 2). This new perception about bilinguals and multilinguals goes beyond the interaction between the two grammars and confirms a unique multilingual system that enables one to retrieve any linguistic element to reach his or her communicative goals.

Repertoire

The notion of repertoire so central to the conceptualization of translinguaging has a long history in language studies. Gumperz (1964) did much to develop this concept in describing the language of particular language groups. He said that the
linguistic repertoire of a group “contains all the accepted ways of formulating languages. It provides the weapons of everyday communication. Speakers choose among this arsenal in accordance with the meanings they wish to convey” (p. 138). Gumperz pointed out that, although individuals make decisions, their choices are constrained by social conventions belonging to the group. The notion of linguistic repertoire developed by Gumperz has provided a way to explain language alternation occurring in communications of heterogeneous communities. While communicative competence addresses the ability to select language and strategies for communication, linguistic repertoire refers to the available linguistic resources for speakers' selections.

The repertoire in Gumperz's conception refers to linguistic resources shared by members of a particular group or community. In contrast to looking at the shared communal resources, researchers taking a translanguaging perspective are more likely to look at individuals' repertoires. For example, Wei (2011a) has described repertoire as composed of linguistic knowledge (associated with all the languages that one knows) as well as available strategies to draw upon and an executive system that provides control. It is important to keep in mind that an individual would have his or her own unique linguistic repertoire, no matter how many languages he or she speaks. Thus, as noted by García and Kleyn (2016), the repertoire “does not correspond to the socially and politically defined boundaries of the named languages” (p. 4). Of course, the repertoire of a particular individual will include many characteristics of the repertoires of others in his or her community.

Bilingual and multilingual research seeks to understand the nature of bilinguals' and multilinguals' linguistic repertoires, which include elements associated with more
than one named language system (Bialystok, 2001; Blommaert & Rampton, 2011; Grosjean, 1992; Jorgensen, 2008). Researchers also attempt to gain insights into multilinguals’ use of those linguistic resources—how and when the bilinguals or multilinguals use features of one language instead of another. Why does it make sense at a particular time to change language? From years of research, it is becoming more and more apparent that people have choices to make and have communicative reasons for their translingual moves. Much of the current research in the U.S has been based on individuals who are bilingual in Spanish and English (e.g., Becker, 1997; Lipski, 2014; Martin-Beltran, 2014; McClure & Mir, 1995).

Community

Community is another major term associated with sociolinguistics. In 1962, Gumperz used *linguistic community* to refer to "a social group which may be either mono-lingual or multilingual, held together by frequency of social interaction patterns and set off from the surrounding areas by weaknesses in the lines of communication" (p. 31). He added that the community might be a small group interacting face-to-face or might be a larger group covering a region. In 1967, retrieving a term used early by Bloomfield (1926), Hymes used *speech community* to refer to a *social entity* in which people share social norms—"rules for the conduct, interpretation of acts of speech, and rules for the interpretation of at least one common linguistic code" (p. 18). In the following year, Gumperz (1968) also began using *speech community*, and he described it as a group of people with shared social norms using the same language or dialect, which may not follow the grammar rules or standards of an official language.
A related notion is discourse community, a label sometimes attributed to Bizzell (1982). Porter (1986) has described a discourse community as “a group of individuals bound by a common interest who communicate through approved channels and whose discourse is regulated” (pp. 38-39). The term has also been used by Swales (1990), who defined discourse communities as “groups that have goals or purposes and use communication to achieve those goals” (p. 24). In discussing the relation between the two formulations, speech community and discourse community, Swales has argued that the major differences lie in channel of communication, purpose of communication, and style of communication. The notion of speech community emphasizes the spoken form as well as the group’s social relationships and solidarity, whereas the notion of discourse community gives more attention to the written form as well as to the group’s shared interests and its goals for communications.

Yet another way of thinking about community that is relevant is community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). This sociocultural conception emphasizes the conventions and customary practices associated with a group whose members share an interest and a purpose. With a focus on “legitimate peripheral activity,” attention goes to the process through which novices become part of the group and interact with other members. This situated learning can be observed in various kinds of groups, such as medical practitioners, a classroom of teacher and students, and chefs in cooking schools. The people in a community have the same interest but are typically at different levels of knowledge. The major purposes of the communications in this community are for sharing experience and for teaching and
learning through hands-on activities. The community of practice conception has guided some previous studies of code-switching (Nichols & Colon, 2000; Wei, 2011a).

The notion of community of practice best describes the target community in my study. It was a particular group that formed a community and had a shared discourse and shared practice. The students in my study shared an interest in academic achievement and cultural activities. Group meetings and social gatherings as well as Facebook conversations were for sharing experiences in school life and social life and strengthening community bonds.

The Problem Prompting the Study

Over the years, a large body of research has been conducted examining language alternation, and much of it has been conducted in the code-shifting/code-mixing paradigm. As mentioned above, in the United States, much of that research has focused on alternation between Spanish and English, although a considerable amount of attention has also gone to dialect shifting between “Black English” and “standard English” (e.g., Greene & Walker, 2004; Hill, 2009; Hobbs, 2004). The Spanish-English research has revealed various reasons that language-users provide for language alternation. For instance, they might combine languages to mark their bicultural identity (Manyak, 2000; Moll & Dworin, 1996; Perez, 2004), to increase interational function (Ervin-Tripp & Reyes, 2005), and to accommodate interlocutors (Callahan, 2007).

Little attention has been given to Vietnamese, which in 2014 was reported to be the first language or an additional language by participants from the sixth largest immigrant group in the United States, with a population of approximately 1,292,000
(Migration Policy Institute, 2016). In addition, a number of individuals have come from Vietnam to the United States to pursue higher education. In 2015, it was reported 18,722 Vietnamese came to the United States to pursue their education (Institute of International Education, 2015). According to the Migration Policy Institute, the number of Vietnamese immigrants is on the rise.

Certain linguistic differences between English and Vietnamese make this an important focus of language study. In contrast to the Indo-European language families (to which English belongs), the Vietnamese language belongs to the Austroasiatic family (Hoa-Pham, 2003). It is a non-inflected, tenseless, and monosyllabic language (Thompson, 1965). Although there are many differences between English and Vietnamese, I provide three as examples. The first is tense, which characterizes English but not Vietnamese. Another is tone, which is an important element of Vietnamese but not of English. Vietnamese language has six tones, which are level, high rising, low, dipping-rising, high rising glottalized, and low glottalized. Yet another major distinction is the difference in personal pronouns. In Vietnamese, social status, kinship, gender, the relationship between speaker and interlocutors, and age difference are determinants of speakers' choice of personal pronouns. Ho-Dac (2003), who investigated such matters in his code-switching study, found that identity negotiation (i.e., speakers' intention of changing their relationship with their interlocutors) motivates code-switching. However, tense and tone are features in the Vietnamese language that deserve attention in code-mixing/translanguaging studies.

There is much still to be learned about translanguaging situated in particular contexts. Cultural differences relating to language choice are indispensable
characteristics of language use in a community of practice. In interactions involving Vietnamese in the United States, individuals' repertoires include cultural resources associated with two languages. Language choice relies not only on an individual's multi-competence that is congruent with the community practices and functional relations but also on individual linguistic repertoires influenced by social constraints and affordances (Cook, 2016). Bilinguals' multi-competence is the use of either Vietnamese or English linguistic elements for their communications so that their communication goals can be attained. Interactions between young Vietnamese Americans and members of older generations are examples. The younger individuals have to navigate their bilingual repertoires to retrieve the items that can be appropriate for their communications with their older family members, whose linguistic repertoires are dominated by the Vietnamese language. The older individuals also have to make their communications more effective for the younger ones by choosing the Vietnamese linguistic elements that are comprehensible to younger generations.

Additional studies are needed to investigate the use of Vietnamese along with English in situated practices of a community. Canagarajah (2011a) indicated that translinguaging is “an interactive achievement that depends on aligning one’s language resources to the features of the ecology to construct meaning” (p. 5). Because of important differences across languages, communities, and contexts, it is essential to have more investigations of the translinguaging of language groups from Southeast Asia, including studies of Vietnamese speakers, who are expected to have different practices of translinguaging.

Questions Guiding the Study
This study examined forms of Vietnamese-English translanguaging and the reasons for translanguaging performed by members of a Vietnamese student organization who integrated Vietnamese and English in both oral and written forms. My research was thus guided by the following two questions: (1) What forms of translanguaging are employed by the Vietnamese-English bilinguals in the student organization community? and (2) What reasons do they provide for particular incidences of translanguaging?

Overview of the Study

This student club that was the focus of my study has specific forums for communication (cf. Porter, 1986): face-to-face meetings, social gatherings, and Facebook postings. For these social uses of language, I investigated the various ways in which club members moved from one language to another and learned something about their reasons for making these moves over a four-and-a-half-month period. This club is comprised of approximately 65 undergraduate and graduate Vietnamese and Vietnamese-American students who are interested in sharing academic and cultural experiences. The community has created a supportive environment for its members in many ways, such as offering assistance with transportation, especially new members, and exchanging information about job opportunities and academic achievements.

To address my research questions, I adopted an approach based on linguistic ethnography, which originated in the U.K. in the 1990s. According to Rampton (2007), linguistic ethnography considers "the contexts for communication" and "the internal organisation of verbal data" (p. 585). He has explained that it is not a new paradigm:

It is more accurately described as a site of encounter where a number of established lines of research interact, pushed together by circumstance, open to
the recognition of new affinities, and sufficiently familiar with one another to treat differences with equanimity. (p. 585)

*Linguistic ethnography*, according to Rampton, involves “putting linguistics and ethnography together to try to understand the social processes that we are involved in” (p. 599). The three components of translanguaging—communicative competence, linguistic repertoires, and community of practice—were, therefore, taken into consideration in my analysis. I was looking at the students’ online written communications and their face-to-face oral communications. I was also cognizant of the fact that a study situated in a particular study provides insights particular to that community as well as to the particular language being studied. Gardner-Chloros (2009) made this point: “The characteristic ways in which bilinguals combine their language in a particular community constitute a way of expressing their group identity like a characteristic accent. Both the languages themselves and the environment play a role in the patterns which emerge” (p. 5).

As a participant observer, I collected data from the members of the Vietnamese student club for a period of four and a half months. Playing a role as both a researcher and a member of this community enabled me to record club members’ conversations during face-to-face meetings and social gatherings and to keep records of their written conversations via Facebook postings. Note-taking and observations during face-to-face meetings were informative to my study. Since I had been participating in this community for almost one year, my bond with members was strong enough that I could obtain much data in natural contexts. My membership facilitated my data collection because I had attended many meetings and gatherings and contributed to Facebook conversations. I recorded conversations at group meetings and social gatherings and
downloaded the Facebook group postings. I sought insights into the forms of translanguaging through discourse analysis, which Grbich (2013) has defined in the following way:

Discourse analysis is a way of questioning in both social and scientific areas, the ways of thinking, writing and speaking about particular topics in order to discover the rules, assumptions, ways of seeing, hidden motivations, conditions for development and change, and how and why these changes occurred or were resisted. (p. 246)

To learn about participants’ reasons for language alternation, I conducted discourse-based interviews (Odell, Goswami, & Herrington, 1983).

Organization of the Dissertation

This introduction, which began with a discussion of translanguaging, has provided a statement of the problem motivating the study, the questions that guided it, and an overview of the research approach. The second chapter, which is a literature review of related studies, shows the gap that should be filled. The third chapter describes my research method in detail regarding the method of the study, including setting, participants, procedures for data collection, and procedures for data analysis. The fourth chapter reports the results of the study in terms of forms of translanguaging and participants' reasons for translanguaging. The last chapter is a discussion of the findings.
CHAPTER 2
RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews literature relevant to this study that focused on the translanguaging of Vietnamese-English bilinguals. I begin with conceptions of code-switching and code-mixing. Next, I focus on research into reasons bilinguals engage in translanguaging—the conception that undergirds this study—and the forms of translanguaging researchers have found. I conclude by looking at research into linguistic differences between English and Vietnamese that are relevant to my study. The latter is important because a study of the translanguaging of Vietnamese speakers would reveal new features of translanguaging that may not have been found in research into translanguaging of speakers from other language groups.

Code-Switching and Code-Mixing: One Phenomenon or Two?

Although I portray my inquiry as a study of translanguaging, it is important to consider the conceptions of code-switching and code-mixing, since studies referring to switching or mixing have investigated phenomena that could also be considered translanguaging. I begin here by referring to the issue that has received some attention: the matter of terminology to which I referred briefly in the previous chapter. The review in this section focuses on conceptual differences between code-switching and code-mixing and their interchangeability as perceived through different lenses of different studies.
Code-Switching

The term *code-switching* has been defined differently by different people, according to their perception of this phenomenon. One might go back to an early study of a New York Community conducted by Labov (1966), who studied *idiolect*, "the speech of one person in the same context over a short period of time" (p. 4). He spoke of the borrowing of elements from different dialects to form one’s unique *idiolect* for a particular kind of communication. The participants switched from one dialect to another to form their own dialect or *idiolect* in their conversations for social relationship. That was followed by another major study, conducted by Blom and Gumperz (1972), who defined code-switching from a sociolinguist perspective as a switch between two dialects to "redefine a situation" (i.e., *situational switching*) and to "enrich a situation" (i.e., *metaphorical switching*) (p. 409). Blom and Gumperz had observed the conversations in the two different dialects in Norway and found that people code-switched for social and pragmatic reasons, for instance, marking local identity and values, strengthening social ties, and changing topics. A few years later, Hymes (1974) provided the description of code-switching that I included in the previous chapter. He described code-switching as an effective and situated strategy for communication, in which speakers move among multiple languages or language varieties to obtain their communication goals.

Yet another important definition came from Poplack (1980), who studied the language of the third-generation Puerto Ricans in the United States who were English-Spanish bilinguals. She defined *code-switching* as "the alternation of two languages within a single discourse, sentence or constituent" (p. 583). The code in this definition is
not a dialect spoken by multilinguals but a named language. Poplack’s definition of code-switching suggests differential roles for the two languages involved in the switching process. The speakers' first language was considered the *base language* in which the other language or speakers' second language is embedded. From this perspective, the grammar rules of *base language* take a major role in utterance and affect the form of the embedded one being used in code-switching.

A major theorist and researcher known for her work in code-switching is Myers-Scotton (1993a), who has defined code-switching as “the selection by bilinguals or multilinguals of forms from an embedded variety (or varieties) in utterances of a matrix variety during the same conversation” (p. 3). In contrast to Poplack, who focused mainly on the linguistic phenomenon itself, Myers-Scotton characterized code-switching from a more psycholinguistic perspective, focusing on the agent of code-switching (i.e., the "selection by bilinguals or multilinguals of forms") (p. 3). She held that speakers are able to control their language choice and use different languages purposefully to reach their communication goals. However, like Poplack, she differentiated the roles of the two languages: She employed *matrix variety* for the language mainly used in the conversation and *embedded variety* for the language that plays minor role. Poplack and Myers-Scotton were sharing the same view on the major and minor roles of two languages in conversations. Code-switching in this sense clearly identifies the switch point between the *major language* or *base language* with the embedded one.

The conception of code-switching presented by Callahan (2004) did not give attention to relative dominance of one language over the other in the code-switching process. In contrast to Poplack’s and Myers-Scotton’s description, Callahan defined
code-switching as "the use of words and structures from more than one language or linguistic variety by the same speaker within the same speech situation, conversation or utterance" (p. 16). This definition merely considers the presence of two languages in a conversation without concerning base language or matrix variety. The *embedded variety* can be a single word or phrase and occurs at intrasentential or intersentential levels (Callahan, 2007). Code-switching studies from this perspective (Greene & Walker, 2004; Hua, 2008; Nichols & Colon, 2000; Weston, 2012) have mainly examined morpho-syntactic features of the phenomenon and have not distinguished code-switching from code-mixing.

**Code-Mixing**

Muysken (2000) is noted for distinguishing between code-mixing and code-switching. *Code-mixing* in his conception refers to all cases "where lexical items and grammatical features from two languages appear in one sentence" (p. 1). *Code-switching* is used for language alternation in larger units, as in "the rapid succession of several languages in a single speech event" (p. 1). The conception of *code-mixing* in this perception includes employment of morphosyntactic structures from more than one language, combination of grammatical rules of two languages, and lexical shifting occurring in one sentence. In other words, code-mixing is intra-sentential and code-switching is inter-sentential. For code-switching, the alternation between languages can be observed in a speech event, which includes more than one sentence. The occurrence of code-mixing that is observable at a micro level, sentential level, he maintained, is a sign of a fluent bilingual (Muysken, 2000; cf. Poplack, 1980).
*Mixing* had been employed previously—and notably—by Auer (1999), who discussed *language mixing* with the explanation that "there are many cases of the juxtaposition of two languages other than code-switching" (p. 314). His research (1984a) on code-mixing of Italian migrants in Germany found that it was impossible to identify which language, either Italian or Swiss German, dominated the conversations. The two languages were blended smoothly to form a "language of interaction" (p. 315). He explained that the language choice in his data did not indicate individuals' language preference, language competence, local meaning, or identity shift. *Language mixing* is syntactically more complicated than code-switching because the two languages are blended well together; as a result, the two language systems are not distinctive within an utterance due to the intricate syntactic structures mixed.

