Multilingual Composing on Facebook: Defining the "Social" in Social Constructivism and Social Media

Kathleen Hynes
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Abstract

Social constructivist theories underpinned nearly all of the seven empirical studies conducted on post-secondary English Language Learners' (ELLs') Facebook use. However, a potentially complicated relationship exists between the term "social" as education theorists conceive it and the adjective "social" used to describe online networking. Analysis shows that the former emerges from a paradigm that sees people's interactions as capable of integration, while the latter refers to activities that tend to promote fragmentation. This suggests that transforming social media into a space for learning partly hinges on the instructor's ability to design assignments that demand greater collaboration than Facebook asks of its users. Rather than abandoning SNSs, working within their limitations might create new opportunities for student engagement and learning.

Keywords: Multilingual writing; ELL; Facebook; Social Media; Social Constructivism

A prominent rhetorical feature of the writing-about-social-media genre involves opening with a catalogue of current stats, like the number of active daily users (Facebook, according to Facebook, 2014, has an average of 829 million); number of monthly users (1.32 billion); and percentage of users residing outside of the U.S. and Canada (about 81%). But when an individual signs into his or her account, the user population feels much more manageable, relatively speaking: In one survey, the average Facebooker had 245 friends, and grew the friend network at a rate of seven people per month (Hampton, Goulet, Marlow, & Rainie, 2012). Yet, those numbers quickly spiral back into mind-boggling territory when, according to the same survey, an average Facebook user

reached about 31,000 people through the profile's outer friends-of-friends circle. Assuming these numbers are roughly accurate, what opportunities might they suggest for the classroom? In the field of literacy studies, where literacy may be defined as "the power to be able to make oneself heard and felt, to signify," and "the way in which we make ourselves meaningful not only to others but through others to ourselves" (Schuster, 2006, p. 43), unless the stats represent human connection—or even the real potential for it—they may not be all that significant.

Though social networking sites (SNSs) like Facebook have already entered educational settings as platforms for developing language and literacy skills, further discussion is needed that

interrogates the nature of the communication occurring across these virtual spaces. SNSs do not reproduce the same relationship that exists elsewhere between producer and audience, as recent research shows: Cuonzo (2010) argues that "Facebook is a new *form* [emphasis added] of communication, not just a new vehicle of communication" (p. 177) and Meikle (2010) shows how Facebook enables a "blurring of the lines between one-to-one and mass communication" (p. 14). What this means for students in a Composition classroom, for example, depends on the ways in which they engage with other users—engage by creating, consuming, and shaping one another's content in a continuous series of interlocking networks. Within this environment, opportunities certainly exist for "mak[ing] oneself heard and felt" (Schuster, 2006, p. 43), but also for calling out to a faceless, indifferent crowd. Most likely, Facebook use unfolds as some combination of these two experiences.

Concentrating on multilingual writers' Facebook use, I examined the findings from seven empirical studies conducted to date on English Language Learners' (ELLs') use of this SNS in higher education, as shown in Table 1. Though the studies covered a range of research focuses, Facebook assignments, and ELL populations, they did share a common thread. Perhaps unsurprisingly given the social media context, social constructivist theories underpinned nearly all of the studies. However, researchers have yet to explore the potentially complicated relationship between the term "social" as education theorists conceive it and the adjective "social" used to describe activity occurring on networks like Facebook. With the social network putting each user in constant conversation with ever-widening circles of "friends" who may or may not be co-creating/consuming/shaping each other's content at a given moment, does Facebook's rhetorical environment support, undermine, or do nothing to facilitate the types of interactions that promote the learning of multilingual writers, according to social constructivist models? In other words, is there some, lots, or no overlap between these uses of the word "social"? Based on the insights gleaned from this analysis, does Facebook foster a space in which Schuster's (2006) socially oriented conception of literacy might flourish, and what does this suggest about the network's value for the multilingual Composition classroom?

Ultimately, I argue that the definition of *social* in social constructivist education theories comes from a paradigm that sees people's interactions as capable of integration, of uniting learners across cultural and linguistic bounds, while the social activity on popular forms of online media can encourage fragmentation and disconnection. The integration/fragmentation binary is not meant to neatly divide the two uses of *social* or to suggest that the distinction is consistent across all real-world classroom and computer-mediated interactions. Possibly, there are more than two definitions of the word in operation here. However, calling attention to the rough split that emerges when examining face-to-face and digital communication will hopefully start a conversation about the slipperiness, or changeability, of the term "social" when it is used across virtual and real-world instructional contexts.

