

## Exploring Reflexivity and Multilingualism in Three French Language Teacher Education Programs

Julie Byrd Clark

*The University of Western Ontario*

Callie Mady

*Nipissing University*

Adrienne Vanthuyne

*The University of Western Ontario*

### Abstract

What does it mean to be and become a bi/multilingual and multicultural language teacher in today's plurilingual times? This paper reports on the perspectives of multilingual student teachers as they pertain to the development of multilingual repertoires for the teacher candidates themselves and for these teacher candidates' future French language learners. Globally, initiatives are often directed at language teachers to contribute to producing effective human capital (Byram, 2010); however, awareness in the field of French language pedagogy (FLP) appears relatively unexplored beyond the local contexts. This paper illuminates the significance of developing *reflexivity* (Aull Davies, 2010; Byrd Clark & Dervin, 2014) for future language teachers and researchers through a multimodal, sociolinguistic approach incorporating new technologies by drawing upon data gathered through online, interactive discussion groups and semistructured interviews. The findings illustrate how certain representations of languages, identities, learning, and teaching are constructed and negotiated in these new spaces, and simultaneously challenge traditional (monolithic) ways of teaching and researching in FLP. This work has implications for all those involved in language and multicultural education as it invites researchers to reflect upon their own engagements as well as how to create conditions for the inclusion of multilingual repertoires in Canadian classrooms and beyond.

### Résumé

Qu'est-ce que cela veut dire d'être et de devenir un enseignant bi/plurilingue et pluriethnique dans ce monde marqué par le plurilinguisme ? Le travail présenté dans cet article porte sur les perspectives des enseignants-apprenants plurilingues en ce qui concerne le développement de répertoires linguistiques pour eux-mêmes ainsi que leurs futurs élèves. Cet article souligne aussi l'importance de développer ce que nous appelons *la réflexivité* (Aull Davies, 2010 ; Byrd Clark et Dervin, 2014) surtout pour les chercheurs, les enseignants et les futurs enseignants de langue. Pour mieux comprendre cela, nous proposons une approche multimodale et sociolinguistique tout en employant les données recueillies par des échanges en ligne, des interactions en groupes de discussion et des entretiens semi-dirigés. Nos données démontrent comment certaines représentations de langue, d'identités, d'apprentissage et d'enseignement sont construites, valorisées, négociées et, surtout, comment elles sont contestées dans ces nouveaux espaces. En fait, les pratiques langagières de ces enseignants-apprenants démontrent la complexité et

l'hétérogénéité tout en offrant un éclairage sur la signification des approches intégrées et réflexives et, à la fois, tout en révélant la nature problématique des approches traditionnelles (étatiques) en ce qui concerne l'enseignement de la langue ainsi que la recherche en didactique des langues. Donc, des résultats de ce travail dérivent quelques implications importantes pour les chercheurs et tous ceux qui sont impliqués dans la didactique des langues et des cultures. Spécifiquement, ces implications nous permettent de réfléchir sur nos propres investissements de langue, de culture, d'identité et d'idéologies, et nous invitent à créer des conditions inclusives pour le développement des répertoires plurilingues dans les salles de classe du Canada et d'ailleurs.

## **Exploring Reflexivity and Multilingualism in Three French Language Teacher Education Programs**

### **Introduction**

What does it mean to be and become a bi/multilingual and multicultural language teacher in contemporary times? With the emergence of a new knowledge economy, increased trans-nationalism and mobility, as well as the impact of globalisation in multilingual societies (Byrd Clark, 2009, 2010, 2012), language educators worldwide are being called upon to produce effective human capital; that is, well-developed people who are critical-thinking, independent, lifelong learners as well as international or worldly citizens (Byram 2010; Hu 2003; Hu & Byram 2009). Language teachers, in particular, are facing current demands of increasing multilingual competence with curricular shifts and the implementation of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR; see Council of Europe, 2011). As Martin (2011) has noted, there is a greater need for multilingual competence.

In Canada, as elsewhere, linguistic landscapes are changing as fluxes of immigration, mobility, and digital technologies continue to reconfigure and redefine traditionally conceived identities, language practices, and notions of community (Byrd Clark, 2012; Lamarre, 2010). While many scholars have been increasingly questioning and problematising monolithic, homogeneous views of language(s) and culture(s) (e.g., Byrd Clark, 2009; Fairclough, 2006; García, 2009; García & Sylvain, 2011), official language policies in Canada continue to reproduce solutions based on the language-nation-state ideology (Hobsbawm, 1990) reminiscent of the 1960s and 70s (i.e., one language, one people). Consequently, many French language university and teacher education programs struggle with the tensions between finding ways to promote diversity and having to operate under an ideological competence-skills based model of language (Chomsky, 1965). This model views language learning as the mastery of "unitary, determinate practices that people can be trained in" (Fairclough, 1992, p. 44), rather than viewing linguistic repertoires as plural and multidimensional, shifting in different social contexts.

