



Engagement and Attitude in Telecollaboration: Topic and cultural background effects

Ana Oskoz, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, USA

Ana Gimeno-Sanz, Universitat Politècnica de València, Spain

Abstract

This study examines the linguistic resources by which foreign language (L2) learners express their ideological positions in online discussions taking place in a telecollaborative encounter during one semester. More specifically, the study attempts to decipher how L2 learners discuss and argue their points of view regarding their first culture, their second culture, and the topic in general, depending on the issue under discussion (immigration and nationalism or patriotism) and to the country where the learners were based (US or Spain). Twenty-four learners, organized into six groups, each with two students from the US and two from Spain, participated in three online forums. For the analysis, learners' postings were subjected to quantitative and qualitative content analysis applying two discourse-semantic subsystems of the Appraisal framework, Engagement—the linguistic resources used to reflect the writer's position and willingness to recognize alternative positions—and Attitude—the linguistic resources used to indicate positive or negative assessment of people, places, things, and states of affairs. This study concludes that there were clear differences in the discursive styles between both sets of learners and topics. Overall, for instance, the learners employed more monoglossic statements when discussing nationalism or patriotism rather than immigration and Spain-based learners made more use of judgment markers than their US-based counterparts did.

Keywords: *Intercultural Telecollaborative Encounter, Appraisal Framework, Engagement, Attitude*

Language(s) Learned in This Study: *English and Spanish*

APA Citation: Oskoz, A., & Gimeno-Sanz, A. (2019). Engagement and Attitude in Telecollaboration: Topic and cultural background effects. *Language Learning & Technology*, 23(3), 136–160.
<http://hdl.handle.net/10125/44700>

Introduction

The steady increase in studies dealing with telecollaboration confirms a widespread interest in the potential of intercultural dialogue in second language (L2) education as a process involving “an open and respectful exchange of views between individuals and groups with different ethnic, cultural, religious, and linguistic backgrounds and heritage, on the basis of mutual understanding and respect” (Council of Europe, 2008, p. 17). By participating in international partnerships where, together with the instructor's help, learners read, analyze, and reflect on specific topics, learners are expected to develop intercultural awareness (Bauer, de Benedette, Furstenberg, Levet, & Waryn, 2006). These studies have demonstrated that, to different extents, the interactions help L2 learners develop or demonstrate their intercultural competence (Chun, 2011; Elola & Oskoz, 2008; L. Lee, 2018; Schenker, 2012). Methodologically, most of these studies have frequently been “characterized primarily in alinguistic terms” (Belz, 2003, p. 69), employing mixed-method quantitative and qualitative analyses consisting of student opinion questionnaires, interviews, and content analysis of learner entries (Benson, 2015; Garrett-Rucks, 2013). Yet, given the interactive nature of telecollaboration and its potential for misunderstandings resulting from different communication styles (O'Dowd, 2008), it is relevant to examine the linguistic choices students from different cultural backgrounds make when interacting in a technology-rich telecollaborative environment.

Indeed, there is a growing body of literature that explores how L2 learners' discourse practices reflect their engagement with their audience and their attitudes in these telecollaborative interactions (Belz, 2002, 2003; Oskoz & Pérez-Broncano, 2016; Oskoz, Gimeno-Sanz, & Sevilla-Pavón, 2018; Ryshina-Pankova, 2014, 2018; Vinagre & Corral, 2018). Building upon the *Appraisal* framework, which examines the linguistic resources by which interlocutors express, negotiate, and naturalize particular inter-subjective or ideological positions (Martin & White, 2005; White, 1998, 2015), this study examines the extent to which discursive practices vary, on the one hand depending, on the topic under discussion (immigration and nationalism or patriotism) and, on the other, on the country where the learners are based. More specifically, the study examines how L2 learners discuss and argue their viewpoints regarding their first culture (C1), their second culture (C2), and the topic (T) under discussion in general, as well as how they employ attitudinal markers when talking about their C1, C2, and T in their online discussions. To this end, *Engagement* and *Attitude*, two discourse-semantic subsystems of the *Appraisal* framework (Martin & White, 2005), offer a fitting framework to illustrate discourse strategies that are recurrent in online forum discussions (McCabe, 2017; Oskoz & Pérez-Broncano, 2016; Oskoz et al., 2018). Ultimately, as described in the conclusion, the findings have pedagogical implications as they reinforce the need to make learners who participate in an intercultural exchange project aware of the differences brought about by culturally marked linguistic traditions affecting written discourse.

Appraisal Framework

Increasingly used to examine L2 learners' discourse, the *Appraisal* framework is divided into three different domains: *Engagement*, *Attitude*, and *Graduation*. *Engagement* refers to “those resources by which a text references, invokes, and negotiates with the various alternative social positions put at risk by a text's meanings” (White, 1998, p. 13). It reflects the writer's position as well as his or her willingness to recognize alternative socio-semiotic positions (White, 2015). *Attitude* refers to the linguistic resources by which a speaker “indicates positive or negative assessment of people, places, things, happenings, and states of affairs” (White, 2015, n. p.). *Graduation*, which provides a scaling for the values of judgment, has not been taken into account in this study because the focus lays on how ideas are conveyed rather than the intensity of the learners' evaluative stances.

Within *Engagement*, Martin and White (2005) distinguished between monoglossic statements, or bare assertions in which the writer presents the “current position as one which has no dialogistic alternatives which need to be recognized” (Martin & White, 2005, p. 99), and heteroglossic statements (see [Appendix A](#) for examples), which reference or recognize alternative positions. In a telecollaborative encounter between the US and Spain, Oskoz et al. (2018) found that, overall, L2 learners participating in the interaction presented a higher presence of heteroglossic discourse strategies—those in which learners did not present propositions as facts hindering dialogistic alternatives—and fewer monoglossic strategies—which do not allow for negotiation. The higher presence of heteroglossic statements illustrates L2 learners' openness toward participating in a dialogic space that brings together different opinions and perspectives. In particular, the lower presence of monoglossic statements when addressing another culture might suggest that L2 learners do not feel that it is their place to provide strong or controversial statements about another culture (Oskoz et al., 2018). Additionally, Belz (2003) illustrated how the use of monoglossic or heteroglossic statements could be a cultural indicator, with her German students using more bald categorical assertions to discuss either their own cultural behavior or that of their American counterparts.

Within heteroglossic statements, Ryshina-Pankova (2014) suggested that when developing argumentative essays, there is a need for a balance between *contracting strategies* (i.e. the extent to which an utterance “acts to challenge, fend off or restrict the scope of such (dialogic contraction)” (Martin & White, 2005, p. 102)), and *expanding strategies*, (i.e. “the degree to which an utterance, by dint of one or more of these locutions, actively makes allowances for dialogically alternative positions and voices” (Martin & White, 2005, p. 102)). Yet, in McCabe's (2017) opinion, the use of expanding versus contracting strategies may be the result of students' discursive goals. While more expanding strategies might be needed to develop

successful argumentative essays (Ryshina-Pankova, 2014; Swain, 2010), in an online forum, where students interact with one another to discuss and display content knowledge, learners might be more likely to present contracting statements (McCabe, 2017). However, in a telecollaborative environment, where learners may wish to present an open attitude toward the views of the others, Oskoz et al. (2018) and Oskoz and Gimeno-Sanz (in press) illustrated how L2 learners engaged in more expanding strategies and were more inclined to avoid dialogically contractive strategies that limited the negotiation space (Wu & Allison, 2005). Furthermore, L2 learners made frequent use of the *Entertain* marker (i.e. “wordings by which the authorial voice indicates that its position is but one of a number of possible positions and thereby makes dialogic space for other possibilities” (Martin & White, 2005, p. 102)) and of the *Attribution* marker (i.e. “formulations which disassociate the proposition from the text’s internal authorial voice by attributing it to some external source” (Martin & White, 2005, p. 111)). That is, either by softening their statements with markers such as *I think* or by referring to external sources or to their partners’ comments, L2 learners create a dialogic space in the telecollaborative environment that recognizes different socio-semiotic alternative realities (White, 1998). However, S. H. Lee (2010) argued that a predominant presence of expanding strategies in written essays might indicate a lack of responsibility for the content provided or a more superficial knowledge that shows a lack of assimilation of knowledge or ownership of the message. Another possibility is that a higher use of contractive strategies might indicate L2 learners’ failure to negotiate in the telecollaborative interactions.

Turning our attention to the second component of the Appraisal model, Attitude can be further divided into *Affect*, *Judgment*, and *Appreciation* (see [Appendix B](#) for examples). *Affect* refers to the evaluation by means of the interlocutor inviting their “audience to share that emotional response, or at least to see that response as appropriate and well-motivated, or [...] as understandable” (White, 1998, p. 145–46). *Judgment* refers to “the evaluation of human behaviour with respect to social norms” (White, 2015, n.p.) and *Appreciation*, to “the evaluation of objects and products (rather than human behaviour) by reference to aesthetic principles and other systems of social value” (White, 2015, n.p.). All of these categories can bear positive and negative values and are further subdivided, as illustrated in [Appendix B](#).

Regarding the presence of these markers in L2 learners’ discourse in telecollaborative encounters, Vinagre and Corral (2017) found that their learners used more Affective markers than Judgment and Appreciation markers. They attributed the high presence of affective markers and a tendency to use positive Affective markers to the learners’ desire “to establish friendly, close, and supportive working relationships that can facilitate the creation of a relaxed and safe learning environment, which in turn fosters collaboration” (p. 11). Similarly, Liaw and English (2017) also found that their Taiwanese and French learners “tried to project themselves as possessing the desirable characteristics for effective relationship and connectedness building” (p. 84), albeit using different communication strategies. Vinagre and Suárez (2018) also suggest that their German and Spanish learners tended to use positive affective strategies to develop closeness, friendship and solidarity links with their virtual exchange partners. Overall, L2 learners’ tendency to use positive affective language supports the idea of the need to create a close and friendly atmosphere in virtual environments for effective collaboration and learning to take place (Morand & Ocker, 2003; Vinagre, 2008).