The "Social" in Social Constructivist Theories

From shuttling to multiliteracies to communities of practice, socially situated and incidental learning, cultures-of-use, and

language socialization, a range of social constructivist theoretical frameworks inform the studies on multilingual writers' use of SNSs like Facebook. Thus, it is important to not only clarify the way "social" is used in social constructivism and social media, but also distinguish among its specific uses within the family of socially informed learning theories utilized in the studies summarized in Table 1. The theories do not all use "social" in exactly the same way, or to describe the same phenomena. Nevertheless, as will be shown, the social constructivist theories in this group of ELL Facebook studies tend to use "social" in a way that emphasizes integration, or the coming together of different cultures, language uses, communication practices, and linguistic norms to relay messages across diverse populations.

DePew (2011) applied Canagarajah's theory of "shuttling" to an analysis of three case studies detailing developmental writers' Facebook use. As DePew's study shows, despite academia's labels and expectations, "developmental" multilingual writers possess sophisticated rhetorical skills that alternative platforms like Facebook can showcase. Canagarajah used the term "shuttling" to describe the back-and-forth movement multilingual writers use as they negotiate the demands of written communication in multiple languages (DePew, 2011, p. 58). A term that connotes dynamism, action, and skill, shuttling contrasts with the immobility associated with deficit models of literacy, as DePew explains. Shuttling requires fine-tuned audience awareness and familiarity with the conventions of different discourse communities. Shuttling is social in the sense that it occurs in order to enable communication with other members of diverse communities: An individual seeks to convey a message to an audience dominated

by speakers of differing socio-cultural and linguistic backgrounds. There is a pragmatic aspect to shuttling and non-native speakers and their communication partners must troubleshoot misunderstandings that arise when moving from one language to another. Finally, shuttling posits a social environment that grants individuals agency, since as DePew explains, standards are less important than the speakers' abilities to negotiate meaning and understand one another's messages.

DePew and Miller-Cochran (2010) used the New London Group's concept of multiliteracies to interpret their findings of L2 writers' use of Facebook and several other SNSs. The researchers understood SNSs to be "culturally constructed spaces" (p. 289). In order to communicate across and within these spaces, users choose from a variety of different types of "social participation," including text, images, videos, friends lists, widgets, and apps (p. 274). Multiliteracies in this context refers to users' ability to craft online identities by drawing upon the various resources provided by the SNS. Multiliteracies suggest that the ability to express oneself in different forms is advantageous, a skill that a socially networked world demands: "As writers interact with their audiences through Web 2.0 technologies they use multiple literate practices to publicly display the choices they want their audiences to make when identifying them" (p. 275). In addition to consuming this multimodal content, "The audience also participates in composing the writer's identity" (p. 275). Thus, multiliteracies posit a kind of social experience in which self-expression occurs collaboratively. At the center of this activity lies the reciprocal conveyance of a co-constructed self-identity, as users remain constantly and actively involved in one another's self-construction.

Utilizing theories of incidental and socially situated learning as well as communities of practice as a framework, Kabilan, Ahmad, and Abidin (2010) conducted a survey investigation of Facebook's relevance to undergraduate learners of English in Malaysia. While incidental learning does not always need to involve social interaction, it can. Kabilan et al. draw connections between this type of knowledge acquisition and socially situated learning, arriving at a model in which opportunities to learn through interactions with others arise organically in settings that are not necessarily academic, but that permit "meaningful interactions between learners that lead to knowledge construction" (p. 181). The researchers also see social networking itself as a site of potential learning through interacting with others in the shared network: "In such a community [as that described by Wenger, 1998], learning involves meaning negotiation and finding, mutual engagement in action, community building and identity construction" (p. 181). Here, the term "social" refers to a situation in which people are in close proximity with one another due to a shared project or common goal. As in social constructivism, individuals achieve understanding through interactions and negotiations with one another. In such situations, as Kabilan et al. explain, *social* implies that writers have "an audience of their peers," which "is the most meaningful forum out there (Kitsis, 2008)" (p. 184).