The research studies into the co-occurrence of two languages conducted in bilingual and multi-lingual communities (Bukhari, Anuar, Khazin, & Aziz, 2015; Ferguson, 2016; Goldrick, Putnam, & Schwarz, 2016) have based their definition of *code-mixing* on Muysken's (2000) and Auer's (1999). This phenomenon has been explained as an integration of the linguistic features originated in two languages. For example, Ferguson (2016) indicated the morphosyntactic integration of Sakha and Russian found in the vocabulary used by the people in Yakutsk. As a result, it was not easy to identify which words belong to which language, Sakha or Russian. The switch point in the study occurred at the morpheme-level where the linguistic features of Sakha integrates with the Russian ones; and they have created a mosaic of languages.
Blurred Boundary between Code-Switching and Code-Mixing

As discussed above, the distinction between code-switching and code-mixing has not always been made by theorists and researchers who have used the terms. Wardhaugh (1986/2006), who has not made differentiations, has argued that code-mixing is a term that includes what some have called code-switching. His research gave much attention to multilingual communities in different areas in Europe, Africa, and Asia, where people use multiple codes (i.e., dialects, languages, or varieties) for communication. His analyses have focused on the discourse involving multiple languages in conversation and the hybrid form language rather than its syntactic structure. Differentiation of code-switching and code-mixing has not been his concern.

His definition is as follows:

People, then, are usually required to select a particular code whenever they choose to speak, and they may also decide to switch from one code to another or to mix codes even within sometimes very short utterances and thereby create a new code. (p. 101)

This perspective has been adopted in other studies of using languages bilingually in different areas including bilingual communities whose members become bilingual due to immigration (Hua, 2008; Lo, 1999; Meng & Miyamoto, 2012; Woolford, 1983). These bilinguals make language choices that differ from those in older generations. They use their first language or home language to communicate with parents while using code-switching or mixing in their conversations with peers.

In some bilingual studies, authors choose either code-mixing or code-switching to refer to both, although they are aware that others differentiate the two (Jiang, García, & Willis, 2014; Nelson, Barrera, Skinner, & Fuentes, 2016). The authors' explanation for
using code-mixing is that it can be used to include code-switching as well as intersentential and intrasentential alternation. It seems to be a more inclusive term.

Translanguaging: A Different Perspective

Linguistically, translanguaging seems similar to code-mixing/switching. However, as noted above, the theoretical explanation for the linguistic practice differs. In this section, my attention is on the conceptualization of translanguaging and its implementation in education.

The Conceptualization of Translanguaging

The term translanguaging has two components, trans- and languaging. García and Wei (2014) have defined languaging as "the simultaneous process of continuous becoming of ourselves and of our language practice, as we interact and make meaning in the world" (p. 8). The prefix trans- means "between" or “across.” From this perspective, translanguaging can be interpreted as bilingual or multilingual individuals using language resources (across previously established boundaries) for their own identity and for interaction with others. The individual draws for his or her communications from a single linguistic repertoire with elements associated with more than one language, which was referred to as an integrated system by Canagarajah (2011a).

It is necessary to discuss in some depth the definition of languaging so that reasons for a shifting paradigm from code-mixing to translanguaging are clear. The concept languaging in García and Wei (2014) is aligned with Alton Becker's (1995)
study into translating across cultures in which *languaging* is a way of expressing connotations and denotations. Becker pointed out that there is an inextricable link between language and culture. A translator must consider both the original language and culture and the target language and culture. The final product of this process is a new version of a text in a new language including two cultures. He illustrated these points through semantic comparison of the text of the essays in Southeast Asian languages (e.g., Burmese, Malay, and Old Javanese) with English versions.

As discussed previously, central to the current translanguaging way of thinking about bilingualism and multilingualism is its distinction from the code-switching/code-mixing conception. It is a different way of looking at the phenomenon: from an internalist rather than an externalist conception. It suggests a different mechanism and emphasizes different factors that motivate bilingual and multilingual interactions.

Another important theoretical difference relates to the perceived relation between languages. The translanguaging perspective holds that languages are not compartmentalized in a bilingual's/multilingual's mind as the way they are designated more generally with a specific name (e.g., English, Spanish, or French). Multiple languages do not mean multiple language systems, but multiple linguistic elements that can make the language production and communication process more effective and efficient. Also important is the way in which an individual's linguistic repertoire is conceptualized. A bilingual/multilingual's mind is not the coexistence of two or multiple monolinguistic minds. Multiple linguistic elements originating from different language systems form a linguistic repertoire that enables a speaker to create language for effective communication. The notion of multi-competence refers to ability to retrieve and
manipulate different linguistic elements from different language systems located in a linguistic repertoire to produce language in a way that can attain communication goals. People use their multi-competence to manipulate their linguistic repertoires for translanguaging at a particular situation to enhance the effectiveness of their communications.

The conceptualization of translanguaging marked an epistemological change in the investigation of the use of more than one language within an utterance. Expressing individual identity through translanguaging is being encouraged by some theorists and researchers for education of U.S students (Canagarajah, 2011a; García, 2011; Langman, 2014). This practice is believed to enhance students' linguistic and cultural development because the nature of bilinguals/multilinguals' language competence is multi-competence. Schools and educators are encouraged to be language planners and to offer their students spaces where they can express their identities through using multiple languages. Translanguaging is said to be a way of "constructing future from the past" (García, 2011, p. 133), and teachers must understand its use and accommodate their instruction (Canagarajah, 2011a). The studies of translanguaging in educational contexts have found that conceptualizing language in this way and allowing the language mixing are beneficial to bilingual and multilingual learners regarding their cognitive development, mutiliteracy abilities, and learning performance (Baker, 2011; Canagarajah, 2011a; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Duran & Palmer, 2014; García, 2011; Johnson, 2013; Langman, 2014; Martin-Beltran, 2014; Wei, 2011b).
Forms of Language Mixing/Translanguaging

In this section, I first summarize some important early studies that set the stage for subsequent work. Then I review research showing major ways in which other researchers have analyzed and categorized forms of language mixing/translanguaging.

Early Studies

The review in this section focuses on the studies that have influenced research on code-switching or code-mixing. They have laid the foundation for others regarding linguistic variation occurring in code-switching and code-mixing.

American sociolinguists paid attention to linguistic variation occurring in some dialects. Labov’s (1966) studies of *idiolect*, described earlier, looked at the vowels, consonants, and phoneme variables and focused on the shift in the patterns of vowels, consonants, and phoneme variables in different social contexts. This approach of studying code-switching is also found in other studies of language switching from the standard to local dialects (Kendall & Wolfram, 2009; Linnes, 1998). Hymes (1986), who focused on diversity of speech, found the differences in speech acts of Afro-American speech groups and standard English. He stated, “Afro-American speakers differ radically from their white neighbors by the cultural emphasis they place on speech acts such as ‘signifying,’ ‘sounding,’ ‘toasts,’ etc” (p. 37).

In addition to phonology and speech, Blom and Gumperz (1972), who examined the language in northern Norway, based code-switching instances on changes in social situation and topic. The switching they found related to sentence speed and such
communication devices as hesitation pauses, phonological variables, morphological variables, and lexical borrowings.

The introduction of the terms *setting*, *situation*, and *event* in Blom and Gumperz’s study have oriented code-switching research towards sociolinguistics; and this view has been found in other code-switching studies (Auer, 1984b; Gardner-Chloros, 1991; Ervin-Tripp & Reyes, 2005; Wei, 1994). An important issue raised by Blom and Gumperz’s code-switching study is the confirmation that “this position implies an important break with previous approaches to social structure and to language and society” (p. 432). The code-switching is perceived as a communication behavior that one can employ to achieve his/her own communication purposes, and social structure may not be a motivation for this phenomenon. This perspective has been supported by other code-switching studies in which the forms of code-switching have been categorized based on sociolinguistic aspects occurred in a particular context (Lipski, 2014; Smith, 2004).

Studies Illustrating Various Means of Analysis

The following presents different methods for analyzing language and categorizing forms of linguistic alternation. Much attention has gone to syntactic form, location, and relative dominance of the language system. Poplack (1980) studied English-Spanish mixing following Gumperz’s (1971) socio-pragmatic perspective, but she also examined syntactic structures of the code-switching. Her attention went to intra-sentential and extra-sentential switching. The intra-sentential switches occurred within a sentence and were categorized according to grammatical functions, such as noun, adjective, independent clause, subordinate clause, and so on. Extra-sentential switches, including
sentence, filler, interjection, idiomatic expression, quotation, and tag, occurred outside a particular sentence. For the intra-sentential switches, she also investigated which grammar of either languages, English or Spanish, was used as a base of the sentence.

Also giving attention to syntactic structure was Muysken (2000). The patterns of code-mixing in his study are categorized into three groups, insertion, alternation, and congruent lexicalization. These three patterns are described as follows.

- **Insertion** of material (lexical items or entire of constituents) from one language into a structure from the other language
- **Alternation** between structures from languages
- **Congruent lexicalization** of material from different lexical inventories into a shared grammatical structure. (p. 3)

Muysken’s *insertion* and *alternation* are similar to Poplack’s (1980) intra-sentential and extra-sentential code-switching respectively; however, *congruent lexicalization* corresponds to the shifting patterns found in Labov’s studies of code-switching between dialect and standard language. This code-mixing category was expanded by Lipski (2014), who studied a group of Spanish speakers in the U.S. He explained that Muysken’s *congruent lexicalization* occurs when “two languages have roughly equal prestige” (p. 43), but there is another possibility of the occurrence of *congruent lexicalization*: “L2 is a dominant language of the venue; there may be a tradition of language separation” (p. 43).

Within the research literature, distinctions are sometimes made between *matrix language* and *embedded language* (Callahan, 2004; Mendieta-Lombardo & Cintron, 1995). This distinction is credited to Myers-Scotton (1993b), who used *matrix language* for the language used to frame a sentence and *embedded language* for constituents of another language that are included within it. It was Myers-Scotton who also made a
distinction between unmarked code-switching (i.e., expected code-switching aligning with the social norm) and marked code-switching (i.e., unexpected code-switching purposefully created by the speaker) focusing on the relationship between the code choice and the social pragmatics. The speaker’s awareness of social norms and bilingual proficiency play a vital role in the choice of marked and unmarked forms of code-switching.

Reasons for Language Mixing/Translanguaging

Over the year same attention has been given to bilingual processing reasons or code-mixing/ transla languaging. This section focuses on two categories of reasons: community factors and discourse-related factors.

Community Factors

Observation of code-mixing in different contexts from classrooms to everyday interactions has revealed contextual factors that affect individual code choice. As mentioned in Chapter One, community linguistic resources are shared by community members, and interactions between an individual and his or her community can be perceived through language use. A community also interacts with other communities in a multilingual society; hence, some distinctive linguistic features of a community can be mixed with those of other communities. Thomason and Kaufman (1988) found that social factors determine structural borrowing and language shifting relating to sounds, syntax, and morphology. The inter-ethnic interactions have enlarged speakers' repertoires by adding new linguistic elements and their pragmatic uses. An example of
this kind of social influence on language use is the phonological influence of Puerto Rican speech on African American English in New York, studied by Wolfram (1974). He found that Puerto Rican phonological features were detected in African Americans' conversations. Inter-ethnicity linguistic influences are evident in other studies on Chicano or Tejano English (Bucholtz, 1999; Edwards, 1992; Fought, 1999; Nelson et al., 2016).

In 1964 Gumperz pointed out how social restraints as well as syntactic factors influence linguistic choices, which include choice of which language to use. This study like the Blom and Gumperz (1972), discussed earlier, examined languages in northern Norway, but it also described dialect switching in Khalapur in India. Gumperz classified the conversations in his research into two types of interactions: transactional and personal. Transactional interaction is used for limited socially defined goals (e.g., a religious service, a petition, a job interview) whereas in personal interaction, "participants act as individuals, rather than for the sake of specific social tasks" (p. 149). He found that the residents from the two communities used their local dialects for personal interaction and the standard for transactional interaction. A change in the function of communication requires changes in language, including vocabulary and syntactic structures, to attain communication goals and to conform to social practice and obligations. The major role of the standard and the local dialects has been socially and historically defined; consequently, code-mixing is expected when people made a switch from personal to transactional interaction and vice versa.

International studies and international trade also contribute to the increases in code-mixing. In some multilingual communities, the difference in social role of a local
language/dialect and the standard is apparent. Variations in their language choice and syntactic structures were tied to social status, and the type of communication (Cashman, 2005; De Fina, 2007; Holmes, 2013). Other related research, conducted with Chinese families in the United Kingdom (Hua, 2008; Wei & Lesley, 1995) found that bilinguals used Cantonese for everyday conversations and English for academic purposes.

A historical example is Zhang’s (2012) account of the occurrence of code-mixing in the eighteenth century in the interactions among the Chinese people who received overseas education. The study explained that trade between Chinese and British businessmen and international study were motivating factors. The frequent contact between different languages and cultures through doing business and studying have required people to adapt to and fit in with multilingual and multicultural societies.

Globalization and Internet connectivity have brought people from different countries closer regarding language and culture. The virtual world on the Internet has bridged geographical distance and facilitated international interactions among people from different language groups across the world. Social media play a major role in encouraging people to participate in discussions and to form large discourse communities, where people can share their stories, interest, knowledge, and other issues; and code-mixing is visible on all of these types of social media postings. International interactions create similar effects on language choice as inter-ethnic interactions do (Bukhari, Anuar, Khazin, & Aziz, 2015; Halim, Nadri, & Mahmood, 2015; Huang, 2009; Snodin, 2014).
The term *community* refers to a group of people who share common cultural values and ways of communicating. Blom and Gumperz (1972) have used *situational switching* for mixing that is constrained by community values. A sudden participation of an outsider into a communication can make the participants switch the language and the formality of group behavior. The arrival of others from outside the community made a group of local people switch their informal gesture to formal gesture and from the grammar of their local language to that of the standard language.

Studies have indicated that linguistic hybridity can be an identity marker, linking members of a group and distinguishing them from others. The Mexican-American communities living on or near the Texas-Mexico border, according to Chaika (1994) and Nelson et al. (2016), saw language-mixing as markers of their community membership. Language was associated with group culture; as a result, the language use in conversations indicates the group to which interactants belong (Bucholtz, 1999; Rampton, 1995).

It seems that many people who belong to a hybrid community identify themselves as multilinguals. In some countries where English has been used for international trade, overseas study, and achieved high social status, mixing English with one’s home language is preferred by many people because it is considered as a way of confirming their multilingual identity and their social status. An increase in the mixing of codes in newspapers, advertisements, and TV commercials in Taiwan (Kuo, 2009; Wei-Yu-Chen, 2006), in Hong Kong (Wu & Chan, 2007), in Japan (Takashi, 1990), in Korea (Lee, 2006) indicates a rise in the number of multilingual people and a need to use a hybrid language in the media. In multilingual countries where many dialects and an official
language are used, such as India, code-mixing is a distinctive feature because it reflects a multilingual and multicultural nature. Kathpalia and Ong (2015) found that multiple languages (e.g., Hindi, English, and other regional languages) are mixed in billboard advertising in India.

Identity and community are integral to bilinguals’ and multilinguals’ language use. For example, Canagarajah (2012) studied young people speaking Tamil and English in the UK, the U.S, and Canada. The young people expressed their identity not in two separate languages but through "mix of codes" (p. 251). This perception is not bounded by "the equation one language = one community" (p. 251).

Much of the research into translanguaging has focused on oral language, but there have also been studies of written language as well. Canagarajah (2011a) used codemeshing to refer to the bilingual writing of students. One of his undergraduate students purposefully used both English and Arabic in her writing to assert her bicultural values. In another study, Johnson (2013) found that translanguaging was a way that students at a boarding school marked their identity. Even though the school was purportedly a two-language community in which students were to use English and Swedish separately as multiple monolinguals, the students engaged in translingual practice. Their writing journals revealed translanguaging involving multiple languages, and students explained that this writing showed who they were. Whatever languages were taught and spoken in school, they always wished to keep their translanguaging practice because their translingual language use reflected their identity.

A set of studies by Pennycook and Otsuji are often used as illustrations of translanguaging in a particular kind of community, such as an urban community
comprised of many migrants from various languages and cultures. Otsuji and Pennycook (2010) used the label *metrolingualism* for what they found: "creative linguistic practices across borders of culture, history, and politics" (p. 240). A negotiated linguistic space was necessary for members of this community to survive and thrive. Related work was reported by Pennycook and Otsuji (2014, 2016), who pointed to the metroplex’s cultural, ethnic, and linguistic diversity, which affects people’s linguistic repertoires and communicative competences in a community of practice. Pennycook and Otsuji (2016) explained that languages with different names cannot describe the language that a metrolingual speaks. Metrolingual practice does not limit a language user to a static linguistic repertoire and a single identity but allows people to be exposed to everyday linguistic resources and to have multiple identities. People in metroplexes have inter-community of practice and intra-community of practice. In the inter-community, they may have to be in contact with people speaking different languages, which offers them new experiences with new linguistic repertoires. The intra-community would offer people chances to exchange their linguistic repertoires with new people from outside their community.