While above-mentioned studies have determined that L2 learners tend to show positive affective markers to create a friendly environment (Vinagre & Corral, 2017), research examining Judgment and Appreciation has found that cultural differences between groups might be manifested in different ways. Vinagre and Corral (2017), for instance, found that Spanish learners tended to use more Judgment markers than their American partners. Belz (2003) illustrated how American learners tended to use more positive Appreciation and positive Evaluation markers than their German counterparts did. Both Belz and Vinagre and Corral suggest that there might have been cultural differences behind these behaviors. For example, in Spanish culture, being critical (i.e., making value judgements about specific behaviors, ideas, and opinions) is considered a positive trait; however, in US culture, as Vinagre and Corral point out, being critical and opinionated are considered to be negative personality traits. Following House’s (2000) continua of interactional patterns, Belz (2003) found her Germany-based learners to be more direct, explicit and likely

to provide *ad hoc* formulations while the US-based students were more indirect and used more linguistic routines to express their ideas. The different discursive patterns, Belz suggested, might bring conflict and create an environment that could result in less successful interaction.

In addition to cultural patterns, the topic under discussion can also influence the presence of attitudinal and engagement markers. This would explain why, contrary to McCabe's (2017) findings based on students' online interactions, Oskoz and Pérez-Broncano (2016) found a higher presence of expanding strategies than contracting strategies in their students' online forum interactions. While the learners in McCabe (2017) focused on class topics relating to Spanish language and teaching, learners in Oskoz and Pérez-Broncano (2016) focused on topics such as immigration, which may have required learners to provide less categorical and fewer contractive assertions. The topic would also explain why, in a telecollaborative environment, Oskoz and Gimeno-Sanz (in press) found a higher presence of Appreciation and Judgment markers compared to those indicating Affect, whereas Vinagre and Corral (2017) found affective markers to be most frequent. Oskoz and Gimeno-Sanz's (in press) topics, immigration and nationalism or patriotism, may well have encouraged learners to address both the consequences of laws and policies as well as societal behaviors. Yet, Vinagre and Corral (2017) also suggested that even though their learners presented a preference for positive markers, controversial topics or situations, such as health systems or immigration, are more likely to encourage L2 learners to present negative values towards these.

It seems, therefore, that group (determined by nationality) and topic may have an influence on L2 learners' discussions. Given the increased attention that telecollaborative encounters attract, it is necessary to understand the extent to which both group and topic can influence L2 learners' discourse strategies. This study thus examines:

1. How do L2 learners from the US and Spain negotiate their ideological position (Engagement), when referring to culture one (C1), culture two (C2), and topic (T) in asynchronous telecollaborative interactions?
2. How do L2 learners from the US and Spain deploy attitudinal markers (Affect, Judgment, and Appreciation), when referring to C1, C2, and T in asynchronous online interactions?
3. How do L2 learners negotiate their ideological position (Engagement), depending on the topic (immigration and nationalism or patriotism), when referring to C1, C2, and T in telecollaborative asynchronous interactions?
4. How do L2 learners deploy attitudinal markers (Affect, Judgment, and Appreciation), depending on the topic, when referring to C1, C2, and T in asynchronous telecollaborative interactions?

Methodology

This study draws on a larger telecollaborative project (Oskoz et al., 2018; Oskoz & Gimeno-Sanz, in press) conducted throughout one semester between a technical university in Spain and an East-coast university in the US.

Participants

There were two groups of students: twelve U.S. students enrolled in a 3rd-year, 3-credit Spanish history and culture class that was a requirement for their major or minor in Spanish and twelve Spanish students, who were majoring in aerospace engineering and had enrolled in an optional 3rd-year, 6-credit higher intermediate English language class. However, only 3 of these credits were devoted to the telecollaborative project. Between both groups, there were 12 male and 12 female students and they were all between 17 and 24 years of age.

According to the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (Council of Europe, 2001), the US-based students' level of Spanish proficiency ranged between B2 and C1, while the Spanish students' level of English proficiency ranged between B2 and C2. These levels were determined by each of the instructors upon conducting an in-house proficiency assignment. The US-based class focused on the history

and culture of Spain, whereas the class in Spain focused on developing language fluency and improving communication skills. Each group of students therefore followed its own curricular program to address their respective learning objectives. Nonetheless, because both courses also focused on addressing issues of social justice from a historical, political and economic perspective, the instructors deemed it appropriate to connect their learners so they could discuss the selected topics from different cultural perspectives.

Procedures

Once preliminary introductions had been made, learners were organized into six groups, each one with two participants from the US and two from Spain. The six groups of students participated in three discussions, each of which took place over a period of two weeks, within a purposefully created private Google+ community, an asynchronous tool that allowed participants to discuss the different topics. The first discussion focused on the video “The Danger of a Single Story” by Chimanda Adichie (2009). This discussion, focusing on stereotypes, was not considered for the study since students were also learning how to communicate and interact with one another in the telecollaborative environment. The second and third discussions (analyzed in this study) focused on (a) immigration and (b) nationalism or patriotism. The discussions on immigration took place entirely in Spanish and those on nationalism or patriotism took place entirely in English in order to allow all the students to interact in the target language.

Each of the cultural discussions was initiated in class and was guided by the instructors, who provided links and articles to encourage the conversation. Both groups used the same links and articles as a starting point. After the initial in-class warm-up, learners continued the online discussion in their respective groups for a fortnight. The topics of immigration and nationalism or patriotism were prominent in the news in both countries due to presidential elections going on in the US, Catalan calls for independence in Spain, and immigration laws being questioned in Spain due to the so-called “refugee crisis” in Europe. Following Arnold and Ducate (2006), Oskoz (2009, 2013), and Weasenforth, Biesenbach-Lucas, and Meloni (2002) each group was assigned a leader for each topic whose mission it was to initiate and ensure an on-going debate. All of the group members were required to provide personal opinions and share personal experiences, integrate ideas from their classmates’ contributions into their own comments, search for additional information, and ask questions that would help maintain the conversation. All of the learners were required to post a minimum of four comments on each topic.

Analysis

Learners’ postings were subjected to quantitative and qualitative content analysis using the Appraisal model (Martin & White, 2005). To examine Attitude, the researchers used the T-unit, that is, a “main clause with all subordinate clauses attached to it” (Hunt, 1965, p. 20), as the element of analysis. The T-unit was selected because “these units are the shortest grammatically allowable sentences into which the theme could be segmented” (Hunt, 1965, p. 21). Within each T-unit, the researchers looked for lexico-grammatical items (adverbs, adjectives, verbs, and nominalizations), that is, a single word, a part of a word, or a chain of words that form the basic elements of a language lexicon.

To start with, the researchers categorized a T-unit according to its primary focus; that is, C1, C2, or general statements referring to the topic under discussion (T) without focusing on either C1 or C2. In those instances in which a single utterance simultaneously referred to C1, C2, or T, it was counted twice or three times, as required. C1, it must be noted, referred to the U.S. culture for the American students whilst C2 referred to Spanish culture and this was reversed for the Spanish students. There were two participants, though, one from the US and one from Spain, who made references to belonging to two different cultures. In those cases, references to both their cultures counted as C1.

Second, the researchers examined whether the T-units were monoglossic or heteroglossic, distinguishing in the latter case whether the statements could be imbued with the voices of others, either through an expansion strategy or through a contraction strategy. Vinagre and Corral (2017) counted lexical items such as *I believe*, *I think*, and *in my opinion*, as part of Attitude (Judgment + > Veracity +). Yet, in this study, these markers were considered to indicate the learners’ engagement and ideological position towards their

own statements. Accordingly, these markers were considered Expanding strategies, specifically falling in the subcategory of Entertain, thus voicing dialogic alternatives. It must be noted that, as illustrated in the following example, an utterance could present more than one Engagement marker.

I think (T > Expand > Entertain) it [not demonstrating their sense of patriotic spirit] (Expand > Attribute > Acknowledge classmate) is very much the opposite from here in the United States (Alicia, US, Online forum).

Third, the T-units were coded as either expressing positive or negative emotions or values. In cases where there was no inherently positive or negative lexical item, decisions were made based on the context of the conversation. Fourth, the researchers decided whether each T-unit represented Affect, Judgment or Appreciation. Note that, as Iedema, Feez, and White (1994) pointed out, the sub-categories of Judgment and Appreciation can be *inscribed* in texts when the evaluation is explicitly stated by means of a lexical item carrying a Judgment value (such as the word *worse* in the text “Nationalism is a radical version, you think that other countries are worse than yours”), or they may be *tokens* when Judgment is evoked by superficially neutral ideational meanings (such as “I mean, we have our current flag and it is in every government building, but we don’t do anything like the pledging allegiance to the flag”), which evoke Judgment responses from the reader. Tokens, therefore, “assume shared social norms” (White, 1998, p. 35), which a reader will interpret according to their own cultural and ideological positioning. Here again, each T-unit can represent more than one Attitude marker. Take, for example, these two units:

You don’t know how ashamed I feel (misery) knowing that such a cruel act (quality -) as bull fighting is what crosses everyone’s mind (normality +) when they think about my country.... (Pedro, Spain, Online forum 1)

Bednarek (2009), Ngo and Unsworth (2015), and Su and Hunston (forthcoming) have all pointed out some of the difficulties of applying the system of Attitude as defined by Martin and White (2005). In line with Bednarek’s (2009) study, when analyzing the data, the coders took into account both the lexis and the context in which a thing or situation is appreciated or a person or behavior judged. Ngo and Unsworth (2015) proposed a redefinition of some of the subcategories within Affect (e.g., surprise, fear) and Appreciation (e.g., valuation). Although this study analyzed the data following Martin and White’s (2005) categories, Ngo and Unsworth’s (2015) redefined categories helped the coders in cases where an instance did not clearly fall into one of Martin and White’s (2015) suggested categories.

In the initial stages of data analysis, inter-rater reliability was sought first by discussing the framework and then coding 20% of the data (from the Spanish and the English versions), comparing results, and discussing inconsistencies. Cohen’s κ was run to determine the level of agreement between the two independent raters on whether the speech units were reliably or unreliably analyzed. After discussion, there was very strong agreement between the two raters, $\kappa = 1.000$, $p < .0005$. Subsequently, once the categories had been agreed upon, one of the researchers coded both the Spanish and the English versions. Independent *t*-tests were utilized to analyze the data. This study only reports on the significant results. Cohen *d* sizes for the significant differences regarding means between the two groups of learners or between the two topics were small, except when noted in the Results section.