Offering additional instances of locally negotiated meaning, Mitchell (2012) drew on the cultures-of-use theory to interpret case study data from nine ESL students' Facebook use. This theory proposes a social realm in which micro-worlds of like-minded co-inhabitants exist alongside other groups that have different conventions but are similarly united by shared local customs. Translating this scheme to the online realm, cultures-of-use says that people develop standards amongst themselves as they interact in various groups online, as Mitchell explains. Mitchell found that the conventions users developed for navigating the SNS were co-constructed with other users, but differed widely amongst the study subjects, each of whom had his or her own cultures-of-use for the site particular to a given friends circle. The "social" realm here consists of users joined together with others who share their interests and goals, devising their own norms for navigating the SNS—norms that are highly contextualized and dependent on members' continued affiliation.

Reinhardt and Zander (2011) focused on language socialization as they explored the ways in which Facebook use encouraged students to interact with one another and develop "transcultural, plurilingual identities" (p. 326). Language socialization sees the learning of a target language and immersion in the target language's culture as occurring hand-in-hand. In addition, according to this theory, language learning and cultural understanding actually co-construct one another. Thus, it is impossible to split up one's acquisition of a language and enculturation in a particular set of the target language's societal norms. In this process, "additional languages, codes, or varieties are also learned through socialization (Duff, in press; Watson-Gegeo, 2004; Watson-Gegeo & Nielsen, 2003)" (p. 328). Like Kabilan et al. (2010), Reinhardt and Zander utilized the communities of practice model. The researchers catalogued the different capabilities of the site, like messaging and social gaming, to show how Facebook permits users to "develop, maintain, strengthen—and damage—social bonds and affiliations, both real and virtual" (p. 327).

Further, they argued that SNS activities are social practices because they "may be shared by communities of individuals (Scribner & Cole as cited in Knobel & Lankshear, 2008)" (p. 327). The literacy practices that evolve from the site facilitate language socialization and in a broad sense rely on virtual communities of people interacting in ways that parallel real-life enculturation practices for language acquisition.

The social constructivist approach that informed Shih's (2011) study helped the researcher examine the effectiveness of integrating Facebook into an English writing classroom in Taiwan. Shih viewed the SNS as an environment in which the activities might be transportable to the real world, citing research showing that "Communication and relationships initially generated in the virtual environment can be brought into the classroom (McCarthy, 2010)" (p. 830). Shih asked students to post messages to the class group's wall and then peer-edit responses. When giving feedback, students often used emoticons, which Shih explained made the critiques less harsh and allowed students to preserve existing friendships. This anecdote exemplifies how Shih's study, even more so than Reinhardt and Zander's (2011), defines "social" in a way that blurs the lines between virtual and real-life worlds and in effect suggests the different worlds may be brought closer together through SNS use.

Whether in the form of shuttling (DePew, 2011), multiliteracies (DePew & Miller-Cochran, 2010) or cultures-of-use (Mitchell, 2012), the social constructivist learning theories applied in an ELL classroom context assert that meaning can be negotiated across differing groups; adhering to "norms" is less important than being able to figure out strategies for communicating with classmates in various linguistic contexts. Similarly, incidental and socially situated learning, as well as communities of practice (Kabilan, Ahmad, and Abidin, 2010), language socialization (Reinhardt and Zander, 2011), and Shih's (2011) application of social constructivism depend on people assembling in groups and assisting one another in reaching greater understanding of their written communication. Learning occurs alongside the acclimatization of new members to the established norms and culture(s) of a given group. Altogether, the social constructivist theories utilized in the studies of ELL learners on Facebook repeatedly emphasized community-building, cross-cultural communication, and co-construction of meaning and identities. Thus, "social" here suggests that people are in proximity to one another, building cultural and linguistic bridges as they work toward achieving understanding of one another's communications.

The "Social" in Social Media

At first glance, the concept of "social" operating in social media sites seems synonymous with the notion of "social" at work in social constructivist learning theories: SNSs, after all, create an environment in which many different users make profiles and manipulate the sites' functions for the ostensible purpose of linking up with other users and sharing content. For example, Aydin (2012) defines a social networking site as a "platform used by individuals" that "focuses on building and reflecting social relations in accordance with interests and/or activities" (p. 1093). Perhaps in its ideal or intended sense, social media connects people in productive ways.