**Discourse-Related Factors**

One of the motivations for code-mixing is to strengthen the effectiveness of communication, and it seems that the “cooperative principles” discussed by Grice (1975) are relevant to code-mixing/translanguaging. Grice suggested four principles—*Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner*—describing interactant’s cooperative efforts to facilitate comprehension and to maintain good relationship with audience in
conversations. According to Grice, *Quantity* and *Quality* refer to the quantity and the truthfulness of the information obtained in a communication, and the other two principles—*Relation* and *Manner*—focus on the relevance and the manner of expression. The maxims under each category elucidate the principles. The last two principles described by the following maxims are particularly relevant for studying code-mixing and translanguaging.

Under the category of RELATION I place a single maxim, namely, ‘Be relevant.’…Finally, under the category of MANNER…I include the supermaxim—‘Be perspicuous’—and various maxims such as:

1. avoid obscurity of expression.
2. avoid ambiguity.
3. be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)
4. be orderly. (p. 46)

The social aspect of relating to one’s audience also has an impact on language used by bilinguals. Bilinguals engage in code-mixing to make their conversations more comprehensible and acceptable to their audience. Gumperz (1964) has explained that each individual in a particular society is bound by rights and obligations, some of which seem similar to Grice’s (1975) principles. Meeuwis and Blommaert (1994) have pointed out that discourse-related factors influence interactants' code choice; hence, code-mixing is expected when it is needed for successful communication. This adaptation of language occurs in a multilingual community, where language is used for inter-group communication. It is even a kind of social norm. This social norm was observed when a bilingual spoke Korean to talk to her teacher or her pastor as a way to express her respect (Chung, 2006) or when a bilingual translanguage to accommodate an audience speaking that language (Burt, 2002; Chen, 2013; Coupland, 1985; Mendieta-Lombardo & Cintron, 1995; Scotton, 1976; Song, 2016).
Language adaptation occurs in many contexts. An example is conversations between store employees and customers. Callahan (2007) described conversations in which a store employee switched to Spanish when the customer asked questions in Spanish. The store employee used English only for price, numbers, and greetings, but later used Spanish for key information that answered the customers' questions. The code-mixing in these instances was to accommodate the customers' language choice. This is another example of strategic communication to fulfill the speakers' responsibility, offering the customers better service. This social practice was found at a workplace in Hong Kong, where a senior employee code-mixed to express welcome and encouragement to new employees (Chui, Liu, & Mak, 2016).

Code-switching can be seen when a speaker changes from one addressee to another. This was seen, for example, in Shim's (2014) study of communications within a family of Korean Americans. The code-mixing occurred when the participants talked to non-family members or when there was an age difference between the speaker and the listener. English was used in interactions among siblings, but individuals switched to Korean when talking to or referring to their grandmother or other older people, including the chef of the restaurant where their family visited for dinner. Shim explained that young people are expected to use the Korean language when talking to older non-family members to show respect and deference, which are common cultural values in other Asian countries, such as Vietnam. This move to Korean for communication occurred regardless of the speaker’s English proficiency.

Canagajarah (2011a) has pointed to various facets of a person’s relating to his or her audience. He has categorized various strategies—recontextualization strategies,
voice strategies, interactional strategies, and textualization strategies—that bilingual writers used to communicate with their readers. He explained that these strategies help a multilingual/bilingual writer using multiple languages to communicate with readers. Other researchers have also given major attention to the strategic aspects of translanguaging. Among them are Blommaert and Rampton (2011), who have argued that linguistics has undergone a change in emphasis:

> It [now] sees linguistic conventions/structures as just one (albeit important) semiotic resource among a number available to participants in the process of local language production and interpretation, and it treats meaning as an active process of here-and-now projection and inferencing, ranging across all kinds of percept, sign and knowledge. (p. 5)

This language behavior attends to the relevance of style and register, “it is essential to consider more than the literal meaning of what they are saying” (p. 5). The authors emphasize the importance of a shared framework of interpretation between the participants, which maximizes understanding and minimizes confusion or misinterpretation due to using multiple languages or codes in conversations.

Duran and Palmer (2014) have written about a negotiated space occupied by speakers/writers and listeners/readers. These researchers studied how teachers teach their children to use translanguaging for classroom conversations. Both the teacher and the students in the study used translanguaging in classroom conversations to better express themselves regarding their identities and the connotational meaning beyond the language. The negotiated space allowed participants to "co-construct the pluralist multilingual discourse" (p. 382).

The Internet connects people from different countries and cultures regardless of their social status, religion, and other social factors that can be obstacles for making
friends or face-to-face contact. Here too, the relation between author and audience is central. An interesting example is communication between fiction authors and their audiences, which was studied by Williams (2009). In this type of communication, the topic and the discourse are based on the fictional text that participants read; and other factors, such as gender, social status, profession, heritage language, and culture are hidden because these people do not have actual contact in the real world, just the virtual world. As a result, the "lingua franca" they use for conversation has many variations; and they do not attempt to correct each other, but they find their own way to negotiate the meaning they want to express (Canagarajah, 2009). The translanguaging in these situations can be considered as a rhetorical device for negotiation.

In contrast, online communication among people who know each other would have different characteristics. It offers people time and opportunity to talk when they cannot meet in person. When communicating online, people may apply some face-to-face communication strategies, for instance, maintaining relationships and negotiating identity (Androutsopoulos, 2006; Barton & Lee, 2013; Wei, 1994; Wei & Hua, 2013). Bilinguals/multilinguals combine multiple languages in their linguistic repertoire to create their own language in their online postings without causing much confusion for their audience because they share some common digital code plays (i.e., online language) and they know the person to whom they are talking to (Georgakopoulou, 1997; Jarworska, 2014; Zentella, 1997).

Linguistic Features Relevant to Vietnamese-English Translanguaging

Individuals from different linguistic and cultural groups would vary in their translanguaging due, in part, to differences in languages and in their linguistic
repertoires. Spanish, Chinese, Tamil, and some African languages are among the languages that have been studied in conjunction with English, but Vietnamese-English translanguaging has not. Consequently, it is desirable to conduct a study into reasons for translanguaging and the patterns of translanguaging in natural contexts by Vietnamese speakers living and studying in the U.S. Although a study like mine, which is situated in a particular community, would not be generalizable to all Vietnamese-English bilinguals but could provide some insights. This section of the review focuses on some features of the Vietnamese language that seem particularly relevant to a study of translanguaging.

Personal Pronouns

Because Vietnamese personal pronouns have more semantic features than those in English, speakers of Vietnamese employ more information when using pronouns. As pointed out by Thompson (1965), in Vietnamese, a personal pronoun can provide information about the age and gender of the referent as well as information about the relationship between the speaker (writer) and the referent and is thus sometimes called “person-referring.” Use of personal pronouns is an interesting feature of translanguaging when it involves Vietnamese and English since English has no similar marking to that in Vietnamese. The table below shows the differences between personal pronouns in English and Vietnamese that were explained by Thompson.

Table 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Plurality</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Formality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Kinship terms, such as cô (paternal aunt), đì (maternal aunt), cẩu (maternal uncle), chú (paternal uncle), ông (grandparent), bà (grandmother), anh (older brother), can be informally used as personal pronouns (first/second person). (See Appendix A.)

The personal pronouns do not have any inflection when functioning as subject or object.

Ho-Dac (1997, 2003) has studied the complexity presented by personal pronouns in translanguaging. In 1997 he noted that the complexity of these pronouns may motivate speakers to switch to English pronouns when they do not want to incorporate age, relationship, and formality into the personal pronouns they are using. The specificity of relations that is required for Vietnamese pronouns contrasts with pronouns in other languages and cultures. In some cultures, it is not common and possible for speakers to define gender and age through pronouns in everyday conversations. The pronouns you and me in English do not require speakers to think about a person’s age and social relationship, whereas the pronouns in Vietnamese language do. As Ho-Dac (2003) explained, switching to English can help speakers express what they want to say in Vietnamese and also avoid thinking about the appropriateness of using pronouns in Vietnamese. Vietnamese-English bilinguals also make these kinds of choices to negotiate their identities and shape the social relationship.
Tones and Vowels with Diacritic Marking

Although tones are phonological aspects of language, they must be represented orthographically in Vietnamese. This is, of course, another way that Vietnamese differs from English. It may serve as a motivation for writers to switch from Vietnamese into English while they are texting or typing a message. The Vietnamese language has six tones which are marked with four diacritics and a dot below the main vowel of a word and one of which is unmarked (Thompson, 1965). Table 2.2 below describes how the tone affects the meaning of a word. Nguyen and Maken (2008) suggested the phonetic description of each tone.

Table 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tones</th>
<th>Huyền</th>
<th>Sắc</th>
<th>Hỏi</th>
<th>Ngã</th>
<th>Nặng</th>
<th>Ngang (Unmarked)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phonetic Description</td>
<td>Falling tone</td>
<td>Rising tone</td>
<td>Falling-rising tone</td>
<td>Glottalized falling-rising tone</td>
<td>Glottalized falling tone</td>
<td>High-level tone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>mà (which)</td>
<td>mà (mother)</td>
<td>mà (tomb)</td>
<td>mà (horse)</td>
<td>ma (young rice plant)</td>
<td>ma (ghost)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hoa-Pham (2003) pointed out that a Vietnamese syllable has four components: tone, initial consonant, vowel, and final consonant. Of these two, tone and vowel, are supposed to be present; consequently, any changes in tone cause changes to the syllable and affect lexical meaning. In other words, the tones affect not only phonetic production but also lexical meaning; hence, without tones, written language can be misunderstood.

The Vietnamese language also has vowels with diacritics (Cao, 1998b), such as ă, ā, ê, ô, ơ, and ư, which have distinctive phonetic production and lexical meaning from
the ones a, e, o, and u, which exist in both English and Vietnamese. If those vowels are not marked with their appropriate diacritics, misunderstanding may occur. The example below shows two possible meanings interpreted from the same message if appropriate diacritics are not used:

*Message (without appropriate diacritics): Ve nha gap, vo de*

*Interpretation 1: Vè nhà gáp, vọ đế (Come home immediately, the dam is broken)*

*Interpretation 2: Vè nhà gáp, vọ đế (Come home immediately, your wife delivered a baby)*

The differences in the tone markers and the diacritics of Interpretation 1 and Interpretation 2 are the glottalized falling-rising tone occurring in “vọ” (broken) versus glottalized falling tone in “vọ” (wife) as well as vowel e with a diacritic in “đế” (dam) comparing to vowel e with falling-rising tone in “đế” (deliver a baby).

Uninflected Language

One of the major features distinguishing between Vietnamese and English is inflection. The Vietnamese language is uninflected (Thompson, 1965), which means that the words in Vietnamese do not change their forms to show differences in meaning and use. Plurality and singularity are factors that require inflection in English. For instance, morphemes "-s" and "-es" are used for marking plurality in English, but those rules do not apply to Vietnamese, for which no morpheme is added to mark plurality. Of particular importance is tense. English tenses are marked with inflection, such as adding morpheme -ed to a regular verb for past tense or adding suffix -ing to verbs preceded by the copula be for present progressive tense, but those functional
morphemes do not exist in Vietnamese. The event frame is defined by fronting a topic frame to refer to the past (Cao, 1998a), and the following events would relate to and develop the topic. This is a method of marking tense instead of using inflection as English speakers do. The topic frame can be an adverbial phrase or a temporal expression that establishes a time frame for the following events. Another way of communicating time is the use of context clues.

With a repertoire comprising of the two linguistic systems that have little in common, especially in grammar, bilingual Vietnamese-English speakers make choices about which language they would comply with to enhance the effectiveness of their conversations. A bilingual linguistic repertoire includes a complex combination of syntactic rules and word choices; hence, such a difference in the two languages may offer Vietnamese-English speakers different choices compared with those who do not speak Vietnamese.

The Matter of Emojis

Emojis, often considered a universal communicative device, are thought to enhance the meaning of written text and to be a means of expressing emotion. The term *emoji* comes from Japanese, and it translates to “picture character.” Moschini (2016) has explained that emojis originated in the 1990s in Japan, where they were developed for pagers by a telecom company. After that, a set of hundreds of standardized symbols has been created and has been standardized in Unicode. According to Moschini, emojis are “a marker of the mashing up of Japanese and American cultures in the discursive practices of geek communities, now gone
mainstream” (p. 9). They have historical ties to Japanese cartoon kaomojis and U.S. counter culture of the 1960s. Emojis are products that originated biculturally but are now used internationally. When studying online communication, one should consider some such graphic elements as emojis that contribute to communication.

A study by Novak, Smailović, Sluban, and Mozetič (2015) investigated the emotional content of the 751 most used emojis to see if the emotional content (negative, neutral, positive) was the same across 13 European languages. To get answers, they had 83 people categorize them for emotional content. Most of the emojis used in the tweets they studied were positive, especially those that are used most frequently. There were no differences across languages in the emotion rankings for the various emojis.

Some evidence exists indicating that cultural factors affect the way people use emojis for different levels of emotional expressivity in their online communication. For example, Cheng (2017) used surveys to investigate emoji use by people raised in a Spanish culture and people raised in a Chinese culture. He found that, across cultures, participants reported making more use of positive emojis (i.e., smiley or happy face) than negative ones. The emojis would capture attention and also communicate positive feelings. Angry messages were more likely to be text only. Comparisons across groups found that Chinese participants in study tended to rely on emojis, these non-verbal communication devices, to a greater extent than Spanish participants, who made more use of communication through text only. Cheng interpreted his results by saying that the Chinese culture tends to “high context” in that more trust is put on non-verbal than verbal communication, whereas the Spanish culture is “low” context in that meanings are interpreted largely through what is said in written or oral language. The high-context
cultures as Chinese motivated the participants to include more emojis into their online communications than the Spanish speakers, who gave less attention to emojis.

Summary

This chapter highlighted the paradigm shift from code-switching/mixing to translanguaging. While code-switching/mixing examines the contact zone between named languages, translanguaging focuses attention on how one’s linguistic repertoire and communicative competence are employed for communication in a speech community. Language is “used in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner to organize and mediate mental processes in understanding, speaking, literacy, and, not least, learning” (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012, p. 1). For reviewing forms of code-mixing/translanguaging, I summarized major early studies of code/mixing and then showed how researchers have based their analyses and categories largely on syntactic distinctions. The reasons for language mixing/translanguaging are classified into two categories: community factors and discourse-related factors. The review in this chapter indicates that there are few studies into translanguaging of Vietnamese speakers and that the linguistic distance between Vietnamese and English is different from that of Spanish and English and also different from that in other languages and English. It is important to have more studies into translanguaging of Vietnamese speakers. The method of data collection and data analysis described in the next chapter are based on the foundation presented in this chapter and the previous one.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD OF THE STUDY

As mentioned in Chapter One, this study focused on forms of translanguaging and reasons for translanguaging in the communicative practice of a particular community. I intended to learn the ways in which members of the VSA in a large public university in the United States “translanguaged” in natural contexts to achieve their communication goals, and I also wanted to learn why they would alternate or mix languages. This research focus on language use in a social context meant obtaining data that revealed not only participants’ language use but also choices they made in their use of language. A research approach that is appropriate for these research purposes was linguistic ethnography, which Copland and Creese (2015) described as “an interpretive approach which studies the local and immediate actions of actors from their point of view and considers how these interactions are embedded in wider social contexts and structures” (p. 13).

The following sections describe the context, the community meetings, the participants, my role, the procedures for collecting and analyzing instances of translanguaging, and the procedures for collecting and analyzing interviews based on translanguaging.

Context

In describing the research setting, I focus first on the university where the study took place and then provide some details about the context of the student organization I investigated.
The University

The study was situated at a large public comprehensive university in the southwestern United States. At this particular university, diversity is encouraged with various extracurricular programs that support international students as well as with international study programs and visiting scholars. One way in which the university culture supports and nurtures diversity has been by maintaining cultural organizations or clubs for international students. The school offers facilities for monthly meetings held by international groups where they can discuss and create plans for academic and cultural purposes and community service. These opportunities have created "sustainable" cultural groups that sometimes last beyond graduation. Some alumni keep in contact with current students in their groups, forming communities of individuals who offer help to one other through job opportunities and advice for new students that help address students’ needs.

The university has a large and diverse international population. In 2017, the university reported more than 2,000 international students, who made up almost 6% of total enrollment. Among these international students, 61% were graduate students and 39% were undergraduates from 129 different countries. Of the international students, 60 students were from Vietnam. The top ten countries having the largest enrollment, in descending order, were India, China, Saudi Arabia, South Korea, Nigeria, Vietnam, Mexico, Oman, Taiwan, and Nepal. The colleges that had the largest number of Vietnamese international enrollment were Engineering, Business Administration, Arts and Science, and Music.
The Vietnamese Student Association

International students enrolled in the university can establish a group based on their home country. However, those groups are not limited to participants' origin, race, or religion; thus, any student, whether international or local can join any group. The International Office assigns an official to supervise the international student organization to offer help with administrative duties and fund raising. All the international student organizations are under the leadership of the university's Student Organization.