Results

The first research question examined how L2 learners negotiate their ideological position (Engagement), depending on the group, when referring to C1, C2, and T in telecollaborative asynchronous interactions. There is evidence to conclude that Spain-based students used significantly more monoglossic statements ($t_{(298)} = 3.37$, $p < 0.05$ and $t_{(83)} = 1.04$, $p < 0.05$) when discussing their C1 or that of their telecollaborative partners compared to their US-based counterparts.

Within heteroglossic statements (see Table 1, Appendix C), both when referring to their C1 or that of their telecollaborative counterparts, Spain-based students used more contractive statements ($t_{(298)} = 2.38$, $p < 0.05$

and $t_{(83)} = 4.19, p < 0.05$ respectively) than the US-based students while the US-based students produced significantly more expanding statements when addressing their C1 and that of their telecollaborative counterparts ($t_{(298)} = .50, p = 0.05$ and $t_{(83)} = -4.65, p < 0.05$, respectively). Looking into the subcategories within expanding and contracting statements, when discussing their C1, that of their counterparts or the topic in general, US-based students employed more Entertain ($t_{(298)} = -3.32, p < 0.05, t_{(83)} = -2.44, p = 0.04$ and $t_{(99)} = -1.72, p < 0.05$) and Attribute ($t_{(298)} = -2.59, p < 0.05, t_{(83)} = -1.76, p = 0.02$ and $t_{(99)} = -1.61, p = 0.03$) strategies than the Spain-based students. This group used significantly more *Proclaim* statements when discussing their own and the U.S. culture ($t_{(298)} = 1.17, p = 0.02$ and $t_{(83)} = 5.58, p < 0.05$ respectively) and *Disclaim* statements ($t_{(298)} = 1.83, p < 0.05$) when addressing their own C1.

The qualitative analysis provided us with further insights. Not only did US-based students employ more expanding strategies than their Spain-based counterparts, they also used them differently. As seen in Excerpt 1, U.S. students often included references to external sources, in particular from articles, either from journals or the web, to provide a definition or data to support their ideas. That is, although these students also referred to their classmates' comments, US-based students tended to rely on established sources to support their opinions or provide alternative views. (See English translations in [Appendix D](#)).

Excerpt 1

En nuestra última conversación comenzamos hablar de la única historia de la inmigración (T > Expand > Attribute > Acknowledge classmate) y cómo afecta nuestros vistos de los países de España y EE.UU. (C1 and C2 > Expand > Attribute > Acknowledge classmate). Según el Diccionario de Webster (T > Expand > Attribute > External sources), un diccionario inglés muy confiable por los hablantes de inglés, inmigración es el acto de llegar a un país que no es un nativo para obtener la residencia permanente. Con esta definición de inmigración, tenemos que pensar de los siguientes: los estereotipos de los inmigrantes y ¿cómo afectan las relaciones entre los inmigrantes y los nativos en el país? (T > Expand > Attribute > Entertain) (David, US, Online forum).

Spain-based students also made references to external sources “Por lo que se puede apreciar en las noticias, en Estados Unidos la situación es similar por los comentarios que realiza Trump.” [According to what can be seen on the news, the situation in the US is similar because of Trump's statements]. Yet, as seen in Excerpt 2, they were more likely to revisit content from their classmates' contributions or to acknowledge what other people said, without searching for alternative views from external sources such as articles. These students, despite providing their opinions using instances such as *I think* or *I believe*, were also more likely to provide their own opinion using contracting strategies, in particular *Proclaim*, without employing these mitigating markers.

Excerpt 2

Respondiendo a lo que ha comentado David, aquí en España el tema de la inmigración está muy presente (C1 > Contract > Proclaim), puesto que recibimos a gente de diferentes países. Estas personas buscan inmigrar a España (C1 > Contract > Proclaim) porque consideran que tendrán una vida mejor que la que tienen en su país (T > Expand > Attribute > Acknowledge external sources). La reacción de los españoles frente a que cada vez hallan más inmigrantes es negativa (C1 > Contract > Proclaim). Esta ideología la justifican (C1 > Contract > Proclaim) alegando que estas personas procedentes de otros países nos quitan los trabajos (C1 > Expand > Attribute > Distance external sources), y que por ello el país no sale de la crisis económica en la que se encuentra (C1 > Expand > Attribute > Distance external sources) (Paco, Spain, Online forum).

With regard to the second question, the study explored whether L2 learners deploy attitudinal markers differently according to the group, when referring to C1, C2, and T in asynchronous online interactions. When addressing their C1 (see [Table 2](#), [Appendix C](#)), the US-based learners used significantly more Affect ($t_{(790)} = -1.114, p = 0.03$) and Appreciation ($t_{(790)} = -1.000, p = 0.04$) markers while Spanish students used significantly more Judgment markers ($t_{(790)} = 2.849, p < 0.05$). US-based students, for example, presented

affective markers such as “*Me gusta mucho ver la diversidad en mi propia comunidad.*” [I really like to see diversity in my own community] or “*I enjoy riding a bike and spending the day out in DC*”, and Appreciation markers such as “*hay una connotación negativa con la palabra ‘inmigración’*” [There is a negative connotation to the word ‘immigration’] or “...as you bash the other side with *hurtful stereotypes*” (emphasis added). In terms of Judgment, Spain-based students made comments such as “*Lo que no comprenden es que la inmigración nos aporta variedad cultural.*” [What they don’t understand is that immigration gives us cultural variety] or “*The ones from Cataluña declare themselves as citizens from a different country*” (emphasis added). When referring to C2, however, US-based students produced significantly more Appreciation markers ($t_{(192)} = -1.219, p = 0.016$) while the Spain-based students produced more Affect ($t_{(192)} = 2.03, p < 0.05$) and Judgment markers ($t_{(192)} = 1.577, p = 0.02$). Regarding Appreciation, US-based students made comments such as “*del mismo modo que los inmigrantes vienen a España en condiciones inhumanas*” [in the same way that immigrants come to Spain in inhumane conditions] or “*in Spain people are not used to demonstrating their sense of patriotic spirit*” (emphasis added). Regarding Affect, students from Spain made comments such as “*una de las cosas que más me gusta de las veces que he viajado a Estados Unidos es que encuentras personas de muchas culturas diferentes conviviendo.*” [One of the things I like the most about the times I’ve traveled to the United States is that you find people from many different cultures living together] or “*here there isn’t that love that you have for your flag, what I really admire.*” (emphasis added) In terms of Judgment, Spain-based students presented statements such as “*No entiendo como alguien que piensa así puede haber llegado hasta las elecciones y tenga opciones de ganarlas.*” [I do not understand how someone who thinks this way has arrived to the elections and have options to win them] or “*It’s incredible that so many people had voted for Trump.*” (emphasis added). In terms of T, the US-based students used significantly more Affect ($t_{(291)} = -1.949, p < 0.05$) and Appreciation ($t_{(291)} = -4.062, p < 0.05$) linguistic markers while their Spain-based counterparts used more Judgment ($t_{(291)} = -1.173, p = 0.21$) markers.

In terms of the categories within Judgment (see Table 3, Appendix C), when referring to C1, Spain-based students predominantly used more *Normality* ($t_{(790)} = 2.1, p < 0.005$) and *Propriety* ($t_{(790)} = 1.4, p = 0.04$) features than their US-based counterparts. When referring to their C1, students from Spain made comments such as “*Para los españoles, un español que inmigre a otro país (como puede ser Alemania) está bien visto.*” [For Spaniards, a Spaniard who immigrates to another country (such as Germany) is acceptable] or “*España es un país que no aprecia lo que tiene como debería (Normality), no lo valora hasta que triunfa fuera.*” [Spain is a country that does not appreciate what it has as it should not value it until it triumphs outside] (emphasis added) In terms of Propriety, these students commented that “*We just can’t go on without condemning what happened here just 50 years ago, which is absolutely nothing on an historical perspective*” or “*Los españoles tampoco aceptan a las personas extranjeras porque muchos de ellos todavía son racistas*” [Spaniards do not accept foreigners because many of them are still racist] (emphasis added). Similarly, when examining T, Spain-based students used significantly more instances of *Normality* ($t_{(291)} = 2.9, p < 0.05$) and *Propriety* ($t_{(291)} = 4.0, p < 0.05$) than their U.S. counterparts. Students, for instance, pointed out that “*Es un hecho que la inmigración aumenta la oferta laboral, pero en una manera que perjudica al puesto de trabajo.*” [It is a fact that immigration increases the labor supply, but in a way that harms the native job] or “*Todos somos personas y tenemos derecho a elegir donde residir.*” [We are all people and we have the right to choose where to live] (emphasis added).

With regard to Appreciation (see Table 4, Appendix C), when discussing their C1, US-based students used significantly more linguistic markers to express *Impact* ($t_{(790)} = -2.45, p < 0.05$). These students, for example, addressed the effect of several laws: (“[Las leyes] tienen *consecuencias muy negativas.*” [[The laws] have very negative consequences.], “*las leyes de inmigración extremadamente duras en varios estados en los EE.UU*” [the extremely harsh immigration laws in several states in the US], and “[US] politics have a major effect on nationalism and patriotism.” (emphasis added). Similarly, when looking at how students addressed their C2, US-based students significantly used more *Impact* ($t_{(192)} = -1.12, p = 0.03$) linguistic markers than their Spanish counterparts. U.S. students, for example, when discussing nationalism and patriotism pointed out that “*I think more of art, the history of the country, and soccer than bullfighting*

and fascism even though they *have made a mark* on Spain today,” and acknowledged that they were not aware of “the differences to be so *apparent and extreme* between the Catalan community and the rest of Spain” or “how big the differences are in accents in Spain especially to the point where *it becomes hard to understand*.” (emphasis added).