Table 1
Overview of empirical studies conducted on English Language Learner Facebook use in higher education

	Facebook Focus	Population (total #)	First language (# of students)	Site	Method	Theory
Prichard (2013)	Training in effective use	Intermediate English students (41)	Japanese	Japan	Action research	--
Mitchell (2012)	Motivation to use	Intensive English Program (IEP) students (9)	Arabic (5); Mandarin (2); Korean (1); Spanish (1)	U.S.	Case study	Cultures-of-use
DePew (2011)	Writing strategies	Developmental writers (3)	Gujarati (2); Spanish (1)	U.S.	Case study	Shuttling (Canagarajah)
Reinhardt & Zander (2011)	As literacy practice	IEP students (11)	Chinese (5); Arabic (4); Spanish (1); German (1)	U.S.	Mixed qualitative/ quantitative	Language socialization
Shih (2011)	Writing skills; peer assessment	First-year English majors (23)	Chinese	Taiwan	Mixed qualitative/ quantitative	Social constructivism
DePew & Miller-Cochran (2010)	Composing identities	College senior (1); Graduate students (2)	Russian (1); Thai (1); Hindi (1)	U.S.	Case study	Multiliteracies
Kabilan, Ahmad, & Abidin (2010)	English language learning potentials	Randomly selected undergrads (300)	Bahasa Malaysia	Malaysia	Survey	Incidental & socially situated learning; Communities of Practice

Certainly, social media relies and thrives on real world relationships, since users join the networks in order to connect with friends they already have. For example, in one case study from Mitchell (2012), a student, Nina, "used Facebook for social reasons. Socially, she was fascinated with the possibilities Facebook gave her to reconnect with old friends and stay informed about her friends' lives" (p. 479).

But, this linking up with existing, real life friends can quickly lead to the formation of "insular groups" (Mitchell, 2012, p. 472). And, the ELL students who participated in Mitchell's research did not make new friends during the course of the study, including the students who expressed a desire to do so (p. 484). Whereas theories like shuttling or language socialization involve individuals reaching across

linguistic and cultural thresholds to connect and interact with others from different communities, social networking can potentially discourage such actions, reinforce divisions, and compromise students' abilities to learn from those in the target language's culture.

As Kabilan et al. (2010) observed, "the students' initial aim to become members of the FB community is not to learn and improve their language and communication skills but to socialize" (p. 184). Not that one type of interaction (real life) eclipses the other (virtual), but the exchanges taking place on Facebook serve a different purpose than the interactions occurring in a social constructivist-informed classroom activity, and they are not guided by the same goals and intentions. As one anonymous respondent in Kabilan et al.'s study observed, Facebook was not conducive to learning English because it was, in the student's view, "only a field to share information or stories with friends" (p. 185). Perhaps under the guidance of the instructor and in an educational context the sharing of information and stories might be transformed into an opportunity for socially situated and incidental learning, but on its own such Facebook activity does not necessarily further these goals.

Facebook represents an entirely new communication medium, which has important implications for its use in the language and Composition classrooms. As Meikle (2010) observes, Facebook consists of "a weird blend of personal communication and public media" (p. 13). Meikle points out that with social media, the one-way broadcast model of communication intersects with the kind of two-way interactions that occur in face-to-face or mediated conversations (e.g. those taking place across phone lines). According to

Meikle, Facebook "mixes up the personal message with the message sent to nobody in particular" (p. 16). Facebook thus introduces a new kind of problem of audience that means a user does not know exactly who reads or is capable of reading his or her status updates and wall postings, yet has the illusion of control over such matters.

Even in cases where a user carefully tends his or her stable of friends, Meikle cautions "none of us can ever be entirely sure just how private a digital message is" (p. 20). Also, assuming users are consciously aware of the strange public/private blurring Meikle highlights, how does the indeterminacy of the audience impact students' composing processes? Sharpening the sense of what is at stake with such an unknowable readership, Meikle poses a troubling question: "who, precisely, are *they*? It's more than just a list of real-life friends, relatives, and colleagues, although it's that as well. It's more complicated than that—on Facebook, 'friend' is a metaphor" (p. 18). Because Facebook resists any straightforward apprehension of audience, it potentially influences what and how users write. "Social" here suggests that all possible audiences are always on call, always available to be (though not necessarily) engaged with one's writing.