The Vietnamese Student Association was founded in August 2015 with two major goals: assisting newly admitted Vietnamese students and introducing Vietnamese culture to the school. The Vietnamese group, represented by Vietnamese Americans and Vietnamese nationals, is much younger compared to other international student organizations such as the organizations representing China and India, which have their own websites and whose activities are publicized through the university website. To fulfill its mission, the Vietnamese group has organized activities such as the Lunar New Year Festivals in 2016 and 2017 for both the Vietnamese association members and students from the campus, celebrating Vietnamese culture, including language, traditions, customs, images, and holidays. Traditional games were set up for those participating in the events. On other occasions, this group has participated in university events such as Cultural Day, to display cultural artifacts and sell handcrafts made by Vietnamese people.

The organization includes both Vietnamese-American students and Vietnamese international students who have come to the U.S for higher education. These students are typically fluent in both Vietnamese and English. Some were born and raised in
Vietnam but came to the U.S for higher education, while others came to the U.S with their family when they were children or in their early teens.

At the time of this study, the Vietnamese Club had 65 members who were current undergraduate and graduate students with ages ranging from 20 years old to 40 years old. Also included were three alumni in the same age range.

Group Meetings, Social Gatherings, and Facebook Conversations

During the four and a half months that I conducted the study, there were three major ways in which members of the organization communicated with one another: group meetings, social gatherings, and Facebook postings and conversations. Group meetings were held the seventh, eleventh, and thirteenth weeks of the study, and the social gatherings were held the fourth, fifth, eighth, and tenth weeks of the study. The Facebook postings and conversations were ongoing throughout the study. In the following, I count myself in the numbers of those who were in attendance.

Group Meetings

*Group Meeting 1: Week 7*

The first group meeting was held one afternoon in the first week of the semester and lasted for one hour and a half. There were 52 people at the meeting, 15 of whom were not Vietnamese and came from different countries, including Turkey, Mexico, and China. This meeting was an introduction of the newly elected officials and also an opportunity for group members to get to know one another. At this meeting my attention went to a small group of six Vietnamese students who were sitting at the end of the
room and talking in Vietnamese about their course schedules and plans for a social gathering.

**Group Meeting 2: Week 11**

This meeting, which lasted for 40 minutes, was attended by nine people, including one member who could not speak Vietnamese. The major focus of this meeting was to announce and to discuss upcoming events and initiatives. Of the nine attendees, only seven, including the three officers and three other members, participated in these discussions. The other two were using their laptops and did not participate.

**Group Meeting 3: Week 13**

This meeting also focused on announcing upcoming events, particularly the Vietnamese music performance at International Night and an auction to be held at another university. This meeting lasted for 50 minutes and was attended by 17 people.

**Social Gatherings**

**Social Gathering 1: Week 4**

This small party was attended by 15 people and was held before classes began and before the first group meeting. One of the club members hosted the party at his place. Although the party started at 6:00 pm, people came to the party at different times, and the last guests left shortly after 10:00 pm. For the first hour or so, people prepared food together in small groups, either cutting vegetables, washing vegetables, or
preparing the meat for a barbecue grill. I spent some time with each group, and then, when all the people sat together and started eating, my attention was on the whole group.

**Social Gathering 2: Week 5**

This gathering was also a small dinner party which began at 7:00 pm and was held at an apartment that was shared by four group members. The four hosts prepared Vietnamese noodle, and five guests attended. There was much conversation as we sat at the table to eat and also when we played a word guessing game. Guests departed at about 10:30 pm.

**Social Gathering 3: Week 8**

This pool party was hosted by one of the officers, who invited members of the Vietnamese Club to join the members from the Asian Student Association for barbecue and for swimming. Thirty-four people, including 16 from the Vietnamese organization, attended the gathering, which started at 6:00 pm. At this gathering, people from the two organizations tended to socialize only with members of their own group. Members of the Vietnamese group sat together, speaking in Vietnamese, and 11 left at about 7:30 pm to have dinner elsewhere. I went with them. The other five played ball in the pool. The pool closed at 8:00 pm.
Social Gathering 4: Week 10

This get-together, held at an apartment of a group member, lasted three hours from 6:00 pm to 9:00 pm and was attended by 21 people. Like the second gathering, it was a dinner party for which the host prepared food. Conversations took place when people sat at a table to eat. While dining, some went to the kitchen to get more food, and some were sitting at the table and talking.

Facebook Conversations

The Facebook group was created for group members at the same time that the Vietnamese Student Organization was established. It was used for promoting Vietnamese culture and welcoming Vietnamese students. Group members understood that any member could post anything relating to school, housing, life events, and other relevant matters. It was a major means of communication among group members, and messages could be in either Vietnamese or English or both. Over the course of the study, there were 131 Facebook postings and conversations.

Participants

Participant recruitment was conducted initially when I posted a letter of invitation on Facebook so that every member could be informed about the study. I also recruited participants at the first meeting, where I explained in detail my study and the nature of participation in the study. At the meeting, I had 37 members of this group who consented to participate in this study.
All Participants

In this group of 37 participants, there were 18 males and 19 females who contributed to Facebook conversations, participated in group meetings, and joined social gatherings. Eight were graduate students including two alumni and three doctoral students; the other 29 undergraduates ranged from sophomores to seniors. The number of Vietnamese international students who had come to the U.S to study was 31. The other six participants were Vietnamese American. One was born and raised in the U.S, one came to the U.S at two years old, and the other four came to the U.S at the age of 15 and older. Table 3.1, below, shows the number of participants who attended each event.

Table 3.1
Participants in the Various Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Meeting 1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Meeting 2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Meeting 3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Gathering 1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Gathering 2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Gathering 3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Gathering 4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse-Based Interview</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Conversation</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewees

For interviews, I selected 10 participants who demonstrated instances of translanguaging that I wanted to understand better. My selection was based on *information-rich cases*, a concept described by Patton (1990). Particularly, the *information-rich cases* among 37 participants in this study were those who (1) participated in most of the events and frequently posted for the Facebook group (i.e., contributing to at least three conversations on Facebook); (2) translanguaged differently from other participants, such as replying in Vietnamese when being asked in English. I also selected both Vietnamese and Vietnamese Americans for interviews because learning English in a foreign language context (e.g., in Vietnam), and in a second language context (e.g., in the U.S) may affect the participants’ translanguaging practice. Ten interviewees were selected based on these reasons. I hoped to learn from them the strategies they might be using from their linguistic repertoires. I hoped to gain insights into their multi-competence. The following is a brief description of the interviewees, each of whom is given a pseudonym.

- **Interviewee 1**: Hue had majored in English at a university in Vietnam for two years but switched her major to biochemistry when pursuing her undergraduate degree at this university. At the time of the study, she was a senior. Hue had started learning English in Vietnam when she was in the third grade.

- **Interviewee 2**: Lan, a doctoral student majoring in music, started her music performance when she was at a university in Denmark and had multiple opportunities to perform music in different countries. She started learning English in the seventh grade in Vietnam, and through the years she has used English frequently for communication.
• Interviewee 3: Le, after completing her bachelor’s degree in Vietnam, came to the U.S. for graduate work. She had received her master’s degree at the time of the study. She started learning English in the sixth grade, and she also studied Chinese in her first year of college in Vietnam.

• Interviewee 4: Ngoc, who was also a graduate student, started learning English at five years old in Vietnam. She came to the U.S for her high school and university.

• Interviewee 5: Dao, an undergraduate business major, learned French at her middle and high schools before starting to learn English at the age of 18. She majored in French at a university in Vietnam for one year before coming to the U.S.

• Interviewee 6: Hoang, a senior undergraduate, came to the U.S with his family at the age of two., He started learning Vietnamese language at a church when he was in kindergarten and continued through 11th grade. He reported that he used only Vietnamese with his parents.

• Interviewee 7: Diep, who was in the second year of her graduate program, started learning English in the sixth grade in Vietnam. After receiving her bachelor’s degree in English in Vietnam, she came to the U.S for her master’s degree.

• Interviewee 8: Minh received his bachelor’s degree in music in Vietnam and came to the U.S several years ago to pursue a master’s degree. When I conducted this study, he was in his doctoral program. He started learning English in the ninth grade in Vietnam.

• Interviewee 9: Nga, who was a sophomore, came to the U.S. for college. She learned French in kindergarten but started learning English in fifth grade in Vietnam.
• Interviewee 10: Kieu, who was a junior, was born and raised in the U.S. She learned Vietnamese mainly by talking to her parents. She watched Vietnamese movies and sang Vietnamese songs from the age of six to 16. After starting high school, she learned more Vietnamese through reading Vietnam news.

My Role

My role in the group, which had been as a regular member, became that of an observer as well as a participant. This role is different from the typical role of a participant observer who enters a new community and gains membership over time. Because the kinds of activities and communications were so familiar to me, I did not experience cultural shock as some ethnographers have when they immerse themselves into a new culture. However, I tried to follow Agar’s (2008) advice to “make the familiar strange.”

Being part of the target community in this study and playing the role of observer as well as participant minimized the drawbacks of a traditional participant observer's role regarding cultural translation because my cultural translation would not be "foreignized," a term from Venuti (1995). The participants were aware of my role as a researcher, and so I was able to take notes and record their conversations without hiding what I was doing. Heath and Street (2008) suggested that an ethnographer is a "constant learner—ever curious and open to what's happening," and their advice was to “remember always that we study something because we already know something" (p. 30). I am aware of Vietnamese-English bilinguals’ translinguaging, including my own.
Coffey (1999) indicated that "fieldwork involves the enactment of social roles and relationships, which places the self at the heart of the enterprise" (p. 23). My social relationship with club members required me to take part in their discussions. That involvement was a helpful way to distract participants from the fact that they were being recorded in their conversations. I was cognizant of playing a dual role and was able to balance the participant’s role with the researcher’s role.

Procedures for Collecting Data

Merriam (1998) characterized qualitative researchers as those who "are interested in understanding the meaning people have constructed, that is, how they make sense of their world and the experiences they have in the world" (p. 6). To understand participants’ “meaning,” I employed various means of data collection. They included the following: audio recording, observational notes, reflections, conceptual memos, Facebook postings, and discourse-based interviews.

Audio recording is a natural source of data for collecting instances of translanguaging in a particular context at a particular time; and it has been used in other translanguaging studies (Alvarez, 2014; Duran & Palmer, 2014; Martin-Beltran, 2014; Wei, 2011b). Since an ethnographic study is expected to capture multiple social aspects to obtain a comprehensive view of a multifaceted social issue like translanguaging, observations captured in event descriptions provided further detailed information that could not be recorded, such as non-verbal communications and informants’ attitudes towards a specific issue (Du Bois, 2004). As Health and Street (2008) suggested, I used written reflections and conceptual memos as a means of “preserving” interpretations,
gaining “aha!” realizations, and making decisions about what other kinds of data need to be collected (p. 80). A modified procedure for discourse-based interviews (Odell, Goswami, & Herrington, 1983) was used to attain further insights regarding translanguaging that was audio recorded.

Audio Recordings

Audio recordings were a major means of data collection for this study. Table 3.2 below shows the length of time for each recording of the meetings and social gatherings.

The recordings were labeled based on time and date of the recording. I divided them into two groups: recordings at meetings and recordings at social gatherings. After an event, I listened to the recording once and identified where translanguaging occurred and transcribed these instances of translanguaging. Features of conversation were included in the transcripts: speaker, audience, and topic.

Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Social Gatherings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>52 minutes 52 seconds</td>
<td>2 hours 19 minutes 15 seconds 8 minutes 19 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17 minutes 33 seconds</td>
<td>46 minutes 16 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24 minutes 5 seconds</td>
<td>No recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 hour 52 minutes 53 seconds 8 minutes 34 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are contrasting conventions for transcribing audio recordings, and the variation is due, in part, to the level of detail needed for a particular research purpose. In
my transcriptions, I followed the conventions recommended by Richards (2003), which are included in Appendix C. Richards’s conventions are appropriate for this study because my attention was on translanguage instances, participation, intonation, pauses, sequences. Since the participants spoke English and Vietnamese, I used symbol < > for English translation, as recommended by Creese and Blackledge (2010). An example from the first group meeting is as follows:

Hoàng: How many? Giơ tay lên! <Raise your hand> ((the meant giơ tay lên)) ((counting how many people guessed that it was Bích’s face))
Huệ: uh (..) I mean.
Hoàng: one (counting the number of people))
Kiều: just one? (.) ((laugh))

For the multiple conversations recorded in the meetings and social gatherings, organization of the transcription followed the conventions of the Language Interaction Data Exchange System (LIDES) (Gardner-Chloros, 2009) with modifications as follows. I included a set of headers giving details of time, date, participants; and I put each utterance on a separate line, following an indication of who was speaking.

Event Description, Reflections, and Conceptual Memos

As mentioned above, I took notes as I recorded at the group events. I had seven pages of event description and reflections for seven events: three meetings and four social gatherings. I put the reflection in a column next to the field notes so that I would know which reflections were related to which notes. For each event, I wrote down the starting time and the ending time at the top of the column. Table 3.3 below provides an example of a section of my notes and reflections.
Table 3.3

Notes from Social Gathering 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflection</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They are aware of my researcher's role but meeting, chatting are attracting them, so they do not pay much attention to the recorder!</td>
<td>Preparing food: begins at 7:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mike goes out sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nam, Trung, Chi cutting vegetables, sitting on the floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lê, An cutting vegetables on the kitchen counter,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The little kid (Lan's son) in Mike’ room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hàng, Tuân, Chi, Lan sitting and chatting on the couch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talked to them sometimes to keep my role as a participant-</td>
<td>Cooking &amp; Eating (simultaneously): 8:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese is dominant, some terms in E are used to refer something that are familiar to people when mentioning them in E</td>
<td>• Ngọc and others setting &quot;table&quot; on the floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tuân, Nam, 1 guy come for help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tuân, Bằng, Nam drinking (group 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mike in his room to take care the child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 groups eating, not drinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 group of 4 men (sitting b/w Group 1 and Group 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Group 3 (6 people): mix men and women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ngọc, Hàng taking care of sauté, frying meat, vegetables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The 2 groups talking with each other in their group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hàng steps out receiving her mom's call from Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An sometimes talking to her boyfriend in E. This guy is so quiet!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These notes provided contextual and situated information that was not captured by recordings. I also wrote conceptual memos on a weekly basis. The conceptual memo is for the ethnographer's insights, the patterns found in the data, and initial findings (Heath & Street, 2008). Later, my notes were integrated with the transcription of the recordings for purposes of analysis, and labels for time and date were confirmed to be consistent with the recordings. Integration of notes and transcription was a process in which the information in the notes was used for providing specific context of each conversation. The additional context in the notes helped me as I spoke with the interviewees during the discourse-based interviews. Writing conceptual memos and reflections provided me with insights into the meetings and the social gatherings.

Copland and Creese (2015) have cautioned linguistic ethnographers to avoid "bring[ing] a range of biases, ideas, emotions, and feelings to the research" (p. 97). As
an ethnographer and participant, I was mindful of what I was writing. I thought about ethnography and my stance as an ethnographer. The conceptual memos were based on the reflections, notes, and the audio recordings, and they were my initial thoughts about possible reasons and forms of translanguaging. Being mindful is essential in a study like this, as Heath and Street (2008) pointed out.

Downloads of Facebook Conversations

I downloaded Facebook communications that took place for a period of four and a half months and arranged them in chronological order from the earliest to the most recent. The next step was to divide all of these postings into conversations. A particular conversation was identified as beginning when an initiator posted a new topic and ending when there were no more responses to that topic. There were 29 conversations in English and Vietnamese, 100 conversations in English, and two conversations in Vietnamese over that period of time. The number of posting contributions, or turns, within an English and Vietnamese conversation ranged from 1 to 8 excluding "like" options because “like” did not make verbal contribution to conversations. The average number of contributions was 3.4. There was one conversation with one initiator, which was seen by 77 and had no verbal response. One respondent choosing "like" instead of giving a comment. The total number of contributions for all conversations was 96.

Analysis of the Translanguaging

Whereas in some research approaches, data analysis follows data collection, "in ethnography, data collection and data analysis are ideally concurrent and inform each
other" (Johnstone, 2000, p. 94). A similar point had been made by Spradley (1980), although he was not speaking about linguistic ethnography: "both questions and answers must be discovered in the social situations being studied" (p. 32). Collecting and analyzing data are recursive processes that require ethnographers' reflexivity. Since linguistic ethnography was my research method, the data analysis focused on language structures, the speaker, and implied meanings (Rampton, 2007), a somewhat different emphasis from many ethnographic studies.