The third research question examined how L2 learners negotiate their ideological position (Engagement), depending on the topic, when referring to C1, C2, and T in asynchronous telecollaborative interactions. When addressing both their own and the other culture, learners produced more monoglossic statements ($t_{(298)} = -3.37, p < 0.05$ and $t_{(83)} = -1.17, p = 0.03$) when discussing Nationalism or patriotism and more heteroglossic statements ($t_{(298)} = 3.37, p < 0.05$ and $t_{(83)} = 1.17, p = 0.03$) when discussing Immigration. Within heteroglossic statements (see Table 5, Appendix C), both when discussing their C1 and the C2, students used significantly more expanding statements ($t_{(298)} = 5.03, p = 0.05$ and $t_{(83)} = 4.65, p < 0.05$) when discussing immigration while they used significantly more contracting statements ($t_{(298)} = -3.39, p < 0.05$ and $t_{(83)} = -4.19, p < 0.05$) when addressing the topic of Nationalism or patriotism. Cohen’s *d* regarding the Expand category was 0.58 for C1 and 0.58 for C2, which corresponds to a medium effect size.

For subcategories of expanding and contracting statements, when referring to C1, C2 and T, there is evidence that students used more Entertain ($t_{(298)} = 3.32, p < 0.05, t_{(83)} = 2.24, p = 0.04$, and $t_{(99)} = 1.7, p < 0.05$) and Attribute ($t_{(298)} = 2.47, p < 0.05, t_{(83)} = 1.7, p = 0.02$, and $t_{(99)} = 1.6, p = 0.03$) markers when discussing the topic of Immigration than when discussing that of Nationalism or patriotism. When discussing the latter, students used more Proclaim strategies ($t_{(298)} = -1.17, p = 0.02$ and $t_{(83)} = -5.6, p < 0.05$) when talking about C1 and C2, but relied on Disclaim ($t_{(298)} = -1.83, p < 0.05$) only to talk about C1.

The following interaction when discussing immigration is an example that shows that, regardless of the country, learners relied on external resources (Attribute) to inform themselves about the topic. They also provided their mitigated opinions with expressions such as “creo que” [I think that] and “pienso que” [I believe that] and asked each other questions to guide the conversation (Entertain).

Excerpt 3

Recientemente, leí un artículo Internet (T > Expand > Attribute > Acknowledge external sources) de la Economía que discutió los beneficios económicos y las desventajas económicas de la inmigración. Aunque el artículo Internet (T > Expand > Attribute > Acknowledge external sources) mencionó aumentar la competencia en el mercado laboral por inmigración, pero los subsiguientes cambios son lo que nos preocupamos (T > Contract > Proclaim > Pronounce). Por ejemplo, hay la posibilidad del reducir los salarios de trabajadores nativos, menos beneficios, y una más grande población anciana (T > Expand > Attribute > Acknowledge external sources) ... (David, US, Online forum).

Excerpt 4

Sobre lo que ha comentado David (T > Expand > Attribute > Acknowledge classmate), es totalmente cierto que (T > Contract > Proclaim) en lo que concierne a la seguridad nacional, la inmigración en muchas ocasiones es una desventaja por los ataques terroristas como pueden ser el del 11-S. Buscando un poco por Internet (T > Expand > Attribute > Acknowledge external sources) he podido encontrar esta definición: “La “Seguridad Nacional” es un componente importante del esfuerzo de un Estado por equilibrar la facilitación y el control de la migración (Paco, Spain, Online forum).

Excerpt 5

Creo que (C1 > Expand > Entertain) la economía es no se va afectada por inmigración (C1 > Expand > Attribute > acknowledge classmates). También, yo creo que (C1 > Expand > Entertain) en ciertas partes de los EE.UU, personas se sienten con derecho a trabajos incluso si los inmigrantes están mejor en la posición. En los EE.UU, “la fuga de cerebros” (T > Expand > Attribute > Acknowledge classmate) es cuando el gente inteligente inmigran a un país del oeste y utilizan sus habilidades. Creo que (C1 >

Expand > Entertain) esto hace que la economía más fuerte (Anastasia, US, Online forum).

As seen in Excerpt 3, David starts his post referring to the content of an article regarding the positive and negative economic consequences of immigration. In particular, he acknowledges the positive effect of “aumentar la competencia laboral” [increasing competitiveness of the labor market], but decides to focus on those elements, as indicated in the article, that can be worrisome for the immigrant-receiving country. In Excerpt 4, Paco makes a reference to David’s entry and focuses on the topic of national security. To add to the conversation, Paco searches for additional information on the Internet and includes the definition provided. In a subsequent entry (Excerpt 5), Anastasia follows David’s and Paco’s comments by entertaining that she does not think that immigration affects the economy (a previous comment) and that some people from the US believe they are entitled to have a job even if immigrants are better qualified for it (a new idea). Anastasia also brings a topic already presented in the discussion, “la fuga de cerebros” [brain drain], which according to her, as seen by the Entertain marker, has a positive effect on the economy.

When discussing the topic of nationalism, however, albeit relying on external sources, students tended to provide their personal opinions and experiences, as illustrated in Excerpts 6 and 7.

Excerpt 6

I did a quick Google search (T > Expand > Attribute > external sources) and found a nice short definition: “patriotic feeling, principles, or efforts” (T > Expand > Attribute > external sources). I will say, under that definition it listed one of the synonyms as “flag-waving” (T > Expand > Attribute > external sources), which is something I really associate (C1 > Contract > Proclaim > Pronounce) with American nationalism/my own sense of nationalism [...] I fly our flag everyday at my home, I celebrate the Fourth of July, Labor Day, and Memorial Day by having a cookout with my family and friends (and in that time remembering all the great people who have fought for, died for, and advanced our country), and taking pride in the fact that my homeland is one of freedom, liberty, and equality (C1 > Contract > Proclaim > Pronounce) (Alicia, US, Online forum).

Excerpt 7

Hello guys, in Spain in general this topic makes a bit of controversy (C1 > Contract > Proclaim > Pronounce). In Spain we have some regions in which people don’t feel “Spanish” (T > Expand > Attribute > external sources), like Catalonia and the Basque Country. They believe (T > Expand > Attribute > external sources) that they should be an independent country. As I am from Murcia, of course I feel I belong to Spain (C1 > Contract > Proclaim > Pronounce) and I’m proud of being Spanish (C1 > Contract > Proclaim > Pronounce) (Lourdes, Spain, Online forum).

As seen in Excerpt 6, Alicia started by providing a definition found on the web. She went on to mention one of the synonyms included in the definition, “flag-waving”, which she rapidly connected with her own experience about nationalism. That is, although she relied briefly on an external source to help her frame the topic, in the rest of her entry, Alicia went on to explain what people did in her state to demonstrate their nationalistic feelings. She made no other references to external sources, from either articles or journals, or what other people had said. Alicia’s interaction was followed by Lourdes (Excerpt 7), who immediately noted the controversy that the concept of nationalism raises in Spain. She starts with a pronouncement “this topic makes a bit of controversy”, which she continues referencing to two regions, Catalonia and the Basque Country, who have expressed their differences with the rest of Spain (Expand > Attribute > External sources). After this brief explanation, Lourdes moves to express her own feelings with two statements in which she does not give place to negotiation (Contract > Proclaim > Pronounce).

The fourth research question examined how L2 learners deploy attitudinal markers (Affect, Judgment and Appreciation), depending on the topic, when referring to C1, C2, and T in asynchronous telecollaborative interactions. The results (see Table 6, Appendix C) indicated that learners produced significantly more instances of Appreciation when discussing Immigration ($t_{(298)} = 1.107$, $p = .023$) than Nationalism or

patriotism in terms of C1. As seen in Excerpt 10, when talking about Immigration, students presented information about different laws, such as the “Arizona Senate Bill 1070” or the Alabama law, “HB 56” or “la ley de extranjería”, the immigration law approved in Spain in 1985. As seen in Excerpt 8, Carolina describes the impact that the Alabama, “HB 56” law had on immigrants and employed terms such as “ilegal” (illegal), “inmigrantes sin papeles” (undocumented immigrants) to describe persons or actions.

Excerpt 8

Esta ley de Alabama, “HB 56”, atacada por completo (Appreciation > Impact -) todos los aspectos de la vida de los inmigrantes, por lo que es ilegal (Appreciation > Quality -) que los propietarios alquilan a inmigrantes sin papeles (Appreciation > Quality -) (Carolina, US, Online forum).

Although there were no differences in terms of Affect in general (see Table 6, Appendix C) between the two topics, when addressing their C1, students used significantly more instances of Affect - ($t_{790} = 1.68, p < 0.05$) for the topic of Immigration while there were more instances of Affect + when discussing Nationalism ($t_{790} = -1.69, p = 0.02$). When talking about how immigration was perceived or acted upon in their own countries, students often presented instances of how they disliked what was happening. Their ideological underpinning always had a positive attitude toward immigration. Consider the following examples: “...y es muy triste que esto se vea como algo negativo” [...and it very sad for this to be seen as something negative]; “Es lamentable que juzgen a todos por igual cuando no es así.” [It’s regrettable that everybody is judged the same when they are not the same.], and “...y lo mas triste es que estas personas vienen huyendo de la pobreza y violencia de sus paises” [...and the saddest thing is that these people are running away from poverty and violence in their countries] (emphasis added). Contrary to this, when discussing the topic of nationalism and presenting their own opinions about their own countries, despite still presenting negative emotions such as “I will never feel proud of my country until this changes,” overall students provided comments such as “I love Spain, its social customs, language and weather,” “I like being Spanish,” “every day I am proud to be an American,” “I’m proud of being Spanish,” or “we feel very proud to be able to celebrate those holidays” (emphasis added).

Within Judgment (see Table 7, Appendix C), the results indicated that when discussing nationalism, learners employed significantly more instances of Judgment - to talk about C2 ($t_{192} = -1.556, p = .001$) than when talking about C1 and T. US-based students, for example, commented on behaviors that were out of their understanding of how people should behave, such as how in Spain “people is not used to demonstrating their sense of patriotic spirit” (Normality -), how, unlike in the US, people do not have “Spanish flags hanging outside their houses if it’s not the time of the World/European cup” (Normality -), or that “so many different places want their community to become independent” (Normality -). Spain-based students, on the other hand, were more inclined to provide moral comment, such as when they commented on the 2016 U.S. presidential elections and how people “share his ideas (male chauvinist or xenophobe ideas)” (Propriety -), or “that he has validated being a racist, misogynist, homophobic [person]...” (Propriety -). When referring to the Topic in general, students produced significantly more instances of Normality ($t_{99} = 1.161, p = .009$), Capacity ($t_{291} = 1.161, p = .009$) and Propriety ($t_{291} = 1.8, p = 0.01$) when discussing nationalism or patriotism. For instance, students pointed to the fine line between patriotism and nationalism and “while patriotism is the love for your country, its people, its landscapes, the feeling of ‘being at home’ that it gives you, nationalism is a radical version (Propriety -), you think that others countries are worse than yours (Propriety -), you want your country to be more powerful at any cost (Propriety -).” (emphasis added). By addressing the topic in general without referring to a particular country, students also provided a positive outlook on how “countries should be looked at how they are trying to right the wrongs” (Propriety +; emphasis added).