While the concept of multiple audiences might suggest that Facebook has the capacity to actually enable integration instead of encouraging social fragmentation, Vejby and Wittkower (2010) point out that "Facebook isolates us behind our respective screens, while giving us an experience of being with others" (p. 100). The illusion of connecting with friends online thus becomes the biggest impediment for actual connection. In fact, the audience issue that Meikle (2010) describes encourages a

similar splintering of one's capacity for personal engagement online, because one reaches individuals either via broadcasts to the masses or tailored messages that may ultimately be held up for mass consumption, depending on where the text appears and the privacy settings applied to that discrete plot of profile space. Or, an individual blasts a status update to the masses, yet because of the structure of the network, that message gets filtered into individual recipient nodes; the "mass" never receives anything, but individuals receive a mass-message, as Meikle explains. Vejby and Wittkower further this notion of Facebook's drive toward fragmentation: "Facebook is often referred to as a social networking site, but is that really an appropriate description of it? Don't we spend most of our time on Facebook looking at profile pages while we sit *by ourselves* in front of a computer screen?" (p. 97). The tension between isolation and connection, mass- and one-to-one communication, makes Facebook communication more complicated than the term "social networking" implies.

Intersections, Disjunctions, and Revelations

As Fairweather and Halpern (2010) observe, "The Facebook community might not even be a real community—depending on how we define 'community'. At the very least, it's an *unusual* community" (p.191). And Facebook might not even be social, depending on how we define "social." Broadly, social constructivists use "social" to signify engaging with other learners such that increased knowledge and understanding result from the interaction. On Facebook, "social" comes to connote something more transient: an outward imitation of interaction that in reality reinforces people's separateness. Therefore, it would seem based on this analysis that Facebook's

rhetorical environment does not support the kind of getting-together that promotes learning for ELL students. Returning to Schuster's (2006) socially oriented conception of literacy, Facebook would seem to provide an unreliable mechanism for "mak[ing] oneself heard and felt" (p. 43). The network may not be able to consistently foster the types of mindful interactions necessary for developing students' written communication skills in the multilingual Composition classroom.

Some of the problem is that the types of writing Facebook encourages are mostly unique to the platform. For example, Butera (2010) shows how the "What's on your mind?" cue in the status update box invites a neverending refashioning of one's self that is unlike any real-life communicative experience. Certainly, it can conjure the familiar blank-page panic that other writing genres do: "the box can become oppressive. What if we have nothing to say?" (Butera, 2010, p. 207). But the box is also a constant reminder of Facebook's imperative to publish for "a possible audience who may or may not be paying attention to your exclamations, fears, and attempted humor" (Butera, 2010, p. 208). The tension between the impulsive attention seeking the box encourages and the (authentic?) identity (re)fashioning it demands may overwhelm or box out other writing goals.

But, perhaps this analysis of Facebook's social environment is overly reductive. Results from the studies cited here show successful communicative and learning experiences occurring on the SNS. For example, DePew (2011) describes the ways in which the students profiled in his study used Facebook to connect with others from their culture and create a "third space" within a social network populated by native speakers of the target language (p. 58).

While this may serve to reinforce the formation of "insular groups" (Mitchell, 2012, p. 472), it may also permit freer and/or fuller expression of various aspects of one's background that can then be used to promote cross-cultural dialogue and learning. Perhaps the successes documented by the researchers suggest that transforming social media into a space for learning partly hinges on the instructor's ability to design assignments that demand greater collaboration than the site itself asks of its users.

However, when Kabilan et al. (2010) observe that Facebook and other SNSs "provide authentic interaction and communication" (p. 183) and that Facebook can "easily and effectively enhance" a feeling of community and belonging among users (p. 185), it seems important to step back and question whether social media really does promote authenticity and such easy, effective enhancement of community. Perhaps it depends on the groups of users themselves and how they choose to navigate, interact with, and co-construct the site. But even when users have the best intentions, Vejby and Wittkower (2010) show how Facebook has the ability to cheapen the value of their social interactions:

> On a Debordian point of view, actual social bonding and conversations are falsified by modern technology, being replaced by a pseudo-world where representations are the predominant part of the social experience. Mere contemplation and passive observation and consumption have replaced actual communication, and social relations seem to become—to some extent at least—merely *looking* at other people,

transforming our friends, in our eyes, from active participating subjects into objects of interest and entertainment. (p. 102)

Facebook may be a generative tool, but it is important not to assume that the term "social" remains stable and refers to the same types of experiences when applied across different contexts and situations.