To see what forms of Vietnamese-English translanguaging were used by group members, I employed a single coding scheme to analyze language from all the kinds of interactions: the group meetings, social gatherings, and Facebook conversations. Although I framed my study as an inquiry into translanguaging, I employed some analytic procedures used in prior studies investigating code-switching or code-mixing. A major category I employed was the distinction between intra-sentential and extra-sentential—distinction made by Poplack (1980). Her extra-sentential category includes sentence, idiomatic expression, interjection, and tags. In my analyses, I paid special attention to the use of person-referring pronouns, which are a feature of Vietnamese language and culture. They could be used inside sentence boundaries or outside of sentence boundaries as honorifics. Appendix B provides examples of coding sheets for language examples from each of the forums.

Extra-Sentential Translanguaging

Extra-sentential translanguaging occurred when participants moved from one language to another outside the boundaries of a sentence. The following are examples:
Intra-Sentential Translanguaging

In my coding, I also looked at the insertion of one language within a sentence phrased in the other language. This intra-sentential translanguage was divided into two categories: sequential and segmented. *Segmented* is a type of translanguaging in which a single word in Vietnamese or in English is integrated into a sentence of the other language. The following is an example of segmented intra-sentential translanguaging: “để chỉ dòng membership luôn đi.” The English word “membership” was integrated into the Vietnamese sentence. *Sequential* is a type of translanguaging in which a sequence of words in Vietnamese or in English is integrated into a sentence of the other language. The following is an example of sequential intra-sentential translanguaging: “lấyدعم cái vòng với mắt kiến glow in the dark đi H ori.” The sequence of English words “glow in the dark” was integrated into the Vietnamese sentence.

Although the names of websites and platforms, such as Facebook and Youtube, might be considered English, I did not count them as intra-sentential translanguaging when they were included in Vietnamese sentences because there is no Vietnamese word for Facebook or Youtube.

The intra-sentential sub-categories identified by Poplack (1980) were based on grammatical functions. However, the sub-categories of intra-sentential in this study—sequential and segmented—are aligned with a translanguaging perspective focused on cross-linguistic expression in which a flow of thought can be expressed by more than
one language. The sequential and segmented sub-categories reveal a continuity of languaging through syntactic boundaries—word and phrase.

Emojis

My analysis of the Facebook conversations also attended to the use of emojis, which are not typically tied to one particular language, even though as noted in Chapter Two some cultures have created their own emojis that are distinct from those used universally. The kinds of emojis used by the participants in this study to foster connections might provide some insights into the practices of this community. My analysis focused on the use of emojis for various communication purposes in the Facebook conversations. The following is an example of using an emoji—a smiling face at the end of an utterance to emphasize the verbal expression: “Come and have fun next Thursday in Union.😀😀”

Procedure for Conducting the Discourse-Based Interviews

Following my initial analysis of the transcripts, I conducted interviews that were a modified version of the discourse-based interview approach introduced by Odell, Goswami, and Herrington (1983). This approach to interviewing involves showing a participant an excerpt of his or her language and asking questions about it. Although this approach has been typically used in research on writing, it is appropriate in this study for learning about the strategic choices that participants made when using language. I tried to gain insights into why they alternated or blended the languages in their utterances. These interviews were audio recorded.
Before interviewing, I reviewed all of the transcripts and Facebook postings for instances of translanguaging; and these transcripts provided the discourse that I might use as the basis for my interviews. As Merriam (1998) has pointed out, interviewing is a means of gaining insights into what people were thinking and other issues that a researcher cannot observe. Earlier, I mentioned Patton’s (1990) criterion of “information-rich,” but I might also refer to Agar (1994), who has used the term “rich points” for instances that are particularly provocative. I selected some information-rich cases of translanguaging as a basis for the interviews. I interviewed club members who showed a high frequency of participation in meetings, social gatherings, and Facebook posting and who had some interesting and/or puzzling instances of translanguaging compared with others in the group. For example, two of these participants had posted one message in two languages, but the Vietnamese version was articulated in a different manner than the one in the English version. There were ten discourse-based interviews conducted individually with ten interviewees selected from 30 participants.

In preparing for the interviews, I followed the suggestion of Maykut and Morehouse (1994) to make the interviews seem like conversations as I focused on instances of extra-sentential and inter-sentential translanguaging. An example of a question I asked is as follows:

You use English in Facebook posts, but in face-to-face-communication with the Vietnamese members, you use Vietnamese even though the speaker asked you something in English. I’m wondering if you can tell me why you changed from English to Vietnamese there.

Here are two more examples: “In your Facebook conversations and your communication at our group meetings, you frequently added “chị or em” to your speech
in English. Why did you do that?” and “In meeting conversations, you spoke English but inserted Vietnamese pronouns into English sentences. What was the reason for that?”

The interviews were tape-recorded. The longest time for an interview was 40 minutes, and the shortest one was 23 minutes. In transcribing the interviews, I did not transcribe everything, I selected the portion of each interview that provided a response to my question about the instance of translanguaging.

Procedure for Analysis of the Discourse-Based Interviews

To gain some understanding of participants’ reasons for their translanguaging. I began with the transcripts of the discourse-based interviews. I was interested in seeing how my findings might fit with prior research and also how it might extend it.

For coding, I created coding sheets with the following columns: (1) the quoted instance of translanguaging, (2) the reason that the individual provided, (3) supporting evidence from the data; and (4) a category for the reason. I began with the two factors that seemed so important in prior research: community factors and discourse-related factors. Although I began the coding in deductive fashion, I also operated inductively by following the recommendations of Canagarajah (2011b):

1. Open coding of data into emerging categories that reflect as far as possible the participants’ perspectives
2. Axial coding that refines categories by reflecting the constant comparison of incoming data with previously gathered data
3. Continuing data collection up to saturation—a point at which incoming data no longer suggest necessary additional categories and at which a theory accounting for the data emerges (p. 403)

As the coding progressed, I added another major category, individual factors. All of the categories had subcategories.
Triangulation

I sought methodological triangulation for this study that focused on forms of translanguaging and reasons for translanguaging. My multiple methods, which included analyzing conversations in group meetings and gatherings, Facebook postings, and discourse-based interviews, were intended to reduce the "deficiencies and biases that stem from any single method" (Mitchel, 1986, p. 19). I hoped to look across analyses of the various sources to find common patterns.

Summary

The first question of the study focused on forms of translanguaging. The answer to this question came from coding language gathered from the three forums. My attention was on individual instances of translanguaging, but I also looked for recurring kinds of translanguaging. As the next chapter shows, it was possible to discover forms of translanguaging that are characteristic for this particular community. The other question of my study focused on reasons of translanguaging. For this question, the answers came by analyzing the transcripts and the participants’ answers in the interviews.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS

This chapter presents findings of my study into forms and reasons of translanguaging used by a group of Vietnamese students at a U.S university. The findings relate to the forms of translanguaging used by this community in three forums—(1) group meeting conversations, (2) social gathering conversations, and (3) Facebook conversations—and also the reasons for translanguaging, as explained by participants in the study.

Forms of Translanguaging

What forms of translanguaging characterized the conversations of members of the Vietnamese student group? In this section I present findings from the three kinds of community communication practices: the group meetings, the social gatherings, and the Facebook conversations.

Group Meeting Conversations

At the rather formal group meetings, most interactions were between the VSA leaders and attendees, and most interactions were in English. For the VSA it was conventional for English to be the dominant language in club meetings and for there to be very little use of Vietnamese. The use of English was intended to make the meetings inclusive of Non-Vietnamese students who were expected to come. At the time of this study, there were two group leaders, and both spoke English as a first language.
Table 4.1 shows the instances of extra-sentential and intra-sentential translanguaging at the group meetings. When looking at this table and the other tables included in this chapter, my readers should keep in mind that circumstances were not equal for all the group meetings, for all the social gatherings, and for all the Facebook conversations. Some encounters lasted much longer than others, and the numbers of translanguaging instances would be affected by the length of time. I have provided numbers in this report of findings mainly to show how the kinds of translanguaging differed relative to one another—to what extent translanguaging instances tended to be extra-sentential or tended to be intra-sentential, either segmented or sequential.

Table 4.1

*Translanguaging Instances in Meetings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Extra-Sentential</th>
<th>Segmented Intra-Sentential</th>
<th>Sequential Intra-Sentential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table, the first meeting involved only two times that a speaker included Vietnamese in an utterance, and both times the English words were incorporated within a sentence. At the first meeting, English clearly predominated, most likely because of the group’s convention to make the meeting accessible to the international students who did not speak Vietnamese. The second meeting involved the most translanguaging instances compared to the other two meetings that can be attributed to two conversations. Some of the translanguaging occurred in the conversation between a group leader, Kiều, and other members during the guessing
game; and other instances of translanguaging were in the conversation between another group leader, Hoàng, and a member, who asked him further information about an upcoming event. The third meeting also involved very little translanguaging because a group leader, Vi, only translanguaged when she used Vietnamese person-related pronouns; and Hoàng had a short English-Vietnamese conversation with a member in a hat game.

Extra-sentential Translanguaging

Much of the extra-sentential translanguaging at that second meeting was use of Vietnamese person-related pronouns. As is conventional when speaking in Vietnamese, speakers would show their respect to other members by using Vietnamese pronouns before their names. The second meeting began with a guessing game. The group leaders showed a photo of some part of a person’s face—eyebrow or nose—and asked the others to guess whose face it was. The following is an excerpt from the guessing game conversation.

Kiều: me?
Huệ: no.
Kiều: chi Bích?
Huệ: no.
Kiều: chi Đào?
Huệ: yeah, chi.((laugh))
Hoàng: awesome..so

((Everyone laughs))
The pronoun *chi* is used for a female who is older than the speaker, and Kieu used it for Bich who was older than she was. *Chi Bích* here can be seen as an ellipsis. Instead of saying *is this chi Bích?* the speaker just said *chi Bích* and raised her intonation.

Also at the second meeting, one of the group leaders, Kiều, invited people to sign up for the upcoming event, and she offered transportation to those who needed a ride to the event. She switched from English to Vietnamese when talking about not wanting to hurt anyone’s feelings about needing transportation:

Kiều: I don’t know to (...) like reach out (...) I don’t know (...) to ask every person like hey, are you driving? I (...) I just assume like if you need it, you ask, you know, so a lot of people that I don’t know. Có nhiều người họ lại (...) họ mắc cảm (...) like they’re embarrassed like they don’t want they don’t like oh, I don’t have a ride. Please let them know that we don’t care, come to us <There are some people who may have a feeling of inferiority>

She restated her concern in English by saying “they’re embarrassed,” even though “embarrassed” is not really equivalent to “mắc cảm”, which means a feeling of inferiority.

At that third meeting group leaders announced the upcoming events before having everyone play a game with a hat on a table. Most of the meeting took place in English, including the announcements. However, I noted that there were changes from English to Vietnamese when leaders spoke to students who were Vietnamese speakers. One group leader, Hoàng, moved back and forth between Vietnamese and English when he persuaded a participant to give a gift to another.

Hương: (*talked to Ngọc*) give me the hat

Ngọc: why? I already had it.

Hương: you’ve already had a hat. Không chiu thì đi chỗ khác đi! <If you don’t, you should go away!> [he just made a joke]

Ngọc: [Thôi:::] <no way>
Hoàng: [không:::] chỉ có hai cái nón! <No, you have two hats>

((Ngọc gave the hat to Hoàng, who gave it back to another student.))

Hoàng spoke in English at the beginning of this excerpt when he was speaking to the whole group. However, when negotiating with Ngọc as an individual and making a joke for her, he switched to Vietnamese.

*Intra-sentential Translanguaging*

Most instances of intra-sentential translanguaging, largely segmented forms, occurred in the second meeting. However, I did collect one instance in the last part of the first meeting. It was incorporation of English into a Vietnamese conversation. I noticed a small group of Vietnamese students chatting with each other in Vietnamese as they sat at the back of the room. They spoke almost totally in Vietnamese about places to go for their get-togethers next time, and they planned to hang out with each other after this meeting. One individual told others in her group that, since her class was cancelled on that day, she was able to join a gathering after the meeting. She inserted *cancel* into her Vietnamese sentence.

Hòa: Bây giờ đi học rồi. <I have class>

Ngọc: Học gì? Lớp *cancel* rồi (. ) học cái gì! <what class? The class was cancelled. What class are you talking about?>

Here she was inserting an English word that is commonly used in academic life into her Vietnamese sentence, which is something that she frequently did when the topic was about school-related issues. In this instance, one should note that the Vietnamese verb is not in past tense. Ngọc was using the English verb but was using it in accordance with Vietnamese language usage as she drew from her hybrid repertoire.
I found most instances of intra-sentential translanguaging at that second meeting, some segmented and some sequential. Although the meeting was almost totally in English, as were all the group meetings, Vietnamese was sometimes used in providing information. For example, Hoang provided some information about a bowling event. In speaking to the group, Hoang inserted two English words, *Monday* and *unlimited*, into Vietnamese sentences:

Hoàng: ra đó chơi … chơi vào thứ tư…hay là.. có.. **Monday**, vào thứ hai là sau khi tắm giờ là mười bốn mươi một người (…) chơi **unlimited** luôn! <going there for bowling….playing on Wednesday….or…Monday, on Monday after eight pm, the ticket is 13 dollars per person….for unlimited bowling>)

As the excerpt shows, Hoàng used the English word for Monday and then used the Vietnamese word for Wednesday. Translanguaging theorists would likely point to this as his drawing from a single linguistic repertoire that included elements from Vietnamese and English. They could also make the same argument for the word “unlimited,” for which there would not be a single-word equivalent in Vietnamese.

In some of the translanguaging, participants made moves from one language to another that were more sustained than those that I called segmented. For these more sustained instances called sequential, there was only one instance at the second meeting and there were only two at the third. At the second group meeting, one of the participants, Hoàng, said the following:

Hoàng: so we’ll stay at her place (…) completely free. all you guys do is bring your money for like (2.0) ra ngoài ăn, chơi thì …nói chung là <eating out and hanging out would be…in general..>

At the third meeting, most of the conversations between the group leaders, Hoàng and Bích, and the other attendees were in English. Extra-sentential translanguaging occurred when Hoàng translanguage for his conversation with Ngọc
in Vietnamese during a hat game. Another group leader, Bích, announced an upcoming event at the beginning of the meeting and used Vietnamese person-related pronouns before a member’s name. She kept using that pronoun when referring to that member.

Social Gathering Conversations

The language choice in the social gatherings was based on individuals’ language preference as well as what were conventional practices for this community. Vietnamese was dominant, although many participants included some English words in their sentences, particularly words related to academic issues and technology applications. Table 4.2 below provides numbers of instances that I noted in my recordings and observations. As the table below shows, the segmented intra-sentential was most common, and there were no instances of extra-sentential translanguaging.

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Extra-Sentential</th>
<th>Segmented Intra-Sentential</th>
<th>Sequential Intra-Sentential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Gathering 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Gathering 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Gathering 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high occurrence of translanguaging in these conversations can be explained perhaps to some extent by the topics. Since this occasion was just before the semester, the talk was largely about school and other related issues, for instance, classes, test administration, admission, and on-campus jobs. Members generally knew the academic lexicon in English, and they translanguaged to English when discussing matters for
which they might not have had equivalent terms in Vietnamese. The topics in the second gathering were cooking and technology applications, and most instances of translanguaging to English occurred in the conversations about technology applications. As noted above, the third gathering was a pool party for the members of two student clubs—this VSA group and an Asian student group. At this gathering, the VSA students’ conversations tended to be about their home visits in Vietnam, and I observed no instances of translanguaging. In the fourth gathering, technology applications, phone services, and group activities were the topics for communication. This gathering included more people than the second one.

Intra-Sentential Translanguaging

The segmented form of intra-sentential translanguaging occurred more frequently than the other forms of translanguaging in conversations at the social gatherings. Participants in these face-to-face conversations at the social gatherings knew one another’s language preference, which was typically Vietnamese; hence, speaking Vietnamese but incorporating some English words or phrases frequently occurred. Words inserted in these conversations related mainly to academic or technology issues.

Although most instances of translanguaging occurred in the first meeting, when topics related most often to university and class-related matters, an instance from the second gathering drew my attention. At that gathering, as club members talked about cooking Vietnamese food, the conversation was almost totally in Vietnamese. The translanguaging that interested me occurred when one participant asked another about a cooker that she used for cooking soup: “over đêm đó overnight đó..nó vẫn còn nóng”
hà?” (Is the food still hot overnight?). Apparently, the speaker wanted to say *overnight*, but the word “đêm” came to her mind before the word “night.” She combined *over* with *đêm* but then she corrected herself immediately saying *overnight*.

The occurrence of sequential intra-sentential translanguaging occurred less frequently than the segmented. The following excerpt is from the second gathering.

Tuần: nó subscribe tôi bốn trăm triệu...mấy tỷ, tổng lượt view tất cả các clip <The number of his video subscriptions is 400 million..billion, the total number of his video clip views>

Diệp: vậy là chỉ click..click vào đó. <so just click..click on there>

Liễu: nhưng mà chị phải coi until the end. <but you have to watch it until the end.>

Liễu translanguaged in a conversation about a pop singer. The sentence was in Vietnamese, but its adverbial phrase—*until the end*—was in English. She combined Vietnamese and English into a sentence without violating English and Vietnamese grammar rules. Her fluent speech indicated that the translanguaging occurred naturally in the conversation and that Liễu’s syntactic and lexical hybrid repertoire enabled her to employ the available linguistic elements to express herself.