In terms of Appreciation (see Table 8, Appendix C), learners produced significantly more instances of Appreciation - in their C1 ($t_{298} = 1.237, p = 0.11$) when talking about nationalism. As such, students made comments such as “Spain [...] will never get rid of their dark past,” “even knowing that patriotism and nationalism was only a part of fascist propaganda,” “States lack that cultural aspect of belonging in most

case,” “how *divided* the country is from back in January,” or “a man who is openly *misogynistic, racist, homophobic*” (emphasis added; those comments reflect a negative perception of the students’ C1s).

Discussion

Upon examining research question one, the extent to which Spain-based and US-based L2 learners negotiate their ideological position when referring to C1, C2, and T in asynchronous telecollaborative interactions, the results indicated different patterns of interaction. Contrary to McCabe’s (2017) findings, but similarly to Oskoz et al.’s (2018) and Oskoz & Gimeno-Sanz’s (in press) findings on telecollaborative encounters, learners in this study presented more instances of expanding vs. contracting strategies. Yet, similar to Belz’s (2003) German students, the Spain-based students made more bald categorical assertions and employed more monoglossic and contractive statements to address both their own and U.S. culture. This seems to support the idea of Spaniards being culturally more opinionated (Vinagre & Corral, 2017) and feeling confident about presenting their own opinions and perspectives in relation to their C1 and that of their telecollaborative partners. As suggested by S. H. Lee (2010), the higher use by the Spain-based group of dialogically contractive strategies, such as *Pronounce* (Proclaim), limited the negotiation space. Yet, while this group used Proclaim strategies with a high presence of Pronounce statements to address their own and U.S. culture, these learners only used more Disclaim features to talk about their C1. It seems that the Spaniards, despite being more opinionated, were also wary of adopting a critical stance in relation to their C2, which they probably knew less about. US-based learners presenting more Entertain markers within heteroglossic statements might also be the result of cultural patterns, with US-based students being more careful and indirect, implicit, and attentive to the addressee (House, 2000) when providing an opinion that could be considered rude. Furthermore, the fact that within heteroglossic statements, US-based learners employed more Attribute statements speaks to them looking for evidence or external sources to support their opinions. This allowed the US-based learners to add new dimensions to their work and to that of their classmates (Wu & Allison, 2005), either answering their questions or building upon the joint discovery of immigration laws or different perspectives regarding nationalism or patriotism. As argued by S. H. Lee (2010), however, it could also be interpreted as the US-based learners not committing to their own message.

When querying the extent to which the use of discursive practices for Affect, Judgment and Appreciation varied when referring to C1, C2, and T in asynchronous telecollaborative interactions depending on the group (research question two), the results of the study suggest that there were indeed differences in how the learners from the two countries approached the discussions. The US-based students presented more instances of Affect and Appreciation while Spain-based students tended to use Judgment markers. In particular, US-based students presented more instances of Affect to talk about their C1 and the topics under discussion in general. It was only when Spain-based students referred to C2 that they produced more Affect markers—and used more positive than negative markers—than their US-based counterparts. This translates into a desire on behalf of the Spain-based learners to create a positive atmosphere in telecollaborative environments (Liaw & English, 2017; Vinagre, 2008). Using positive Affect markers to talk about C2 might have also been a way for the Spain-based learners to soften their discourse, given that, similar to Vinagre and Corral’s (2017) study, Spain-based learners made more use of Judgment markers than their US-based partners did. Additionally, the overall higher presence of Judgment markers provides further support to the idea that being critical is considered a positive trait in Spain while in U.S. culture being critical and opinionated are considered to be negative personality traits. In fact, the higher presence of the Propriety category in the Spain-based learners illustrates that these students did not hesitate to show their mostly negative opinions about the ethical values presented by their C1 and, to a lesser extent, by the behaviors observed in the other culture. Finally, the fact that when discussing C1 or C2, US-based learners used more instances of Impact markers reflects how, rather than focusing on human behavior, they were more inclined to discuss the consequences of the different immigration policies and practices and the effects of nationalism in both countries.

The third question sought to determine how L2 learners negotiate their ideological position depending on

the topic when referring to C1, C2, and T in asynchronous telecollaborative interactions. The results of the study illustrate that learners produced more monoglossic statements when discussing nationalism than when discussing immigration. Even when using heteroglossic statements, learners produced more contracting (Proclaim and Disclaim) strategies than expanding strategies on the topic of nationalism. When discussing this topic, after brief references to definitions or to other comments, learners were likely to provide their own personal viewpoints. Moreover, as mentioned above, both Spain and the US were going through very politically charged moments at the time of the study. L2 learners in this study used more bare assertions both to present their own opinions about what was happening in their country, as well as to create solidarity with their telecollaborative partners. On the other hand, L2 learners employed more expanding strategies to talk about immigration, indicating that learners were open to different alternatives and to building knowledge based on questions posted and threads discussed in the online forums. Like in Wu and Allison's (2005) study, L2 learners frequently made use of attributions (expanding strategy) and referred to both external sources that provided support to their thoughts and additional information that added new dimensions to their work and to that of their classmates, either answering their questions or building upon the joint discovery of immigration laws or different perspectives of nationalism. When comparing the two topics, therefore, it seems that nationalism provided more leeway for an emotional discussion in which learners expressed their inner emotions and deeper feelings, which to some extent limited the negotiation space (Wu & Allison, 2005), while the less-frequent presence of both monoglossic and contracting strategies when talking about immigration can imply the conduciveness of this topic to a more open and informed dialogue.

Our fourth and final question examined whether there were differences in L2 learners' use of linguistic markers for Attitude, depending on the topic, when referring to C1, C2, and T in asynchronous telecollaborative interactions. The results suggest that while learners presented similar attitudinal markers when referring to immigration and nationalism or patriotism regarding C2 and T, the differences in Attitude between the two topics chiefly rested on how learners approached their C1. As such, when addressing the topic of immigration, students often rejected the negative implications and consequences of their country's practices and policies regarding this issue. The fact that these results were accompanied by negative affective values illustrates the negative emotions that this topic brought forth. Finally, the fact that students produced significantly more instances of Normality and Capacity when discussing the Topic of immigration in general terms displays the prevalence of using T as a neutral space to express Judgement, avoiding reference to either C1 or C2. When discussing nationalism, however, learners presented higher instances of positive Affect markers. In particular, they used expressions of *Cheer* and *Affection* to express their emotions, particularly pride, about their own country. This corroborates the idea that learners provide a positive view to create a friendly environment, which is effective for successful interaction (Vinagre, 2008; Morand & Ocker, 2003). It was initially surprising to discover the presence of negative Judgment markers to talk about C2. However, this could be explained if we take into account that this conversation took place at the time when nationalism was a very heated topic in both countries. Students from the US, for example, found it difficult to understand that some Spanish autonomous regions sought independence. Likewise, Spanish students commented on several of the racist and misogynistic comments heard during the 2016 U.S. elections. Similarly, to the debate on immigration, L2 learners used their interactions about the topic in general to talk about Propriety, supporting the idea that learners felt safer judging ethical behaviors or evaluating attitudes when talking about the topic, without addressing any particular culture.

Conclusion

The results of this study confirmed the differences in discursive style between learners from two different countries. This, in itself, is not a negative implication, but it might suggest the need to make L2 learners aware of different styles both in terms of how they and their collaborative partners present Attitude and how they engage with the content. This by no means implies that we need to change our learner's communicative styles, but to make them open to different discursive practices that they will find in this increasingly globalized world. Our results also highlight that despite the unique and distinctive discourse

patterns of the different groups, students also performed differently when addressing the L2 culture, being perchance more respectful and tentative than when addressing their own. This indicates an interest and desire, on the learners' behalf, to develop an environment conducive to successful interaction that, in turn, will facilitate intercultural communication. The results of the study also illustrate the impact that the topic has on our learners' discourse practices. Topics that require the learners to delve beyond their personal and emotional opinions and push them to provide an informed opinion based on evidence may encourage them to add newly discovered dimensions to their work.

There are a number of limitations to this study. First, the small sample size prevents us from being able to extrapolate the results to a larger population. Second, given the different discursive practices between the two groups of students, it would have been of interest to provide students with a questionnaire to understand more about the extent to which the different styles of communication influenced the online discussion. Third, although the topics of the tasks did indeed lead to different reactions from the L2 learners, they were still considered heated and controversial topics. It would be of interest to investigate how learners present attitude and engage with the topics, moving from more neutral to more controversial. Fourth, it would also be of interest to learn how L2 learners use attitude markers and engagement statements when addressing C1, C2 and T in their first language and L2. Without a doubt, continuing this line of research will provide us with valuable information regarding learners' true engagement in telecollaborative environments. Finally, the work of Bednarek (2009), Ngo and Unsworth (2015), and Su and Hunston (forthcoming) is directing research based on the Appraisal framework to a more finetuned analysis of the data that takes into account the lexis, the context and the association between language patterns and attitudinal meanings.

From a pedagogical point of view, the results from this study have a number of implications. First, it is advisable to discuss with L2 learners the various discursive patterns that may arise depending on the country their counterparts are based in. It is not a matter of asking students to change their discourse styles in terms of engagement or attitude, but for them to be aware of each other's style (Byrnes, 1986) and, thus, help to avoid misunderstandings. Second, L2 learners should also be made aware that these different discursive patterns belong to the sphere of cultural awareness, which to a large extent is the core of such classroom practices. Third, the online forum entries can be used as models that L2 learners can analyze to understand different styles and patterns, which they could potentially learn to emulate when communicating in the target language (Belz & Vyatkina, 2005, 2008). Learning more about their discursive practices will allow us to create a space that provides and nurtures the true dialogue needed for successful telecollaboration.