In their review of second language research focused on Web 2.0 tools, Wang and Vásquez (2012) found that only 9% of the empirical studies centered on social networking sites, indicating an opportunity for further research in this area. In addition, 56% of the studies conducted on Web 2.0 tools lacked an identifiable theoretical framework, as Wang and Vásquez reported. Of the studies that did have a theoretical framework, most were in the family of sociocultural/sociocognitive approaches; according to Wang and Vásquez, this trend aligns with the field's understanding of the computer as "a tool that mediates interactions between language learners and other humans" (p. 420). Additional inquiry is therefore needed into the ways these social constructivist theories do and do not map onto the landscape of social media. This paper only considered the existing research on Facebook and ELL multilingual writers in a postsecondary context, so additional analysis focused on other SNSs and student populations would further the discussion in valuable ways. In addition, studies focused on determining the types of assignments that work best within the particular environment of SNSs like Facebook would help neutralize the tension between the sometimes-competing goals of social media and social constructivism. Rather than abandoning SNSs, working within their limitations might create new

opportunities for student engagement and learning.

Researcher Bias: A Facebook Literacy Narrative

To provide a personal Facebook Timeline of sorts, I first heard about "thefacebook" about a year after its launch, just before starting college. My classmates and I—nearly all native English speakers—used the then college-only social network to friend and communicate with our future roommates and each other, so that when move-in day came at our respective colleges we would have links to past and present, insider knowledge about our own cohorts and each other's. For the purposes of this article, I wish I could remember what I wrote on friends' walls and vice versa, but all I can recall from my early social media days is a picture of a cat wearing a watermelon helmet—the mascot of a virtual group I joined, the name of which also escapes me. Ephemera.

I deactivated my account twice while an undergraduate, trying to negotiate the Web 2.0 tangle of private and public, fantasy and reality, faux-me and authentic-me, with all their awkward divisions. I found Facebook increasingly addictive, with the appearance of gimcrack apps, quizzes, feeds and ads. More importantly, Facebook founder Zuckerberg, in his continuous quest to "make the world more open and connected" (Facebook, 2014), made headlines for updating the site in ways that compromised users' privacy. But applying to jobs in the world of professional writing after graduating college, I could not escape social media. Ads from PR companies and editorial firms repeatedly called for expertise in SNSs; in this context, recruiters considered the active use of sites like Facebook and Twitter not mere distraction

but a desirable, resume-worthy skill. Somehow, in the span of a few years, opting out of Facebook had become not just socially but professionally risky.

How representative of Facebook's split personality! From the inside, it seems like a giant scrapbook—not so much a way of keeping in touch but of knitting together moments, of marking continuous points of intersection. From the outside, though as Scholz (2010) quips, "There is no outside" (p. 250), Facebook is yet another appendage of the marketing machine, a commercialized space that permits the site "to profit like mad from our active, addictive, and passive translation of our selves" (p. 248). With a similarly critical view, I stayed away from the site until last year, when I started working in my current position as a writing center graduate assistant and the facilitator of a student poetry club. I needed to rejoin Facebook to manage the club's official Page, so right now my pseudonymous personal profile is an empty shell. I have one friend, my supervisor, and I log on as an administrator to upload pictures and post status updates to the group's Timeline.

I take this responsibility seriously, but I am hesitant to invest once again in my personal and professional Facebook presence and network, for the reasons outlined above. And I am hesitant to use Facebook in the classroom. I must work very hard to overcome my original conception of the site as a menagerie of inside jokes. But perhaps as proof of Jung's aphoristic "what you resist persists," Facebook and the questions it raises for me about the dual private/public nature of online audiences, the way profiles scaffold the construction of digital alter egos, and the problems and possibilities these features spawn, persist.