In the excerpt above, Tuần’s segmented translanguaging consisted of English words—subscribe, view, and clip, and the nouns “view” and “clip” missed plural morphemes. Missing morphemes were also found in another conversation at the fourth gathering as follows:

Trang: bức mình quá…cái máy này chỉ mới upgrade nó lên, bây giờ cái máy này nó đờ hơi. <really annoyed...I have just upgraded this cellphone, now it becomes that trash.>

Ngọc: nó đúng hà? <Does it stop working?>
The English verbs—upgrade and expect—in Trang’s translanguaging were not conjugated, as Tuấn’s and Trang’s attention seemed to go to the meaning and not to the form of the English words. As mentioned in Chapter 1, Vietnamese is an uninflected language; as a result, the English words in the conversations above missed grammatical morphemes. Participants were using a hybrid language in which Vietnamese grammar was applied to English lexicon.

Conversations on Facebook

Most of the Facebook conversations (100) were in English, although some were in Vietnamese and English (29). Only two were in Vietnamese without translanguaging. My attention was on the 29 conversations that included both. Although the number of Vietnamese nationals and Vietnamese American participating in the conversations was 31 and 6, respectively, English was used more frequently than Vietnamese by this Facebook group, probably because some members did not speak English. Topics of the Facebook conversations varied. Common topics were academic matters, group activities, campus events, the virtual world, and various day-to-day facets of everyday life. (See Appendix D.)

Table 4.3 below summarizes findings from analyses of the English-Vietnamese conversations for the following: extra-sentential translanguaging, segmented intra-sentential translanguaging, and sequential intra-sentential translanguaging.

Table 4.3

*Translanguaging Instances in Facebook Conversations*
Extra-sentential Translanguaging

Some translanguaging occurred when a participant gave emphasis to a particular point by saying something in the other language. For instance, when a photo of a member’s musical performance was posted, Hằng said, “Chúc mừng anh nhé!!! Great playing 😊:).” The Vietnamese sentence translates to “Congratulations!!!” Hằng moved from Vietnamese to English and to an emoji as she strengthened the message.

Another form of extra-sentential translanguaging was bilingual posting. Participants sometimes wrote a message in one language and translated it into the other language, as in the following example:

Cảm ơn mọi người đã đến uống trà và trò chuyện hôm nay. Cảm ơn anh Tài đã lo trả tiền và chúc mừng anh tốt nghiệp.

Thank you for coming to get the drink and chit chat with us. Special thanks to anh Tài for paying our milktea cups and congrats for your upcoming graduation day.

In this utterance the English is the translation of the Vietnamese version, and the two versions share similar structures. This communicative strategy, which was sometimes used in this community, could get the message across to everyone: the Vietnamese speakers who preferred Vietnamese and also those who preferred English.

An interesting example of bilingual posting was focused on two days in Vietnam that celebrate women: Vietnamese Women’s Day and International Women’s Day:

Good morning,
We want to send a message to our VSA beautiful ladies:
🌹🌹 Happy 10-20 Vietnamese Women's Day 🌹🌹

We hope you have a wonderful day with your family and partners. Remember to celebrate this day because you are Vietnamese women and you deserve not just one but two Women's Day in the year. We wish you, Viet women, always be happy, be smart, be pretty, and be sexy the way you proudly are.

From VSA officers with all the love and appreciation.

Hãy luôn tự hào là người phụ nữ Việt Nam xinh đẹp, quyền rũ, thông minh, bản lĩnh, và đảm dang nhé. Chúc các chị em VSA có một ngày lễ thật ý nghĩa bên người thương yêu và gia đình.

<Be proud to be a beautiful, charming, intelligent, brave, and confident Vietnamese woman. Wish our VSA women a meaningful day for your beloved ones and your family.>

Although the Vietnamese and English versions communicate a similar message, there are some differences between the two, particularly in the kinds of adjectives that are used. The translation is not veridical.

Intra-sentential Translanguaging

The most common kind of translanguaging was segmented—a single word from one language within a sentence written in the other language. Common words related to academic issues included advisor, semester, and library. The sequential—a sequence of words within a sentence written in the other language—was not so frequently used as the segmented. Phrases referring to academic issues included financial aid and scholarship office, academic advisor, the best way, and transfer scholarship. English academic vocabulary would be understood by many, and the Vietnamese equivalents would not be familiar to most of the group. It was interesting to see that there were 73 instances of translanguaging in a conversation about dropping class, which was the highest percentage of translanguaging (41.7% of the total number).
Many of the English words or phrases were related to the virtual world, for instance *hashtag*, *inbox*, and *link*. Others tended to be words of high frequency, such as housing, text, and library, and words that were shorter than their Vietnamese equivalents, such as *share* (*cùng ở chung*), *roommate* (*bạn cùng phòng*), and *available* (*có sẵn*). The frequent exposure to those vocabularies, no doubt, enabled language users to employ those words.

In the Facebook conversations, as in the group meetings, some instances of translanguaging had to do with the use of person-referring terms used in Vietnamese communications as honorifics. However, in this communicative context, they tended to be incorporated into sentences. As noted above, use of this complex system of pronouns contributes to the politeness that is associated with Vietnamese culture. An example follows, showing how the writer used *chi* repeatedly to refer to Lan.

Đào: Hi all,

Just a quick reminder that our friend *chi* Lan will have a performance tomorrow night. As a member of VSA Family, you cannot miss this. Come to support our beautiful lady and to enjoy the best music performance you’d ever seen

*Lan*: I promise there will be only TREAT, not Trick folks 😁😁. Pls come and share the music atmosphere together

*Thu*: Have a great performance *chi*!!!

*Lê*: I’ll have evening class tonight, can’t attend your second recital. I’m sorry!! Always root for you 😊😊😊😊😊 Stunning tonight *chi*!!!!!

*Lan*: Thanks *em* 😊:) 

*Điệp*: Good luck *chi* nhe!

The italicized Vietnamese words in the conversations above—*chị*, *em*—perform a social function. *Chị* refers to a woman who is older than the speaker, and *em* is for one who is younger than the speaker. Using pronouns properly shows respect and politeness in
communication. The participants in this conversation knew the age of one other, and, thus, they knew which would be appropriate. Although these kinds of communications were in English, contributors might insert a Vietnamese pronoun after one’s name or at the end of an utterance to personalize their communications.

At the beginning of each semester, there were some new students participating in the VSA. They started their searching on VSA Facebook for the information about Vietnamese students. An example of the sequential translanguaging presented below is a communication between a new member, Khương, and a current member of the VSA, Ngọc.

Khương: Mấy hôm nay toàn đi 1 mình buồn chết người 😞😞 <I’ve got bored with being on my own for couple days>

Ngọc: Welcome to ABC University bạn! Vì hiện giờ mọi người đang còn nghỉ hè và ở VN nên không có nhiều bạn ở đây. T7 này VSA có đi làm tình nguyện nếu bạn tham gia sẽ có cơ hội gặp những bạn khác trong hội😊😊 <Welcome to ABC University! Because people are on summer vacation in Vietnam, there are not many Vietnamese students around. This Saturday VSA volunteers for community service. If you want to join us, you will have an opportunity to meet with the others in our group.>

Khương: Ơ tốt quá ở đâu cho mình đi hóng với <Great! Where can I go to join you?>

Ngọc: Bạn có thể search vsa help move in để them info nha <You may want to search VSA help move in for further information.>

Khương’s posts were in Vietnamese, but Ngọc’s responses employed various forms of translanguaging. In Ngoc’s last response, she integrated phrase “search vsa help move in” into Vietnamese sentence. All of the translanguage words and phrases in Ngoc’s responses are related to school events, which indicated that her English academic lexicon is more available for use in her repertoire than Vietnamese lexicon.
Emojis in the Online Conversations

The emojis used by participants were not tied to either English or Vietnamese. As mentioned above, these non-linguistic symbols are often considered as a kind of online universal “language” and a substitute for non-verbal means of communication, such as facial expressions. Emojis were used frequently in the conversations of the club members' virtual world as another mode of communication. Table 4.4 shows the distribution of emojis in each type of conversations based on language choice. There were almost equal numbers of emojis used in the English and the English-Vietnamese conversations, but there were three times more English conversations than English-Vietnamese conversations. Thus, the emojis were much more prominent percentage-wise in the English-Vietnamese conversations.

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English Conversations</th>
<th>English-Vietnamese Conversations</th>
<th>Vietnamese Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Conversations</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Emojis</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is quite common now in online conversations, participants often inserted emojis to enhance the effectiveness of verbal communication. Some signaled a kind of emotion. The following emojis were used by participants, Nga and Thúc:

Thúc: Lol 😁青蛙

Nga: Chúc mừng anh nhé!!! Great playing 😊:) <Congratulations!!!>
Participants used Vietnamese, English, and a smiling face for the same message. Thúc used rolling on the floor laughing face emojis that have the same message as “Lol” or laugh out loud. Nga used slightly smiling face for “great playing.” The emoji strengthens the message and adds visual effect to the communication.

Other emojis functioned by themselves as contributions to the conversation. On five occasions, instead of responding with language, participants responded with emojis. The two thumbs up emojis in the following example indicated Mike’s approval.

Nam: *(posting a picture of people jumping into a swimming pool)*

Mike: 👍👍👍👍

Here is another example:

Đào: yeah you def can pay during the 2nd meeting. Thanks for coming today 😊😊

Nick: 🤣🤣

The double slightly smiling faces in Đào’s message highlighted “thanks for coming today,” the verbalized message. The laughing face and the grinning face in Nick’s post were to respond to Đào’s thanks instead of saying “you’re welcome.”

Commonalities and Differences across the Conversations in Forms of Translanguaging

The three types of conversations varied in terms of context, number of participants, purposes for conversations, and language choice. Table 4.5 summarizes the numbers for forms of translanguaging I collected across the conversations. As the table shows, most translanguaging I studied occurred in the less formal interactions associated with social gatherings and Facebook conversations. Most translanguaging
occurred within the boundaries of sentences, quite commonly as use of a word or phrase of one named language within a sentence expressed in the other named language.

Table 4.5

*Forms of Translanguaging across the Conversations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Event</th>
<th>Extra-Sentential</th>
<th>Segmented Intra-Sentential</th>
<th>Sequential Intra-Sentential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Meetings</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Gatherings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Conversations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conversations at the group meetings were dominated by English, which was used by the group leaders. Use of English made the meetings more accessible to non-Vietnamese students who were welcome to come and participate. Group leaders occasionally translanguaged outside of sentence boundaries. Most notable was the use of person-related pronouns to address a particular individual or refer to an individual. Since the purpose of the meetings was mainly to announce group activities and events, which were connected to school activities and the local community, using English was more comfortable for non-Vietnamese audience and for the group leaders.

The social gatherings were very different from the group meetings. They included more Vietnamese students, and the Vietnamese language was dominant. Within the conversations, which occurred mainly in Vietnamese, English words and phrases, used for such matters as technology, virtual world, and academic issues, were incorporated within Vietnamese sentences. Of interest to me was Liễu’s creation of a hybrid word—over đếm (which combined the English word “over” with the Vietnamese word “đếm”).
The hybridity was also found in grammar. The participants’ hybrid repertoire and their multi-competence enabled them to integrate English words into Vietnamese sentences and to apply Vietnamese grammar rules to English lexicon.

The Facebook conversations involving both English and Vietnamese revealed some interesting patterns. One was the double posting: providing the message first in one named language and then providing it in the other. This occurred with respect to Vietnamese culture. In another version the second language had some subtle differences in meaning from the original. Also, I noted the person-related pronouns commonly used here too as individuals conversed with one another and signaled their mutual respect.

Reasons for Translanguaging

Table 4.6

Factors Motivating Translanguaging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Discourse-Related</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Following group practices</td>
<td>Facilitating comprehension</td>
<td>Drawing from linguistic repertoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting group identity</td>
<td>Enhancing social relations</td>
<td>Saving time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistically and culturally accommodating others</td>
<td>Fostering bonds with individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circumventing complexities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section presents club members’ reasons for translanguaging as I have placed them in three categories: community factors, discourse-related factors, and individual factors. Table 4.6 shows these categories and subcategories for each.
Community Factors

The community related factors were reasons associated with the conventions, practices, and identity of the community.

Following Group Practices

The Vietnamese student group in this study included Vietnamese speakers and Vietnamese American who speak Vietnamese as a second language; therefore, the language used for the whole-group interactions—group meetings and Facebook posts—were expected to be English. One of VSA leaders, Đào, and a group member, Lê, told me about this rule in their interviews. However, it was common practice for there to be occasions when the Vietnamese language was mainly used, especially at informal gatherings. However, across the various kinds of interactions, translanguaging was a conventional facet of the communicative practices of this group.

Promoting Group Identity

Another reason for using two languages in a single message was relating to Vietnamese culture and identity. An example was the use of two languages in posting the Facebook message about Vietnamese Women’s Day that I recounted above. Đào, the author of this post, told me her reasons for using both languages. She believed that her expression in Vietnamese intended for Vietnamese speakers was to remind them of a Vietnamese tradition of celebrating Vietnamese Women’s Day. The English version was to introduce this Vietnamese cultural day to English speakers. She accommodated her style to both. She followed the American-English message convention of beginning
with “happy” and the name of the event. For the Vietnamese version, she used more adjectives describing Vietnamese women’s character to encourage Vietnamese women to be proud of themselves, since some Vietnamese people still hold conservative views on the role of women.

For another Facebook post using two languages, Lan shared with me a different intention for her dual posting, which appeared as the following:

A great chance to listen to one of the most beautiful Vietnamese traditional instruments, 16 strings/Zither in collaboration with ABC Festival String Orchestra (our friend Hằng will be playing in this orchestra so pls come and support her as well 😊)

Come and explore an authentically concert of Vietnamese tune sounding together with Western music!!!
Hope to see as many of you there

Thanks everyone!!!

According to Lan, the two versions had different purposes. The English version was to invite people to support a friend of hers and to enjoy a concert, whereas the Vietnamese version would turn people’s attention to Vietnamese musicians with more detailed information. Lan explained that English was to announce or advocate the
event, and Vietnamese was to provide the Vietnamese group with detailed information by writing in Vietnamese style.

Discourse-Related Factors

Other reasons were discourse-related. Participants explained that their translanguaging was intended to support and enhance discursive interactions with others through list the various subcategories.

Facilitating Understanding

Participants’ efforts to be comprehensible while expressing themselves was noticeable in both the face-to-face and the Facebook conversations. In my analyses of conversations, analyses often showed that contributors’ language choice often accorded with the language used by the initiator. When one started a conversation in the face-to-face events, such as the group meetings, another participant tended to follow the language choice of the initiator; and, when the initiator moved to the other language, so did the other participant. An example from the third group meeting follows:

Hoàng: ((talked to Ngọc)) give me the hat
Ngọc: why? I already had it.

Hoàng: you’ve already had a hat. Không chiu thì đi chỗ khác đi! <if you don’t, you can leave> ((Tâm was making a joke>)

Ngọc: [Thôi:::] <no way>

Hoàng: [không:::] chỉ có hai cái nón! <you have two hats!>

Ngọc explained to me that she followed Hoàng’s linguistic choice because she thought doing so was a kind of conversation principle. She explained that she was
comfortable with both Vietnamese and English. When she was with a group talking in English, she too would speak in English, even though she knew that those people could communicate in Vietnamese. The same convention tended to guide the Facebook conversations. When an initiator switched to Vietnamese, another contributor would reply to him or her in Vietnamese. For example, in a conversation between a new member, Khương, and an VSA officer, Đào, Khương asked in English if there were any Vietnamese students coming to an orientation, and Đào responded to him in English. Khương switched to Vietnamese in his second turn, and Đào answered him in Vietnamese.

Intra-sentential translanguaging was another means of facilitating understanding. For example, in a Facebook conversation, a new member, Trần, asked information about scholarships, and another group member, Nga, responded. When she explained how to apply for a scholarship, she integrated many English words and phrases (e.g., tuition waiver, offer scholarship, and accumulative) into her Vietnamese sentences. She told me that, if she had used Vietnamese for these words and phrases, the new member would have difficulties in finding the right words for searching further on the university’s website. Providing the English words would help the other student in online searching for detailed information.

With respect to the Facebook posts, each member was aware that there were some members who might not understand much Vietnamese. As a result, any post that was intended for all members, such as a meeting announcement or information for upcoming events, was in English. Sometimes the Vietnamese language was also used in those messages as in the following example:
Reminder‼‼
Today's meeting is cancelled due to t-shirts processing.
Chú ý chiều nay không có meeting nhé mọi người!!! <There is no meeting this afternoon>

The Vietnamese sentence was added to highlight the key information in this announcement and was also to accommodate new members who might prefer reading something in Vietnamese, according to Đào the initiator of this post. She also shared with me that it did not make sense for her to have a Vietnamese message translated exactly from the English version because members’ English should be proficient enough that they can understand the message. Her intention of using Vietnamese was not simply for comprehension but to emphasize important information in her announcement. Using two languages in one post would make the post more interesting to everyone, including some members who came to her and complained that they did not like reading everything in English.