References

- Adichie, C. (2009). *Adichie Chimanda: The danger of a single story* [Video file]. Retrieved from https://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story?language=en
- Arnold, N., & Ducate, L. (2006). Future language teachers' social and cognitive collaboration in an online environment. *Language Learning & Technology*, 10(1), 42–63. Retrieved from <https://www.lltjournal.org/item/2533>
- Bauer, B., de Benedette, L., Furstenberg, G., Levet, S., & Waryn, S. (2006). The Cultura Project. In J. A. Belz & S. L. Thorne (Eds.), *Internet mediated intercultural foreign language education* (pp. 31–62). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Bednarek, M. (2009). Language patterns and ATTITUDE. *Functions of Language*, 16(2), 165–192.
- Belz, J. A. (2002). Social dimensions of telecollaborative foreign language study. *Language Learning & Technology*, 6(1), 60–81. Retrieved from <https://www.lltjournal.org/item/2373>
- Belz, J. A. (2003). Linguistic perspectives on the development of intercultural competence in telecollaboration. *Language Learning & Technology*, 7(2), 68–99. Retrieved from <https://www.lltjournal.org/item/2431>

- Belz, J. A., & Vyatkina, N. (2005). Learner corpus analysis and the development of L2 pragmatic competence in networked intercultural language study: The case of German modal particles. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 62(1), 17–48.
- Belz, J. A., & Vyatkina, N. (2008). The pedagogical mediation of a developmental learner corpus for classroom-based language instruction. *Language Learning & Technology*, 12(3), 33–52. doi:https://dx.doi.org/10125/44154, Retrieved from https://www.lltjournal.org/item/2640
- Benson, P. (2015). Commenting to learn: Evidence of language and intercultural learning in comments on YouTube videos. *Language Learning & Technology*, 19(3), 88–105. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10125/44435. Retrieved from https://www.lltjournal.org/item/2921
- Byrnes, H. (1986). Interactional style in German and American conversations. *Text*, 2(1), 189–206.
- Chun, D. (2011). Developing Intercultural Communicative Competence through Online Exchanges. *CALICO Journal*, 28(2), 392–419.
- Council of Europe (2001). *The common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/CADRE_EN.asp
- Council of Europe (2008). *White paper on intercultural dialogue. Living together as equals in dignity*. Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/intercultural/source/white%20paper_final_revised_en.pdf
- Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2008). Blogging: Fostering intercultural competence development in foreign language and study abroad contexts. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41(3), 421–444.
- Garrett-Rucks, P. (2013). A discussion-based online approach to fostering deep cultural inquiry in an introductory language course. *Foreign Language Annals*, 46, 191–212. doi:10.1111/flan.12026
- House, J. (2000). Understanding misunderstanding: A pragmatic-discourse approach to analysing mismanaged rapport in talk across cultures. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking. Managing relations across cultures* (pp. 145–165). London: Continuum.
- Hunt, K. W. (1965). *Grammatical structures written at three grade levels*. Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Iedema, R., Feez, S., & White, P. R. (1994). *Media literacy (Write it right literacy in industry research project – Stage 2)*. Sydney: Metropolitan East Disadvantaged Schools Program.
- Lee, L. (2018). Using Telecollaboration 2.0 to Build Intercultural Communicative Competence: A Spanish-American Exchange. In D. Tafazoli, M. E. Gomez Parra, & C. A. Huertas-Abril (Eds.), *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Technology-Enhanced Language Learning* (pp. 303–321). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Lee, S. H. (2010). Attribution in high- and low-graded persuasive essays by tertiary students. *Functions of Language*, 17, 181–206. doi:10.1075/fo1.17.2.02lee
- Liaw, M.-L., & English, K. (2017). Identity and addressivity in the Beyond these Walls program. *System*, 64, 74–86.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation. Appraisal in English*. New York, NY: Palgrave.
- McCabe, A. (2017). Knowledge and interaction in on-line discussions in Spanish by advanced language learners. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 30(5), 409–431.
- Morand, D. A., & Ocker, R. J. (2003). *Politeness theory and computer-mediated communication: A sociolinguistic approach to analyzing relational messages*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 36th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, Hawaii.

- Ngo, T., & Unsworth, L. (2015) Reworking the appraisal framework in ESL research: refining attitude resources. *Functional Linguistics*, 2(1), 1–24.
- Oskoz, A. (2009). Using Online Forums to Integrate the *Standards* into the Foreign Language Curriculum. In V. Scott (Ed.), *Principles and Practices of the Standards in College Foreign Language Education*. (pp. 106–125). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Oskoz, A. (2013). Let's Enhance Learners' Cultural Discussions: Developing a Community of Inquiry in a Blended Course. In Z. Akyol & R. Garrison (Eds.), *Educational Communities of Inquiry: Theoretical Framework, Research and Practice*. (pp. 267–294). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Oskoz, A., & Gimeno-Sanz, A. (in press). Exploring L2 learners' engagement and attitude in an intercultural encounter. *Language Learning & Technology*, 24(1).
- Oskoz, A., Gimeno-Sanz, A., & Sevilla-Pavón, A. (2018). Exploring learner written discourse in a university telecollaboration project. In Moustén, B., Vandepitte, S., Arnó, E., & Maylath, B. (Eds.), *Multilingual Writing and Pedagogical Cooperation in Virtual Learning Environments* (pp. 200–220). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Oskoz, A., & Pérez-Broncano, O. (2016). What did you say? How did you say it? Linguistic choices in online discussions. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49(4), 772–788.
- Ryshina-Pankova, M. (2014). Exploring academic argumentation in course-related blogs through ENGAGEMENT. In G. Thompson & L. Alba (Eds.), *Evaluation in context* (pp. 281–302). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Ryshina-Pankova, M. (2018). Discourse moves and intercultural communicative competence in telecollaborative chats. *Language Learning & Technology*, 22(1), 218–239. Retrieved from <https://www.lltjournal.org/item/3036>
- Schenker, T. (2012). Intercultural Competence and Cultural Learning through Telecollaboration. *CALICO Journal*, 29(3), 449–470.
- Su, H. & Hunston, S. (forthcoming) Language patterns and ATTITUDE revisited: Adjective patterns, Attitude and Appraisal. *Functions of Language*.
- Swain, E. (2010). Getting engaged: Dialogistic positioning in novice academic discussion writing. In E. Swain (Ed.), *Thresholds and potentialities of systemic functional linguistics: Multilingual, multimodal and other specialised discourses* (pp. 291–317). Trieste: EUT Edizioni Università di Trieste.
- Vinagre, M. (2008). Politeness strategies in collaborative e-mail exchanges. *Computers & Education*, 50(3), 1022–1036.
- Vinagre, M., & Corral, A. (2017). Evaluative language for rapport building in virtual collaboration: An analysis of Appraisal in computer-mediated interaction. *Journal of Language and Intercultural Communication*, 1–19.
- Vinagre, M., & Suárez, M. (2018). El uso de la cortesía lingüística en la petición en español y alemán: Estudio de un caso en un entorno virtual. *Resla*, 31(2), 686–709.
- Weasenforth, D., Biesenbach-Lucas, S., & Meloni, C. (2002). Realizing constructivist objectives through collaborative technologies: Threaded discussions. *Language Learning & Technology*, 6(3), 58–86.
- White, P. (1998). *Telling media tales: The news story as rhetoric*. (PhD), The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.
- White, P. (2015). Introductory tour through appraisal theory. Retrieved from <http://www.grammatics.com/appraisal/AppraisalGuide/Framed/Frame.htm>.

Wu, S. M., & Allison, D. (2005). Evaluative expressions in analytical arguments: Aspects of appraisal in assigned English language essays. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(1), 105–127.

Appendix A. Examples of Expanding and Contracting Engagement Statements

Expanding Statements		Examples
Entertain	Entertain	I do think that these symbols are used politically to form good opinions of the country or advance specific ideologies.
Attribute	Acknowledge	Luis, it was very interesting to hear that in Spain people is not used to demonstrating their sense of patriotic spirit (Acknowledge > classmate) According to the Oxford Dictionary, nationalism is defined as patriotic feeling, principles, or efforts surrounding one's country (Acknowledge > external sources)
	Distance	Here is a website about southern secession, and it's honestly disturbing to me (Distance > external sources) I believe she left out a key part of that definition (Distance > classmate)
Contracting Statements		Examples
Proclaim	Concur	I agree that to move on and make the country better you need to remember the past
	Pronounce	I take a lot of pride ... in representing my country with respect wherever I am.
	Endorse	The quote "Nationalism is the poisonous idea that one's country is superior to somebody else's [...]" does a good job showing how negative nationalism can be for both individual countries and the world in general. (Endorse > readings). Like Alicia i agree with what she said about how during Labor Day, Memorial Day and fourth of July our sense of nationalism is much prominent than any other time during the year (Endorse > classmates).
Disclaim	Deny	I do not see these symbols being sold
	Counter-expectation	however, we do not show a particular pride in our country (Counter > external sources). but to keep the country on the same level of other countries does not make sense to me. (Counter > classmates).