References

Aydin, S. (2012). A review of research on facebook as an educational environment. *Educational Technology Research & Development, 60*, 1093-1106. doi:10.1007/s11423-012-9260-7

Butera, M. V. (2010). Gatekeeper, moderator, synthesizer. In D. E. Wittkower, (Ed.), *Facebook and Philosophy: What's on your mind?* (pp. 201-212). Chicago: Open Court.

Cuonzo, M. A. (2010). Gossip and the evolution of facebook. In D. E. Wittkower, (Ed.), *Facebook and Philosophy: What's on your mind?* (pp. 173-179). Chicago: Open Court.

DePew, K. E. (2011). Social media at academia's periphery: Studying multilingual developmental writers' facebook composing strategies. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal, 11*(1), 54-75. http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/january_2011/depew.pdf

DePew, K. E., & Miller-Cochran, S. (2010). Social networking in a second language: Engaging multiple literate practices through identity composition. In M. Cox, J. Jordan, C. Ortmeier-Hooper, & G. G. Schwartz, (Eds.), *Reinventing Identities in Second Language Writing* (pp. 273-295). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Facebook. (2014). Company Info. [Web page] Retrieved from http://newsroom.fb.com/company-info/

Fairweather, A., & Halpern, J. (2010). Do status updates have any value? In D. E. Wittkower, (Ed.), *Facebook and Philosophy: What's on your mind?* (pp. 191-199). Chicago: Open Court.

Hampton, K. N., Goulet, L. S., Marlow, C., & Rainie, L. (2012, February). *Why most Facebook users get more than they give: The effect of Facebook 'power users' on everybody else*. Pew Research Center Internet & American Life Project. Retrieved from Pew Research Center, Washington, D.C. website: http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2012/Facebook-users.aspx

Kabilan, M. K., Ahmad, N., & Abidin, M. J. Z. (2010). Facebook: An online environment for learning of English in institutions of higher education? *Internet and Higher Education, 13*, 179-187. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2010.07.003

Meikle, G. (2010). It's like talking to a wall. In D. E. Wittkower, (Ed.), *Facebook and Philosophy: What's on your mind?* (pp. 13-20). Chicago: Open Court.

Mitchell, K. (2012). A social tool: Why and how ESOL students use facebook. *CALICO Journal, 29*(3), 471-493. http://journals.sfu.ca/CALICO/index.php/calico/article/view/21

Prichard, C. (2013). Training L2 learners to use facebook appropriately and effectively. *CALICO Journal, 30*(2), 204-225. http://journals.sfu.ca/CALICO/index.php/calico/article/view/161

Reinhardt, J., & Zander, V. (2011). Social networking in an intensive English program classroom: A language socialization perspective. *CALICO Journal, 28*(2), 326-344. http://journals.sfu.ca/CALICO/index.php/calico/article/view/897

Scholz, T. (2010). facebook as playground and factory. In D. E. Wittkower, (Ed.), *Facebook and Philosophy: What's on your mind?* (pp. 241-252). Chicago: Open Court.

Schuster, C. (2006). The ideology of literacy: A Bakhtinian perspective. In P. Vandenberg, S. Hum, & J. Clary-Lemon (Eds.), *Relations, Locations, Positions: Composition Theory for Writing Teachers* (pp. 40-49). Urbana, IL: NCTE. (Reprinted from *The Right to Literacy*, pp. 225-232, by A. A. Lunsford, H. Moglen, & J. Slevin, Eds., 1990, New York: MLA)

Shih, R.-C. (2011). Can Web 2.0 technology assist college students in learning English writing? Integrating *Facebook* and peer assessment with blended learning. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 27*(5), 829-845. http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet27/shih.html

Vejby, R., & Wittkower, D. E. (2010). Spectacle 2.0? In D. E. Wittkower, (Ed.), *Facebook and Philosophy: What's on your mind?* (pp. 97-108). Chicago: Open Court.

Wang, S., & Vásquez, C. (2012). Web 2.0 and second language learning: What does the research tell us? *CALICO Journal, 29*(3), 412-430. http://journals.sfu.ca/CALICO/index.php/calico/article/view/25/35

About the Author

Kathleen Hynes is a Ph.D. candidate in Indiana University of Pennsylvania's Composition & TESOL program and Assistant Director of the Writing Center at IUP-Punxsutawney.