This is particularly salient in Canada, which has the highest per capita rate of immigration in the world (Citizenship & Immigration Canada, 2009). Many studies have looked at how language teachers' work has been changed by increases in the number of multilingual students from diverse backgrounds (e.g., Cenoz & Genesee, 1998; Dagenais, 2008; Lapkin, MacFarlane, & Vandergrift, 2006). However, there is little research on the increasing numbers of multilingual teachers from diverse social backgrounds, and

especially on those who have invested in being and becoming teachers of French (Byrd Clark, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012).

With the growing number of multilingual students from diverse backgrounds participating in French language education and teacher education programs, there is a critical need to (re)shape pedagogies that reflect the complex linguistic repertoires and social practices of youth with multiple, heterogeneous identities in today's 21<sup>st</sup> century classrooms: diversity within Canada's linguistic duality. However, awareness (reflexivity) in the field of French language pedagogy (FLP) appears relatively unexplored beyond local contexts. But, what do we mean by critical thinking and how does this relate to awareness?

In this paper, we explore the significance of developing *reflexivity* (Aull Davies, 2010) for future language teachers and researchers by investigating the ways in which student teachers from three French language teacher education programs (two in Canada and one in France) come to understand and make sense of constructs such as multilingualism and code-switching (CS) through their interactions in an online discussion forum. We use the term reflexivity as a means to represent criticality and awareness (Byrd Clark, 2012). Our paper is organised into three main parts. The first part situates our understanding of reflexivity and reviews theoretical constructs from the past as well as those that support our position. We include a brief description of our primary context regarding policies and practices surrounding French language education in Ontario, Canada. The second part of the paper details the first data analysis which centers around how the student teachers perceived constructs such as multilingualism and CS in relation to their teaching. The third part entails a critical discussion, or an *analysis of the analysis*, whereby we, as researchers, draw upon reflexivity as a process in order to critically reflect upon the ways in which we have organised, represented and interpreted the data from the student teachers.

## Supporting Theories

### Reflexivity in Relation to Awareness

Reflexivity has been most widely associated with the fields of sociology and linguistic anthropology, most closely connected conceptually to ethnography (e.g., Aull Davies, 1999/2010; Hammersely, 2007; Rampton et al., 2004) and has generally been linked to criticality, critical reflection or being "critical" (e.g., Barnett, 1997; Byram, 2011; Byrd Clark & Dervin, 2014; Hoskins & Sallah, 2011). Simply put, reflexivity means a "turning onto oneself" (Aull Davies, 2010, p. 4); in other words, a process of self-reference. For Hoskins and Sallah (2011), this means "critical thinking towards your own beliefs and actions towards others" (p. 114). Reflexivity, for our purposes, certainly comprises awareness. Awareness, as a facet of reflexivity, goes beyond being aware of particular linguistic features and entails an openness to diversity that will lead to some introspection or ways of becoming self-critical. However, awareness, on its own, is not enough as we need "not only a constant inspection of one's positionalities throughout the research process at every stage, but also the openness to variation, to failure, and to imagination in each of our self-other engagements" (Byrd Clark & Dervin, 2014, p. 24).

Recently, Byrd Clark and Dervin (2014) have referred to reflexivity as a multifaceted process. They state:

Reflexivity takes into account the ways in which we make and index meaning (e.g., through gestures, voice, movement, music, online discussions, signing, texts, styles, recordings, drawings, etc.)—that is the complex, overlapping, and multiple modes of representations that allow us to configure (and reconfigure) the social world—but more importantly, the ways in which we invest in certain social meanings and representations (e.g., in this case, multilingualism, identities, etc.), as well as in our performances of them. (p. 3)

Reflexivity as a process, then, takes into account a sense of criticality, awareness, and a certain amount of vigilance on the part of the researchers as it underscores the constant attention that should be paid to ideological dimensions “lurking” behind how we conceptualise and do research, particularly within different contexts. This is considerably noteworthy as much of the work done involving reflexivity has focused on the “critical” of the reflection, and the critical, in this sense, has tended to focus on the questioning of the outside world rather than reflecting upon and/or including one’s own positionings/subjectivities and strategies. In other words, emphasis has been placed on trying to understand how and why who does what to whom, when, where, how often, and what the consequences are of these actions. For instance, Fairclough (1992) distinguishes *critical language awareness* from *language awareness* by explaining how power is exercised through language. Rather than only developing an awareness for linguistic variation, Fairclough (1992) would posit the question, how does one know what constitutes “appropriate” language? The author thus underscores the need to develop a greater awareness of the social and political issues construed through language.