Appendix B. Examples of Attitude

Discourse Marker	Sub-category	Examples
Affect	Happiness/	I'm proud of being Spanish (Spain > C1 > Happiness > Affection) [...]
	Unhappiness	I will never feel proud of my country until this changes... (Spain > C1 Unhappiness > Misery)

	Security/ Insecurity	As for accents, I think it's safe to say that you can definitely distinguish where someone is from within the US based on their accent. (US > C1 > Security > Confidence) every day I'm surprised about the amount of people who still support him (US > C1 > Insecurity > Surprise)
	Satisfaction/ Dissatisfaction	I like being Spanish (Spain > C1> Satisfaction > Pleasure/Admiration) it really disappointing me because I have always thought that we are one of the most prideful countries in the world, (US > C1> Dissatisfaction > Displeasure)
	Inclination/ Disinclination	There still are some people who have extreme southern pride that would want (US > Inclination > Desire) to become independent. I'm really worried about how things are going to change (US > C1 > Disinclination > Fear)
Judgment	Normality	When I think of Spain, the bull comes to mine as well as the royal seal in the flag and used on the Spanish soccer jersey (US > C2 > Normality +) we do say the pledge of allegiance to our Flag every day in school (US > C1 > Normality +)
	Capacity	and create (US > C1 > Capacity +) new opportunities I think Spain, unlike other European countries like Germany or Italy, will never get rid of (Spain > C1 > Capacity -) their dark past...
	Tenacity	the Cataluña nationalist people has been trying (Spain > C1 > Tenacity +) so hard to separate from Spain The fact that many people in this country still think that way and have been waiting (US > C1 > Tenacity -) for someone to represent them
	Veracity	i believe the two are very close together. (Spain > T > Veracity +) or at least that was what I wanted to. (US > C1 > Veracity +)
	Propriety	whereas the Native Americans have been pushed away from mainstream society and forced to assimilate. (US > C1> Propriety -) here in Spain it will always represent for me the part of my country that looks away from the crimes that our past hide (Spain > C1 > Propriety -)
Appreciation	Impact	I think the nationalism affects the politics (Spain > T > Impact +) this is a great example of how someone's nationalism or patriotism can be affected or changed (US > C1 > Impact -)
	Quality	I don't think that you need to be so disappointed in your country because that was one of the darkest periods (US > C2 > Quality -) in all of history it kind of sounds like there is a very strong lack of unity (Quality -) among the country
	Balance	I think I fall in a minority (US > T > Balance -) of those in the US I believe she left out a key part (US > T > Balance -) of that definition given by the Oxford dictionary
	Complexity	It's hard to make a clear distinction between these two terms (US > T > Complexity +) so depending on where are you from inside Spain, you I know it's hard to compare (US > C2 > Complexity -)

Valuation which is absolutely nothing (Spain > C1 > Valuation -) on an historical perspective.
[these groups are] seen as a crucial part to the success of the nation
nothing (US > C1 > Valuation +)

Appendix C. Quantitative Analysis

Table 1. Engagement by Group

	Spain-based learners						US-Based Learners					
	C1		C2		T		C1		C2		T	
Expand	162	8.44%	98	5.10%	51	2.66%	439	22.86%	175	9.11%	187	9.74%
Entertain	75	3.91%	58	3.02%	34	1.77%	236	12.29%	102	5.31%	129	6.72%
Attribute	87	4.53%	40	2.08%	17	0.89%	203	10.57%	73	3.80%	58	3.02%
Acknowledge readings	38	1.98%	21	1.09%	9	0.47%	135	7.03%	25	1.30%	37	1.93%
Acknowledge classmates	10	0.52%	15	0.78%	7	0.36%	38	1.98%	45	2.34%	17	0.89%
Distance readings	39	2.03%	4	0.21%	1	0.05%	28	1.46%	3	0.16%	0	0.00%
Distance classmate	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	0.10%	0	0.00%	4	0.21%
Contract	189	9.84%	46	2.40%	109	5.68%	358	18.65%	22	1.15%	84	4.38%
Proclaim	124	6.46%	35	1.82%	93	4.84%	278	14.48%	10	0.52%	57	2.97%
Concur	7	0.36%	2	0.10%	4	0.21%	28	1.46%	2	0.10%	10	0.52%
Pronounce	103	5.36%	27	1.41%	86	4.48%	223	11.61%	8	0.42%	39	2.03%
Endorse readings	3	0.16%	4	0.21%	2	0.10%	10	0.52%	0	0.00%	4	0.21%
Endorse classmate	11	0.57%	2	0.10%	1	0.05%	17	0.89%	0	0.00%	4	0.21%
Disclaim	65	3.39%	11	0.57%	16	0.83%	80	4.17%	12	0.63%	27	1.41%
Deny	25	1.30%	8	0.42%	6	0.31%	20	1.04%	4	0.21%	6	0.31%
Counter readings	40	2.08%	3	0.16%	9	0.47%	55	2.86%	6	0.31%	17	0.89%
Counter classmate	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.05%	5	0.26%	2	0.10%	4	0.21%
Total	351	18.28%	144	7.50%	160	8.33%	797	41.51%	197	10.26%	271	14.11%

Table 2. Total tokens of Affect by group

	Spain-based Learners						US-based Learners					
	C1		C2		T		C1		C2		T	
Affect +	19	1.02	13	0.78%	8	0.42%	50	3.00%	17	1.02%	27	1.62%

Affect -	14	1.80%	22	1.32%	3	0.18%	51	3.06%	6	0.36%	4	0.24%
Happiness	3	0.18%	0	0.12%	0	0.06%	15	0.90%	1	0.06%	3	0.18%
Cheer	1	0.12%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	9	0.54%	1	0.06%	1	0.06%
Affection	2	0.06%	0	0.12%	0	0.06%	6	0.36%	0	0.00%	2	0.12%
Unhappiness	6	0.90%	7	0.42%	1	0.06%	24	1.44%	2	0.12%	1	0.06%
Misery	6	0.84%	7	0.42%	1	0.06%	23	1.38%	2	0.12%	1	0.06%
Antipathy	0	0.06%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Security	2	0.06%	4	0.12%	0	0.00%	17	1.02%	1	0.06%	7	0.42%
Confidence	2	0.06%	3	0.06%	0	0.00%	11	0.66%	1	0.06%	6	0.36%
Trust	0	0.00%	1	0.06%	0	0.00%	6	0.36%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%
Insecurity	4	0.24%	11	0.66%	1	0.06%	14	0.84%	3	0.18%	3	0.18%
Disquiet	1	0.06%	5	0.30%	0	0.00%	5	0.30%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%
Surprise	3	0.18%	6	0.36%	1	0.06%	9	0.54%	3	0.18%	2	0.12%
Satisfaction	7	0.36%	5	0.30%	7	0.37%	10	0.60%	4	0.24%	8	0.48%
Interest	3	0.18%	2	0.12%	2	0.06%	2	0.12%	3	0.18%	6	0.36%
Pleasure/Admiration	4	0.18%	3	0.18%	5	0.24%	8	0.48%	1	0.06%	2	0.12%
Dissatisfaction	4	0.18%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%	7	0.42%	1	0.06%	0	0.00%
Ennui	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Displeasure	4	0.18%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%	6	0.36%	1	0.06%	0	0.00%
Inclination	7	0.36%	4	0.24%	1	0.06%	8	0.48%	11	0.66%	9	0.54%
Desire	7	0.36%	4	0.24%	1	0.06%	8	0.48%	11	0.66%	9	0.54%
Disinclination	0	0.00%	4	0.24%	0	0.00%	6	0.66%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Fear	0	0.00%	4	0.24%	0	0.00%	6	0.66%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	33	2.82%	35	2.10%	11	0.66%	101	6.06%	23	1.38%	31	1.86%

Table 3. Total tokens of Judgment appraisal by group

	Spain-based Learners						US-based learners					
	C1		C2		T		C1		C2		T	
Judgment +	85	5.10%	18	1.08%	43	2.58%	152	9.12%	25	1.50%	54	3.24%
Judgment -	76	4.56%	17	1.02%	29	1.74%	110	6.60%	15	0.90%	14	0.84%
Positive Normality	59	3.54%	13	0.78%	25	1.50%	92	5.52%	19	1.14%	23	1.38%
Negative Normality	20	1.20%	8	0.48%	6	0.36%	25	1.50%	13	0.78%	4	0.24%
Positive Capacity	7	0.42%	2	0.12%	8	0.48%	35	2.10%	3	0.18%	13	0.78%
Negative Capacity	18	1.08%	3	0.18%	3	0.18%	22	1.32%	1	0.06%	3	0.18%
Positive Tenacity	3	0.18%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%	0	0.00%	2	0.12%
Negative Tenacity	1	0.06%	1	0.06%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Positive Veracity	13	0.78%	3	0.18%	5	0.30%	15	0.90%	3	0.18%	11	0.66%

Negative Veracity	2	0.12%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%	6	0.36%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%
Positive Propriety	3	0.18%	0	0.00%	5	0.30%	9	0.54%	0	0.00%	5	0.30%
Negative Propriety	35	2.10%	5	0.30%	19	1.14%	56	3.36%	1	0.06%	6	0.36%
Total	161	9.66%	35	2.10%	72	4.32%	262	15.73%	40	2.40%	68	4.08%

Table 4. Total tokens of Appreciation Appraisal by group

	Spain-based Learners						US-based learners					
	C1		C2		T		C1		C2		T	
Appreciation +	63	3.78%	13	0.78%	27	1.62%	139	8.34%	43	2.58%	83	4.98%
Appreciation -	74	4.44%	37	2.22%	33	1.98%	202	12.12%	38	2.28%	42	2.52%
Reaction												
Positive Impact	9	0.54%	2	0.12%	3	0.18%	30	1.80%	8	0.48%	26	1.56%
Negative Impact	18	1.08%	11	0.66%	12	0.72%	67	4.02%	15	0.90%	15	0.90%
Positive Quality	44	2.64%	11	0.66%	20	1.20%	88	5.28%	31	1.86%	36	2.16%
Negative Quality	44	2.64%	20	1.20%	19	1.14%	105	6.30%	19	1.14%	18	1.08%
Composition												
Positive Balance	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%	1	0.06%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Negative Balance	1	0.06%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5	0.30%	1	0.06%	1	0.06%
Positive Complexity	8	0.48%	0	0.00%	3	0.18%	16	0.96%	4	0.24%	19	1.14%
Negative Complexity	4	0.24%	0	0.00%	2	0.12%	10	0.60%	2	0.12%	2	0.12%
Valuation												
Positive Valuation	2	0.12%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	0.24%	0	0.00%	3	0.18%
Negative Valuation	7	0.42%	6	0.36%	0	0.00%	15	0.90%	1	0.06%	5	0.30%
Total	137	8.22%	50	3.00%	60	3.60%	341	20.47%	81	4.86%	125	7.50%

Table 5. Engagement by topic

	Immigration (Spanish)						Nationalism or Patriotism (English)					
	C1		C2		T		C1		C2		T	
Expand	267	13.91%	99	5.16%	154	8.02%	334	17.40%	174	9.06%	84	4.38%
Entertain	116	6.04%	52	2.71%	111	5.78%	195	10.16%	108	5.63%	52	2.71%
Attribute	151	7.86%	47	2.45%	43	2.24%	139	7.24%	66	3.44%	32	1.67%
Acknowledge Reading	86	4.48%	27	1.41%	25	1.30%	87	4.53%	19	0.99%	21	1.09%
Acknowledge Classmate	24	1.25%	17	0.89%	17	0.89%	24	1.25%	43	2.24%	7	0.36%
Distance Readings	41	2.14%	3	0.1%	1	0.05%	26	1.35%	4	0.21%	0	0.00%
Distance Classmate	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	0.10%	0	0.00%	4	0.21%
Contract	221	11.51%	11	0.57%	146	7.60%	326	16.98%	57	2.97%	47	2.45%