Fostering Social Relations

Intra-sentential translanguaging was employed in Vietnamese conversations much more than extra-sentential translanguaging. Some common English words inserted into Vietnamese sentences—share, grad, undergrad, and common—were familiar to everyone in the group. In a conversation with me, Minh shared with me his reasons for inserting English words or phrases into Vietnamese sentences. He thought using such words was the group’s language behavior, and he wanted to follow that practice to confirm his membership.

Inserting Vietnamese person-related pronouns—chị, anh, em—into English structures is another interesting language behavior of this community. This type of
translanguaging was found in Facebook as follows: “Đào: we'll miss you, chị.” It was also found in meeting conversations:

Hoàng: So, the next.. VSA will be doing locally is the (..) multicultural night will be held on October nineteenth, the day to be decided (…) we'll launch multicultural performances (…) we gonna ask chị..do you know…?

Kiều: hold on…chị, chị Lan (...) and (..) anh (...) anh Minh

Đào said that using pronouns to refer to someone is an element of Vietnamese culture and is a norm. She believed that the practice should be maintained even in English conversations to show respectfulness to older people and politeness to others. Hoàng said that using Vietnamese pronoun before a name is a way of showing his politeness.

I was also interested in the club members’ reasons for expressing appreciation in the way that they did. When I asked Le about saying thank you, she explained that, in her opinion, appreciation needed to be expressed in Vietnamese. To her, thank you/thanks in English sounded perfunctory (“like an etiquette”) and did not express her appreciation to the extent that she wanted. She added that Vietnamese people do not say that expression as much as American people do and that the high frequency of that expression in English has made it lose its value. She was able to show her appreciation in a Vietnamese manner by expressing it in Vietnamese.

Accommodating Others

Communicating in English, communicating in Vietnamese, and being able to mix the two seemed to be part of most members’ repertoires. They had the kind of multi-competence that has been described in the translanguaging literature. For this factor, the following interaction provides an illustration. At one group meeting, when the group leader, Hoàng talked in English about the upcoming events, a member, Huệ, asked him
about the address of the bowling game. He turned to her and answered her question in Vietnamese, and he did the same with every member for whom Vietnamese was a first language. Hoàng explained that this language choice, for him, was as a subconscious language switch. His mind automatically switched to Vietnamese when he talked to Vietnamese people, especially to the people in this group. He said, “I don’t know why I did that.” When I asked him about his language with Vietnamese people outside of this group, he said that he would use Vietnamese to those speaking Vietnamese to him and those who are five years or more older than him. He indicated that his translanguaging was based, to some extent, on a person’s appearance and identity. His ability to alternate so easily was perhaps related to his Vietnamese identity: born to Vietnamese parents but speaking Vietnamese as a second language.

A similar practice was observed in the communications of another group member, Minh, who spoke Vietnamese as a first language. However, from him I obtained a different answer regarding his reasons. He explained that he would not speak English to his fellow Vietnamese students unless he knew that someone did not understand Vietnamese very well. He used translanguaging just because this was a group practice and he wanted to align himself with the group culture. He did not include English in his communications when talking to friends in Vietnam.

*Circumventing Complexities*

As mentioned in Chapter 2, Vietnamese pronouns require someone to know another person’s age and status to be used properly, although there are some pronouns that can be used for everyone regardless of their age, such as *bạn*. Some participants in this study switched to English, which does not have a complex pronoun system, when
they did not want to know or were unsure about someone’s age. The following conversation shows an instance of translanguaging to avoid a Vietnamese pronoun.

Khương: Is there anyone still studying in UNT and coming to the transfer Orientation on 23rd? I just transferred here and saw no vietnamese at school.

Đào: You can always attend VSA meetings during the school year. Don’t worry. I’m pretty sure there will be Vietnameses and VSA officers during transfer orientation as well. Good luck.

Khương: Ở đâu hả <Where are the meetings?>

Đào: khi vào học sẽ có ngày giờ cụ thể nhé <We will let you know the time and the date when the school starts>

Khương: Em xin lỗi nhé mà chị hay anh ạ <Excuse me, are you chị [older female] or anh [older male]?>

Đào: girl nhà bạn <A girl>

Using Vietnamese pronouns requires knowing the interactant’s age and gender, which sometime is a sensitive and unnecessary issue in American culture. Translanguaging provided the participants in this study with a choice of Vietnamese culture or American culture. Khương asked Đào in Vietnamese if she was an older female or older male.

Đào answered that she is a girl. She did not say that she was an older female because if she did so, she would be older than Khương. When I spoke with Đào, Đào explained that she did not know Khương’s age and thus could not say chiều (older female) to him.

But, since she had access to English, she could use an English word, girl, to refer her gender only not her age. However, according to Vietnamese culture, Khương addressed Đào as chiều (older female) for his respect and politeness by putting himself in a lower position than Đào’s.
Individual Choices

The factors discussed in this final category include reasons related to participants’ own individual strategic choices in communicating with particular other members of the group.

**Drawing from One’s Linguistic Repertoire**

It can be assumed that, to varying extents, the linguistic repertoires of these club members included elements associated with one named language or the other, English and Vietnamese. The most noticeable feature my analyses uncovered was the number of English words and phrases inserted into Vietnamese sentences, and participants gave me different answers for their choices. The participants, Huệ, Lan, Lê, Ngọc, Diệp, and Nga, with whom I spoke about this said that they just used the words that came to their mind first, and I observed that, also during the interviews they inserted English words and phrases into Vietnamese sentences. They explained that they had not even noticed that language behavior until I asked them about it. These people were Vietnamese speakers and they knew Vietnamese equivalents, but the English words came to their mind first.

However, in other situations, two interviewees, Ngọc and Huệ, explained that they used English words because they did not know Vietnamese equivalents. Ngọc frequently integrated English words into Vietnamese sentences. She came to the U.S for high school, lived with an American family during her high school study and was thus in an English-speaking environment. She had learned many English words and had forgotten many Vietnamese words. When I spoke with her, she explained that, when
she talked to her mother in Vietnam, she did not know how to express some concepts in Vietnamese. Sometimes her mother, who did not speak English, did not know exactly what she was talking about. Recently, she has received help in developing her Vietnamese from friends who are Vietnamese students.

I heard yet another explanation from Huệ, who had come to the U.S. for her second bachelor’s degree. She told me that there were some English words for which she did not know their Vietnamese equivalents. She had learned the concepts in English in the context of her university studies, and she had not known about them when she was in Vietnam. This student was a biology major. Whenever she discussed concepts associated with biology, she switched to English.

In contrast to some other Vietnamese club members, Kiều was born and raised in the U.S., and English was her first language. However, she knew many concepts relating to feeling and to emotion in Vietnamese, and she did not know their English equivalents. When she was at preschool age, her parents had taught her Vietnamese, and she had watched Vietnamese comedies and had sung Vietnamese songs since then until her high school years. Although her linguistic proficiency in Vietnamese was not as strong as her proficiency in English, she said that she loved speaking in Vietnamese because its lexicon has more words expressing emotion and feeling than English lexicon does. One of her examples was that Vietnamese differentiates between different kinds of love. Yêu is commonly used for romantic relationship, but thương traditionally refers to the love for parents, siblings, or relatives.
Saving Time

Another reason for translanguaging was for saving time, which meant avoiding the linguistic or conceptual complexity of one language or the other. This reason was provided particularly for online communications in which the participants wanted to save typing time. Club members valued their time and did not want to waste it. It was not, though, that one language or the other was always associated with saving time. For example, Lan preferred using English for Facebook conversations when she was in a hurry. She explained that typing in English took her less time than in Vietnamese because typing in Vietnamese required her to switch the keyboard to mark tones and diacritics. For other students, English was used because Vietnamese would require more words to make the same point. Some English words signify a particular concept with fewer words than Vietnamese language does. For example, the Vietnamese equivalent of advisor is người tư vấn; the Vietnamese equivalent for audience is khán giả. The Vietnamese words require more time for typing because of length and also the tone marking.

Participants also provided conceptual explanations for their linguistic choices intended to save time. For example, in one Facebook conversation, the initiator, Lê, started the conversation in English, but the contributor, Lan, responded to Lê’s request in Vietnamese. Lan’s explanation was that, since she was in hurry, she preferred using Vietnamese for a quick response. She had no time for thinking in English.

Strengthening Bonds with Other Individuals

Pronouns, which contribute to the linguistic complexity of Vietnamese, offer language users more choice than English pronouns. The speaker may want to use chí
or anh for addressing a female or a male who is older the speaker. All of the participants in this study used Vietnamese pronouns to address others in the Vietnamese style. Interestingly, even those who spoke English as a first language had learned how to use Vietnamese pronouns. As mentioned above, this practice, which is important in Vietnamese culture, is a means of showing respect to the people who are older than the speaker. A participant, Kiều, shared her thought with me about Vietnamese pronouns. She said she felt “like home” when using Vietnamese pronouns to the others within the group. Calling people merely by name does not help her address a close relationship among people in the group. She mentioned “like home” because pronouns chị or anh can be used for addressing older sister or older brother respectively. There is no difference in using Vietnamese pronouns for family members and for non-family members.

A switch from English to Vietnamese within a conversation to personalize one’s communication with a particular person signalizes a move from a large audience to a person. This translanguaging sends a message that the speaker knows with whom he or she is interacting and signals that they belong to the same group. Ngọc, for instance, always used Vietnamese through translanguaging to the people with whom she had a close relationship. Also, she switched from English to Vietnamese for cracking jokes.

Commonalities and Differences across the Conversations Regarding Reasons for Translanguaging

In the discourse-based interviews, VSA members provided some reasons for their translanguaging. Across the various communications, they used both English and Vietnamese, and they translanguaged as part of their community identity and also for
discourse related reasons. At the group meetings, the use of English with only minimal Vietnamese accords with community rules, and Vietnamese was used largely for promoting group identity. At the social gatherings members tended to use mainly Vietnamese but they translanguaged to English because of the availability of English lexicon in their repertoire. Translanguaging in the Facebook conversations was for linguistically and culturally accommodating others. In these conversations, which involved written language, there were individual reasons related to the challenges of diacritical marking of tones, specifically saving time, which was a rationale that was not provided for the other kinds of communications.

Summary of Findings

The linguistic boundary between English and Vietnamese became blurry due to the high frequency of mixing two languages in sentences or in conversations of SVA members. They tended to employ translanguaging naturally and subconsciously for communications, and this translanguaging was conventional for language use by this community. The availability of two named language resources in their linguistic repertoires provided a wide array of linguistic elements members could use to accomplish their communication goals.

For this study, I focused on the forms of translanguaging performed by VSA members as well as the reasons that they provided for their translanguaging. For the forms of translanguaging, my attention was on extra-sentential translanguaging (outside the boundaries of single sentences), whether the sentences were largely in Vietnamese or in English, and intra-sentential translanguaging, which could be either segmented
(appearing as single words within a sentence) or sequential (appearing as a sequence of words within a sentence). In the group meetings, almost all translanguaging in the formal part of the meeting, conducted almost totally in English, was performed by the group leaders, largely as person-related pronouns used as honorifics. The intra-sentential translanguaging appeared in the language of a small group of club members conversing apart from the scheduled activities. In the social gatherings, which were conducted largely in Vietnamese, translanguaging was mainly intra-sentential, most commonly the insertion of English words and phrases (relating mainly to university matters and technology) within English. For the Facebook conversations, the translanguaging was both extra-sentential and intra-sentential. Of particular interest were extra-sentential double postings and the use of emojis.

VSA club members provided various reasons for their translanguaging. Community factors included following group practices and promoting group identity, whereas discourse related-factors included facilitating comprehension, enhancing social relations, linguistically and culturally accommodating others, and circumventing complexities. However, there were also reasons that seemed to be unique to individuals, which included drawing from one’s linguistic repertoire, saving time, and fostering bonds with specific other individuals.
In their communication forums, VSA members drew from their linguistic repertoires as they engaged in conversations with one another. If these conversations were to be examined only in terms of “named languages,” one would see much alternation and mixing of English and Vietnamese. But this has been a study of translanguaging—to see how translanguaging across the “named” languages defined the VSA club in terms of its community and also how the members of the club demonstrated their multi-competences as they drew from their hybrid linguistic repertoires. In the following I discuss findings of the study in terms of key concepts mentioned in Chapter One: the related notions of linguistic repertoire and multi-competences and the notion of community.

**Linguistic Repertoires and Multi-Competences**

In previous considerations of translanguaging, other scholars have pointed to the linguistic repertoires and multi-competences of bilingual or plurilingual individuals. Building on prior descriptions of repertoire, Grosjean (1982) argued that, instead of having two systems of named languages, a bilingual has a single linguistic repertoire with linguistic elements associated with more than one named language from which he or she can draw to communicate effectively. Wei (2011a) described an individual’s repertoire as composed of linguistic knowledge (associated with all the languages that one knows) as well as available strategies to draw upon and an executive system that provides control. The related notion of multi-competence, originated by Cook (1991),
highlights individuals’ ability to retrieve and employ these linguistic elements from the repertoire. Cook’s (2016) most recent definition has described multi-competence as a system of more than one language in an individual or community. In this section, I discuss the linguistic hybridity performed by VSA members and then the kinds of translanguaging associated with different conversations. I follow that by discussing the reasons that members provided for the translanguaging that they did.

Linguistic Hybridity

With this study, conducted over a period of four and a half months, I sought insights into the linguistic repertoires and multi-competences of a particular group of bilingual individuals who communicated regularly and drew on the resources of both English and Vietnamese in their communications. Their translanguaging took various forms. Some was extra-sentential, in that it occurred outside of sentence boundaries. But most of it was intra-sentential, particularly the incorporation of words or phrases within sentences. Most often the sentences would begin and end with the same language. The study showed that, for these bilinguals, communicating effectively was more important than language boundaries. VSA members accessed words or phrases from their repertoires that best communicated what they wanted to say and that followed the group’s conventions, and they often did so without considering whether the word or expression “belonged” to English or to Vietnamese. In communicating, they tended to be conscious of those with whom they were communicating and of the forum to which they were contributing and to adjust their language accordingly.
I noted some combining of linguistic elements from the two very different language systems as participants focused more on the content and social functions than on language and syntactic boundaries. As discussed earlier, Vietnamese is an uninflected language, which does not require tenses and plural forms, unlike English which has inflections for both. In group members’ face-to-face conversations, some English morphemes were missing, particularly those marking tenses. This hybrid grammar was a mix of English lexicon and Vietnamese grammar. A good example was Ngọc’s incorporation of the English word cancel in her Vietnamese sentence without marking the tense with –ed: “Lớp cancel rồi (. ) học cái gì!” (The class was cancelled). Participants tended not to conjugate English verbs when they integrated them into Vietnamese sentences, and this practice did not seem to cause any misunderstanding. Their multi-competences permitted them to employ both English grammar and Vietnamese grammar for communicating messages.

Missing English tense morphemes did not affect the participants’ comprehension because the context clues provided the time frame for a conversation as in the example below.

Trang: bực mình quá...cái máy này chỉ mới upgrade nó lên, bây giờ cái máy này nó đơ hơi. <(really annoyed...I have just upgraded this cellphone, now it becomes that trash.>)

Ngọc: nó dưng hà? <Does it stop working?>

Trang: không, nó không như tui expect… không dùng được các chức năng mà tôi muốn dùng. <No, it does not work as I expected…I can’t use some functions that I want>)

The participant, Trang, did not conjugate verbs upgrade and expect, but Ngọc could understand that the action “upgrade” had happened before Trang got frustrated with her cellphone. As a result, Ngọc asked Trang if the cellphone stopped working...
resulting from Trang’s upgrading. Ngọc understood the sequence of the events although Trang missed English tense morpheme “-ed” of verb *upgrade*.

Another type of hybrid language is a hybrid lexicon employed in face-to-face conversations. It was interesting to see, as I reported above, that Liễu, one of the group members, created a hybrid word in a conversation at the second social gathering. She asked Ngọc about a slower cooker: “*over đêm đồ* overnight đồ..nó vẫn còn nóng hà?” Initially, she combined *over* and *đêm* (night) in her speech, which was a combination of English and Vietnamese lexicons as she was using both Vietnamese and English to say, “Is it still hot overnight?” She corrected “*over đêm*” immediately by saying *overnight*. Her natural language production resulted from her integrated repertoire of English and Vietnamese.

Translanguaging in Group Communications

By analyzing communications in group meetings, social gatherings, and Facebook conversations, I studied VSA members’ various forms of translanguaging. I found that, even though there was much variability across settings and individuals, there seemed to be some contrasting patterns of translanguaging across the three kinds of communications. Extra-sentential and intra-sentential translanguaging characterized the group meetings and Facebook conversations, but only the intra-sentential form occurred in social gatherings.