That said, there has been some important work which has been critical of the social order, hegemony or hegemonic processes, the distribution of resources, the construction of difference, language politics, the organisation and operationalisation of social institutions, capitalism, and/or processes of socialisation (e.g., see Duchêne & Heller, 2007, 2011; Fairclough, 1992, 2006; Gramsci, 1971; Heller, 1994, 1999/2006). “These works exude criticality with particular emphasis on the materiality of social processes but appear unreflexive in their own ideological and social positionings (positions of power) and of the material conditions that enabled them to produce such critical work” (Byrd Clark & Dervin, 2014, p. 15). While important, the critical in this case (as awareness) represents only one facet of reflexivity.

One begins by questioning and trying to understand “the problem(s) of the social world”, yet we are left wondering how can one be and become critical without being/becoming aware of one’s own performances, experiences, and values, and more importantly, one’s investments in such representations? Reflexivity, therefore, must include an awareness of how researchers interpret and present their data and subjectivities, including themselves as researchers; in other words, a process<sup>1</sup> that equally inclines us to look at our own illusions of the social world (Bourdieu, 1980/1991). Often, as demonstrated in our initial analyses, researchers present data (and themselves) as transparent rather than as representations from particular moments and times. For instance, in critiques of Norton’s (1995) work, published under the name of Norton Peirce<sup>2</sup>, Canagarajah (1996) highlighted that Norton did not appear aware of her own representations as a researcher nor the representations of the immigrant women in Canada in her study, namely positioning their use of diary writing entries as transparent reflections of their lives (see Byrd Clark & Dervin, 2014). Whereas Norton made the case for a theory of identity as multiple and a site

of struggle, Canagarajah (1996) argued that Norton's own identity(ies) was largely absent from the written research report. On the other hand, there is a caution for researchers not to become reflexive to the point of self-obsession, bringing themselves so much to the centre of the text that the research is much more about themselves than about the people being studied (e.g., see Behar, 1993; Lawless, 1992). Nonetheless, Pennycook (2005) situated the *I* in both writing and research as a performance, and in doing so, emphasised an important dimension of awareness and positionality that many reflexive moves in qualitative research do not take into account. Drawing upon Pillow's (2003) work, Pennycook (2005) stated, "the point here is that the textual 'I', the invitation to these reflexive accounts, is not so much a transparent representation of an author, but a textual production of one" (p. 301)—the *I* of research writing is a performed form of identification, that is a desire to be seen or to represent oneself in a certain way(s).

According to Byrd Clark and Dervin (2014), reflexivity, as it relates to language awareness, must comprise a heightened sense of criticality and awareness of the experiences, representations, power issues, and identities that we bring with us throughout the research process. This multidimensional process should compel us to examine how our discursive constructions are intimately linked to our positionings (socioeconomic, gendered, cultural, linguistic, geographic, historical, institutional) and (often) our failure to recognise heterogeneity. However, in order to have a deeper engagement, as researchers we must be willing to revisit our own writings with the view to reflect on our understandings and employment of representations at particular moments in time. Thus, reflexivity as a process is significant for students, teachers, and researchers, but particularly, as argued in this paper, for future language teachers of the 21<sup>st</sup> century who will be entering multilingual and multicultural classrooms characterised by an increased plurality of youth with multiple, heterogeneous identities who are developing complex linguistic repertoires, whereby views of ethnolinguistic groups as monolithic are no longer viable.