Proclaim	151	7.86%	6	0.31%	115	5.99%	251	13.07%	39	2.03%	35	1.88%
Concur	6	0.31%	1	0.05%	10	0.52%	29	1.51%	3	0.16%	4	0.21%
Pronounce	126	6.56%	4	0.21%	100	5.21%	200	10.42%	31	1.61%	25	1.30%
Endorse Reading	11	0.57%	0	0.00%	1	0.05%	2	0.10%	4	0.21%	5	0.26%
Endorse Classmate	8	0.42%	1	0.05%	4	0.21%	20	1.04%	1	0.05%	1	0.05%
Disclaim	70	3.65%	5	0.26%	31	1.61%	75	3.91%	18	0.94%	12	0.63%
Deny	19	0.99%	3	0.16%	9	0.47%	26	1.35%	9	0.47%	3	0.16%
Counter Reading	50	2.60%	2	0.10%	17	0.89%	45	2.34%	7	0.36%	9	0.47%
Counter Classmate	1	0.05%	0	0.00%	5	0.26%	4	0.21%	2	0.10%	0	0.00%
Total	488	25.42%	110	5.73%	300	15.63%	660	34.38%	231	12.03%	131	6.82%

Table 6. Total tokens of Affect Appraisal by topic

Forum	Immigration (Spanish)						Nationalism or Patriotism (English)					
	C1		C2		T		C1		C2		T	
Affect +	17	1.02%	12	0.72%	23	1.38%	52	3.12%	18	1.08%	12	0.72%
Affect -	30	1.80%	9	0.54%	6	0.36%	35	2.10%	19	1.14%	1	0.06%
Happiness	3	0.18%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%	15	0.90%	1	0.06%	2	0.12%
Cheer	2	0.12%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	8	0.48%	1	0.06%	1	0.06%
Affection	1	0.06%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%	7	0.42%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%
Unhappiness	15	0.90%	3	0.18%	2	0.12%	15	0.90%	6	0.36%	0	0.00%
Misery	14	0.84%	3	0.18%	2	0.12%	15	0.90%	6	0.36%	0	0.00%
Antipathy	1	0.06%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.06%	0	0.00%
Security	3	0.18%	1	0.06%	3	0.18%	16	0.96%	4	0.24%	4	0.24%
Confidence	3	0.18%	1	0.06%	3	0.18%	10	0.60%	3	0.18%	3	0.18%
Trust	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.00%	6	0.36%	1	0.06%	1	0.06%
Insecurity	8	0.48%	5	0.30%	3	0.18%	10	0.60%	9	0.54%	1	0.06%
Disquiet	1	0.06%	1	0.06%	0	0.00%	5	0.30%	4	0.24%	1	0.06%
Surprise	7	0.42%	4	0.24%	3	0.18%	5	0.30%	5	0.30%	0	0.00%
Satisfaction	8	0.48%	6	0.36%	12	0.72%	9	0.54%	3	0.18%	3	0.18%
Interest	4	0.24%	4	0.24%	8	0.48%	1	0.06%	1	0.06%	0	0.00%
Pleasure/Admiration	4	0.24%	2	0.12%	4	0.24%	8	0.48%	2	0.12%	3	0.18%
Dissatisfaction	5	0.30%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%	6	0.36%	1	0.06%	0	0.00%
Ennui	1	0.06%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Displeasure	4	0.24%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%	6	0.30%	1	0.06%	0	0.00%
Inclination	3	0.18%	5	0.30%	7	0.42%	12	0.72%	10	0.60%	3	0.18%
Desire	3	0.18%	5	0.30%	7	0.42%	12	0.72%	10	0.60%	3	0.18%
Disinclination	2	0.12%	1	0.06%	0	0.00%	4	0.24%	3	0.18%	0	0.00%

Fear	2	0.12%	1	0.06%	0	0.00%	4	0.24%	3	0.18%	0	0.00%
Total	47	2.82%	21	1.26%	29	1.74%	87	5.22%	39	2.22%	13	0.78%

Table 7. Total tokens of Judgment Appraisal by topic

	Immigration (Spanish)						Nationalism or Patriotism (English)					
	C1		C2		T		C1		C2		T	
Judgment +	96	5.76%	17	1.02%	67	4.67%	142	8.52%	26	1.56%	29	1.74%
Judgment -	107	6.42%	17	1.02%	36	2.04%	78	4.68%	15	0.90%	8	0.48%
Positive Normality	64	3.84%	11	0.66%	35	2.52%	87	5.22%	21	1.26%	13	0.78%
Negative Normality	22	1.32%	10	0.60%	10	0.60%	23	1.38%	11	0.66%	0	0.00%
Positive Capacity	17	1.02%	2	0.12%	19	1.20%	25	1.50%	3	0.18%	2	0.12%
Negative Capacity	22	1.32%	2	0.12%	4	0.18%	18	1.08%	2	0.12%	2	0.12%
Positive Tenacity	1	0.06%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%	3	0.18%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%
Negative Tenacity	0	0.00%	1	0.06%	0	0.00%	2	0.12%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Positive Veracity	10	0.60%	4	0.24%	7	0.48%	18	1.08%	2	0.12%	9	0.54%
Negative Veracity	6	0.36%	0	0.00%	1	0.00%	2	0.12%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%
Positive Propriety	4	0.24%	0	0.00%	5	1.68%	8	0.48%	0	0.00%	5	0.30%
Negative Propriety	57	3.42%	4	0.24%	21	1.26%	34	2.04%	2	0.12%	4	0.24%
Total	203	12.18%	34	2.04%	103	6.18%	220	13.21%	41	2.46%	37	2.22%

Table 8. Total tokens of Appreciation Appraisal by topic

	Immigration (Spanish)						Nationalism or Patriotism (English)					
	C1		C2		T		C1		C2		T	
Appreciation +	76	4.56%	14	0.84%	62	3.72%	129	7.74%	42	2.46%	48	2.88%
Appreciation -	122	7.32%	19	1.14%	63	3.78%	151	9.06%	56	3.18%	12	0.66%
Positive Impact	11	0.66%	2	0.12%	20	1.20%	28	1.68%	8	0.42%	9	0.48%
Negative Impact	29	1.74%	4	0.24%	10	1.14%	56	3.36%	22	0.20%	8	0.36%
Positive Quality	54	3.24%	12	0.72%	37	2.22%	78	4.68%	30	1.80%	19	1.08%
Negative Quality	70	4.20%	11	0.66%	36	2.16%	79	4.74%	28	1.62%	1	0.06%
Positive Balance	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%
Negative Balance	2	0.12%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	0.24%	1	0.06%	1	0.06%
Positive Complexity	9	0.54%	0	0.00%	5	0.30%	15	0.90%	4	0.24%	17	1.02%
Negative Complexity	6	0.36%	0	0.00%	3	0.18%	8	0.48%	2	0.12%	1	0.12%
Positive Valuation	1	0.06%	0	0.00%	1	0.06%	5	0.36%	0	0.00%	2	0.24%
Negative Valuation	16	0.96%	4	0.24%	4	0.24%	6	0.36%	3	0.18%	1	0.06%
Total	198	11.88%	33	1.98%	125	7.50%	280	16.80%	98	5.64%	60	3.54%

Appendix D. Translations from Spanish into English

Excerpt 1

In our last conversation, we started talking about the unique history of immigration and how it affects our views of countries such as Spain and the US. According to Webster's Dictionary, an English dictionary that English speakers highly trust, immigration is the act of arriving in a country that is not a native to obtain permanent residency. With this definition of immigration, we have to think of the following: the stereotypes of immigrants, and how do relations between immigrants and natives affect the country (David, US, Online forum).

Excerpt 2

In reply to David's comments, the issue of immigration is very present here in Spain because we receive people from different countries. These people seek to immigrate to Spain because they think they will be able to lead a better life than they would in their own country. Spaniards react increasingly negatively to the increasing number of immigrants. They justify this ideology saying that these people who come from other countries take jobs away from us, therefore preventing the country from overcoming the financial crisis it is going through (Paco, Spain, Online forum).

Excerpt 3

I recently read an article on the Internet on Economy that argued the financial benefits and disadvantages of immigration. Although the Internet article mentioned the increasing competitiveness of the labor market due to immigration, however it is the subsequent changes that worry us. For example, there is the possibility of reducing the salaries of the native workers, less benefits, and a larger elderly population... (David, US, Online forum).

Excerpt 4

Regarding what David said, it is absolutely true that regarding national security, immigration, immigration can on many occasions be a disadvantage because of the terrorist attacks like the 9/11 one. Browsing through the Internet, I found this definition: "National Security is an important component of the effort made by a country to balance facilitation and control of immigration." (Paco, Spain, Online forum).

Excerpt 5

I think the economy is not affected by immigration. Also, I believe that in certain parts of the US, people feel entitled to jobs even if the immigrants are better in the position. In the US, 'the brain drain' is when smart people immigrate to a western country and use their skills. I think this makes the economy stronger (Anastasia, US, Online forum).

Excerpt 8

This Alabama law, "HB 56", completely attacked every aspect of immigrants' lives, making it illegal for property owners to rent out to undocumented immigrants (Carolina, US, Online forum).

About the Authors

Ana Oskoz is Full Professor at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) where she teaches courses in Spanish and second language acquisition. In her research, Ana Oskoz focuses on digital writing literacies and intercultural competence development. She is also Co-Editor of the *CALICO Journal*.

E-mail: aoskoz@umbc.edu

Ana Gimeno is Full Professor of English Language in the Department of Applied Linguistics at the Universitat Politècnica de València, Spain. She is Head of the CAMILLE Research Group and is President of WorldCALL. She is also editor-in-chief of EuroCALL's online scientific journal, *The EuroCALL Review* and Associate Editor of *ReCALL* (CUP).

E-mail: agimeno@upvnet.upv.es