The group meetings, conducted largely in English, featured extra-sentential translanguaging that often took the form of person-related pronouns used by one of the group leaders. The intra-sentential translanguaging occurred mainly in a conversation
between a group of Vietnamese students chatting among themselves apart from the meeting. The social gatherings, where members spoke mainly in Vietnamese, tended to have English words or phrases, associated with such topics as university matters and technology, incorporated intra-sententially within Vietnamese. Although most Facebook conversations were in English only, I attended to 29 conversations that included both Vietnamese and English, occurring together both extra-sententially and intra-sententially. Of interest for extra-sentential translanguaging was the double-posting, for which the translation was not always veridical but might be modified culturally. Of interest for intra-sentential translanguaging was use of the person-related Vietnamese pronouns. In contributions to Facebook conversations there was much use of the non-linguistic means of communication that we know as emojis, which are now also part of an individual’s and a community’s multi-competence.

Reasons for Translanguaging

Prior research has given some attention to the reasons for moving from one named language to another or incorporating elements from one into another. Decades ago, Blom and Gumperz (1972) found that people tend to use the majority language for academic reasons, and others (e.g., dialects, minority languages) have been used for personal interaction. The present study revealed various additional reasons for bilinguals’ translanguaging.

In my interviews, the most noticeable answer for translanguaging provided by participants was that they used the words that came first to their minds, which was categorized as “Drawing from Linguistic Repertoire” in my analyses. For these students,
there had been exposure to particular vocabularies that made some words more accessible than other words. Club members would draw upon English elements when engaging in particular kinds of conversations. For example, in an interview, Lan explained that “Nhiều khi em với em Hằng nói chuyện có những từ chuyên môn các thứ thì tiến nói luôn một loạt tiếng Anh luôn” (When I was talking to Hằng, I switched to English for technical terms). Members would draw upon Vietnamese elements when those they could and when they were appropriate. And they would mix elements when that seemed to work. Group members felt that they “naturally” mixed English words into Vietnamese and vice versa without being aware that they were translanguaging.

A common assumption is that people speaking two languages make choices between two languages that could communicate the same thing equally well. However, my conversations with participants revealed some complications. For instance, when I asked Kiều, an English speaker, about her mixing English and Vietnamese, she answered that, in contrast to English, she knew more Vietnamese words about feelings or emotion and would be more likely to use them when the context allowed. I asked Ngọc, a Vietnamese speaker, the same question, and her answer was that she had some struggles with finding the right words in Vietnamese. She had to mix English and Vietnamese due to her lack of Vietnamese lexicon.

According to Hoàng and Kiều, they used translanguaging for linguistical and cultural accommodation when communicating with others. Linguistical accommodation had also been pointed out in previous studies (Burt, 2002; Chen, 2013; Coupland, 1985; Mendieta-Lombardo & Cintron, 1995; Scotton, 1976). This accommodation was also shown in a code-switching study conducted in Malaysia (Hadei, Kumar, & Jie, 2016).
The participant in this study used Malay for communication, but she switched to English to welcome people from different language background. Although all members of this student club were able to communicate in English, they preferred using Vietnamese with some translinguaging to the members whose first language was Vietnamese.

Different from face-to-face conversations, Facebook conversations required users to be more careful with their writing. The translinguaging instances found in this online forum did not violate conventions of English grammar or Vietnamese grammar. Since Facebook is a forum for a type of conversation, people prefer some kinds of short form or something that take them less time than an actual writing. The participants chose language elements that required less time for thinking and typing. When I asked Lan why she replied a post in English, her answer is as follows:

Lan: nhiều khi tiếng Anh nó nhanh hơn và nếu em dùng tiếng Anh ngắn hơn thì em sẽ dùng tiếng Anh. Nhất là nhiều khi em đang vội, tiếng Việt còn phải đánh dấu, em phải chuyển bàn phím. <Sometimes typing in English is faster. If saying in English is shorter than Vietnamese, I will type in English. When I am in hurry, typing in Vietnamese takes me more time because I have to put tones and diacritic markers over syllables and switch the keyboard from English to Vietnamese.>

Lan did not want to spend time with tones and diacritic markers in Vietnamese, she chose English for her posts. Her repertoire provided her with a choice of language, which could be adjusted to the constraints of particular kinds of communications.

Community: VSA’s Situated Practices

As a linguistic ethnography, the study focused much attention on the practices of the VSA as a community, particularly the practices associated with the translinguaging that characterized their communications. As discussed in Chapter One, “community” has been an important concept in sociolinguistic studies. Gumperz (1962, 1968) used
this term to refer to groups that have their own lines of communication and norms. Hymes (1967) too emphasized social norms, or “rules for conduct” and “rules for interpretation” that characterize a community (p. 18). Porter (1986) spoke of communities as having approved forums and having discourse that is regulated. Swales (1990) highlighted the shared goals that communities have for their communications, and Lave and Wenger (1991) pointed to the conventions and customs of a community with members who share a purpose or an interest. In the following I discuss first the approved forums and the norms or rules within each.

Conventions and Norms

The VSA had its three major forums for communications. There were the group meetings in which English dominated and which functioned mainly for announcing events and activities. There were the social gatherings, in which Vietnamese was dominant and which almost always involved food. And there were the Facebook conversations, which were the most hybrid in terms of language. These conversations kept people connected and allowed members to assist others in academic related issues and life in the U.S. It is important to note that these different forums varied in terms of their rules or conventions.

For the group meetings, the rule of using English as the group’s “lingua franca” was understood and supported by club members. However, on occasion, the group leaders, Hoàng and Kiều, translanguaged to Vietnamese in conversations with Vietnamese speakers. These group leaders thus modified the English rule to make it a translanguaging rule. This incorporation of Vietnamese involved mainly Vietnamese
person-related pronouns, making communications conform with the “proper” use of pronouns in Vietnamese language and culture.

As to the social gatherings, when some VSA members got together at a member’s house for cooking, eating, and chatting, the members sat in small groups and talked about different topics while preparing the meal, cooking, and eating, and also after the meal. These social gatherings were not governed by the rule of English. Instead, Vietnamese was dominant because most of the participants had Vietnamese as their first language. However, integrating English words or phrases was frequently used by most, particularly when talking about certain topics, including technology, virtual world, and academic related issues.

Within the Facebook conversations, communications were for announcements and also for informal communications among group members. The contributors to this forum knew one another to varying degrees though meetings and social gatherings; hence, the formality of these online communications varied from conversation to conversation. Noticeably, the members always posted in English if the message was intended for all members because they were expected to follow the rule of using English for group discussions such as group meetings and group discussions on Facebook. For example, Ngọc said, “cái gì đó publish ra nhiều người cùng đọc thì em sẽ viết tiếng Anh” (I will write in English for something that will be intended for everyone). The other members, Lan, Đào, and Huệ, also shared their agreement with this rule of language choice. Their posts relating school events and other school activities, such as community services, were in English.
I return again to the practice I saw of double-posting, which shows some of the complexity of translanguaging. A posting would be in one language, and then a “translation” would be provided in the other language. These Facebook posts using two languages in two versions allowed people to send messages to different subgroups: The English version was for the members who preferred reading English, and Vietnamese writing was for those who would read the Vietnamese version. But these were not veridical translations, as a Vietnamese version would include information relating specifically to Vietnamese people. Since that information would not be so important for those who were not familiar with Vietnamese culture, it was not included in an English version.

Employing emojis is another convention of the Facebook conversations. They were used frequently in the conversations among the members of this community because of their visual effect on virtual communication. The group members used them as a substitute for facial expressions in face-to-face conversations and as contributions to the conversation. One of the interviewees told me that she liked using emojis to express her feeling and to make her conversations friendlier and more fun.

“Politeness,” which is often mentioned in the literature as a characteristic of Vietnamese culture and communication, was a norm of this community. Related to this feature of politeness were the Vietnamese pronouns used in face-to-face and Facebook conversations. As noted above, Vietnamese pronouns have important social functions. The pronouns anh and chi can be used to index social hierarchy, and in some formal speech, pronouns anh and chi can be used for politeness regardless the difference of age. Prior studies are relevant. For instance, Phan (2001) observed Vietnamese
students’ using the pronoun *em* to refer to their lower status relative to their teacher’s and thus manifesting politeness. Vietnamese kinship terms and personal names were also used as honorifics in conversations, which is obligatory for Vietnamese culture, between the workers at a company in Kleifgan and Le (2007). In the present study this “politeness” feature of Vietnamese communications was most apparent in the group meetings and in the Facebook conversations, both of which brought together people who differed in age and status. In contrast, in the social gatherings members often interacted with others who were similar in age and status.

**Community Identity**

The convention and norms discussed above are significant markers of community identity. Since this student group was identified as Vietnamese students, the Vietnamese members who spoke English as their first language used Vietnamese to other members to individualize their communications. The Vietnamese members who spoke English as their second language also used English in appropriate contexts to linguistically accommodate others. Using Vietnamese, English, and translanguaging practice shaped bilingual norms that specifically applied to this community discourse. As noted earlier, Gardner-Chloros (2009) explained that combining languages is a way that bilinguals express their group identity—it is like a dialect. Ho-Dac (1997) noted that language mixing is a matter of identity negotiation. The use of both English and Vietnamese seemed important to the identity of this group. This was a Vietnamese/Vietnamese American group within an English-speaking university as Minh explained regarding the bilingual nature of this community:
Minh: Khi nói chuyện với các bạn ở bên này, cũng là người Việt như chị Lan, em Hằng, hoặc mọi người thì có thể thịnh thơng mình xen tiếng Anh vào. Thi cái đấy nó cũng là cách chung mọi người dùng. <When talking to Vietnamese people living here like Lan, Hằng, or others, I sometimes integrate English words into Vietnamese sentences. That is a common practice used by the people here.>

To borrow a notion from Bhabha (1994), one could say that this community was a “third space” at the interstices between Vietnamese positionality and American English positionality. In its hybrid language and cultural practices, there was an interweaving of elements that some might associate with a Vietnamese subject position or with an American-English subject position to create the place or space between (cf. Kramsch, 1993). Wei (2011b) has extended this space notion to translanguaging with the term translanguaging space, which refers to a space where people can integrate languages and associated practices that have previously been separated. In many ways the VSA can be described as occupying a third space—a translangual space where all members were engaged and practiced bilingualism and biculturalism.

Conclusion

The group’s conventions and practices provided a translanguaging space (Wei, 2011b), in which members could speak or write English or Vietnamese as well as English and Vietnamese. The reasons for translanguaging provided by the participants indicated that the translanguaging space included and facilitated both group’s practices and individual language choice. This translanguaging space was created by and occurred within this community of practice, whose interacting members had a shared pursuit and shared practices, which, to borrow a term from Wenger (1998), can be seen as their “property.” Wenger has argued that central to the concept of community of
practice are mutual engagement and a shared repertoire of practices.

Translanguaging, which took various forms, resulted in linguistic hybridity of two very different (named) languages. Members drew strategically and fluently from their linguistic repertoires for communication purposes, and they accommodated their language to social context and audience. Their multi-competences enabled them to produce language that was not simply comprehensible but rhetorically effective with other members within the community. My interviews showed that much of their translanguaging, which occurred largely in the Facebook conversations, was to enhance communication—to use language that would accommodate and to relate to those who would be reading or hearing their words. Sometimes it meant using Vietnamese, sometimes English, and sometimes a hybrid form. Sometimes it meant putting the message in one language and then the other to make cultural accommodations.

This inquiry provides further insights into the multi-competences of bilingual individuals as they communicate with one another. The Vietnamese and Vietnamese-American students in this study drew flexibly from their linguistic repertoires, merging two languages that differ considerably in terms of morphology, syntax, and orthography. Use of hybridized language was conventional in the forums of their community, and it was central to the community’s practices. This linguistic hybridity was a mutuality—one of the ways in which these students were, in fact, a community.

Additional research might build upon the present study in various ways. Future studies could focus on particular forums, particular features of language, or particular subgroups. As to forums, an interesting forum for translanguaging in the present study
was the Facebook conversations, which included emojis as well as verbal contributions. My attention was on Facebook conversations that occurred over four and a half months, but an inquiry might extend over a longer period of time to discern patterns. One could see, for example, how the language of newcomers changes to accord with group practices. Also, since this study was limited to the within-community communications, an inquiry might contrast translanguaging in community practices with translanguaging in other contexts as well. As to specific features of language, a study might focus more intensively on pronoun use of Vietnamese-English bilinguals in various kinds of contributions. The honorifics associated with pronouns could be investigated with respect to “politeness” in other features of the language. As to particular subgroups, subsequent research might examine the difference in translanguaging practice between Vietnamese-English bilinguals who speak English as their first language and those who speak English as their second language.
APPENDIX A

SEMANTIC FEATURES OF ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE PERSONAL PRONOUNS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Plurality</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Formality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Singular/ Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Older brother/non</td>
<td>Older than the interlocutor</td>
<td>Formal/ Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Older sister/none</td>
<td>Older than the interlocutor</td>
<td>Formal/ Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chúng)Tôi</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>(plural) singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal/ Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tao</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anh</td>
<td>First/ Second</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Younger sister/ brother/ none</td>
<td>Younger than the interlocutor</td>
<td>Formal/ Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chí</td>
<td>First/ Second</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Older sister/none</td>
<td>Older than the interlocutor</td>
<td>Formal/ Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Các/Mây)Anh</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>(plural) singular</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Older brother/none</td>
<td>Older than the speaker</td>
<td>Formal/ Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Các/Mây)Chị</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>(plural) singular</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Older sister/none</td>
<td>Older than the speaker</td>
<td>Formal/ Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em</td>
<td>First/ Second</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ông</td>
<td>First/ Second</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Grandparent/ none</td>
<td>Much older than the speaker/ the interlocutor</td>
<td>Formal/ Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bà</td>
<td>First/second</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Grandmother/ none</td>
<td>Much older than the speaker/ the interlocutor</td>
<td>Formal/ Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cháu</td>
<td>First/second</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minh</td>
<td>First/second</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Male/ Female</td>
<td>Close friend/ husband/wife</td>
<td>The same age (friend)</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mày/ (Mày Đứa/Bay)</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Singular (plural)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Younger sibling/ none</td>
<td>The same as or younger than the speaker</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nó</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td>Younger sibling/ none</td>
<td>Younger than the speaker</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Plurality</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Kinship</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Formality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chúng</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Younger sibling/none</td>
<td>The same as or younger than the speaker</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nó/Bọn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nó/Tụi Nó</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

CODING SHEET FOR EACH FORUM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forums</th>
<th>Extra-Sentential</th>
<th>Segmented Intra-Sentential</th>
<th>Sequential Intra-Sentential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Meetings</td>
<td>Giờ tay lên! ra ngoài ăn, chơi thì nói chung là</td>
<td>Monday Unlimited</td>
<td>chí, chí Hương (...) and (...) anh (...) anh Quang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Gatherings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate Experience</td>
<td>back up test set function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Conversations</td>
<td>… Cảm ơn anh Bin đã lo trà sữa và chúc mừng anh tốt nghiệp…. Special thanks to anh Bin Đặng Vũ for paying our milktea cups and congrats for your upcoming graduation day.</td>
<td>Share, bill, scholarship</td>
<td>Today's meeting is cancelled due to t-shirts processing. Chú ý chiều nay không có meeting nhé mọi người!!!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

RICHARDS’ (2003) TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>Falling intonation</td>
<td>That was foolish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>Continuing contour</td>
<td>I took bread, butter, jam and honey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Questioning intonation</td>
<td>Who was that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!</td>
<td>Exclamatory utterance</td>
<td>Look!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>Pause of about 2 seconds</td>
<td>So (2.0) what are we going to do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(...)</td>
<td>Pause of about 1 second</td>
<td>In front of (...) the table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(..)</td>
<td>Pause of about 0.5 second</td>
<td>Then (..) she just (..) left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>Micropause</td>
<td>Put it (.) away</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| [ ]           | Overlap | A: He saw it [to] and stopped  
|               |         | B: [oh] |
| [ [          | Speakers start at the same time | [[A: And the  
|               |         | [[B: So she left it behind. |
| =             | Latched utterances | A: We saw her yesterday.=  
|               |         | B: =And she looked fine. |
| _             | Emphasis | Put it away |
| -             | Cut off | All over the pl- the floor |
| :             | Sound stretching | We waited for a lo:::ng time |
| (xxx)         | Unable to transcribe | We’ll just (xxxxxxxxx) tomorrow |
| (send)        | Unsure transcription | And then he (juggled) it |
| (( ))         | Other details | Leave it alone ((moves book)) |
APPENDIX D

TOPICS OF FACEBOOK CONVERSATIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Number of Conversations in English</th>
<th>Number of Conversations in English and Vietnamese</th>
<th>Number of Conversations in Vietnamese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Group meetings, group events</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other events</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Asking info. About group event</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Meeting recap</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Photos relating to group events</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Thank you note/wishing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Celebration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Poll</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sharing info. About school and everyday issues</td>
<td>11(10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Asking for help</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Inviting to an event</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Introducing oneself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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