### **Multilingualism: From Systems to Practices**

With regard to globalisation, there has been a shift within the last 15 years in viewing multilingualism from a critical perspective, that is conceiving multilingualism as a social practice or as a set of resources (e.g., Blackledge & Creese, 2010; Budach, Roy, & Heller, 2003; Hornberger, 2005; Kramsch, 2006; Pennycook, 2010). Defining the *multi* in multilingualism has been a more recent preoccupation among scholars (e.g., *societal multilingualism* proposed by Fishman [2002]; *dynamic bi/multilingualism* [Herdina & Jessner, 2002; García, 2009]; and *flexible multilingualism* as recently put forth by Weber and Horner [2012]). Through a critical perspective, which underscores some type of emancipation, (see Habermas, 1962/1989, 1974; Marcuse, 1964), it has become problematic to define or continue to use the term *multilingualism* as it implies an ideal objective, mastery of three separate monolingual systems. But controversy related to this ideal mastery of languages as separate systems is not new to the field. Cook (1992, 1995), Grosjean (1989), Gogolin (1994), and others, have criticised what they call *monolingual prejudice*, *monolingual habitus* or *the monolingual view of bilingualism* and proposed the notion of *multicompetence* to designate a unique form of language competence that is not necessarily comparable to that of monolinguals. In this sense, the language competence of bilinguals should not be regarded as simply the sum of two monolingual competencies, but rather should be judged in conjunction with the user's total linguistic repertoire (Byrd Clark

& Stratilaki, 2013; Lüdi & Py 2002). Baker (2006), Cummins (2000), Byrd Clark, (2012), and García (2009), amongst others, have asserted, “bilinguals are not double monolinguals...and should not be studied from monolingual perspectives” (García, 2009, p. 48). Cummins (2000, 2001, 2004, 2009) has poignantly argued that educators need to stop viewing children’s heterogeneous linguistic practices as well as their identities as a deficit or handicap, and to instead affirm them as a valued set of resources. However, a monolingual view of languages has been perpetuated and continues to dominate throughout many branches of applied linguistics—including French language education in Canada. For example, French language education in Canada, excepting the province of Quebec, continues to be referred to as French as a Second Language (FSL). Within second and foreign language education, languages are still viewed as autonomous, separate systems. This is problematic for a host of reasons, but mainly the construct and (continued) use denies the multi-dimensional, heterogeneous nature of language(s) and identities as well as the complexity of contexts (Byrd Clark, 2012). The enumerating of languages (first language [L1], second language [L2], third language [L3]) reduces knowledge of languages and the spaces in which such knowledge is acquired to fixed, sedentary traits. This monolingual view of languages and the ultimate goal of becoming, speaking, and feeling like an idealised native speaker are still being reproduced and promoted in language learning classrooms worldwide (see Castellotti, 2008; Davies, 2003; Dervin & Badrinathan, 2011; Mahboob, 2005). CS and code mixing continue to be regarded as “second-class” interactions and not representative of “real” or “proper” multilingualism (as our upcoming data samples will show). Consequently, multilingualism is often still viewed as an addition of separate systems despite the fact that scholars such as Cook (1995, 2002) have demonstrated a unified linguistic competence in which knowledge of two or more languages exist (a multi-competence). Coste (2002) has equally challenged this bias by putting forth the notion of *plurilingual and pluricultural competence* taking into account the situated mobilisation of the linguistic and cultural components of the repertoire, and its potential evolution and reconfiguration over time: “a wholistic rather than segmented vision of language skills” (Moore & Gajo, 2009, p. 7). The use of monolithic categorisations (e.g., English as a Second Language [ESL], FSL, L1-L2) does not appear to take into account any type of awareness of the hierarchical and problematic nature of the imposition of social categories nor the recognition of transnational, diverse, plural identities. In other words (as demonstrated in our initial analysis), the use of such categorisations still reflects a national, monolingual ideology (Risager, 2007) rather than the reality of multilingualism demanded by globalisation. Nor does it reflect researchers awareness of their own investments in the employment of such categories (see Byrd Clark, 2008, 2009, 2011, 2012; Byrd Clark & Labrie, 2010). As educators and researchers, we need to continually be reflexive and question our own and others’ assumptions about languages, cultures, and identities. Awareness (or reflexivity as we have suggested here) of the ways in which we employ social categories, as well as becoming aware of ways in which future teachers (and teachers) can support their students’ complex linguistic practices and multiple identities (MI), are also contributing to supporting critical language awareness.

Languages are representations mediated through our discursive practices. For Jovchelovitch (2007), “the reality of the human world is in its entirety made of representation: in fact there is no sense of reality for our human world without the work of representation” (p. 11). Representations are significant to understanding reflexivity (and language awareness), as it is through representations that people come to understand the

world and organise their constructions of reality and one another (Byrd Clark & Dervin, 2014). However, in the upcoming analyses of student teachers, one can see that while an individual may use heterogeneous linguistic practices or speak about himself or herself as having multiple, complex, identities (e.g., not wishing to fit into one box or category), this does not guarantee that the individual will be aware of such representations when talking about his or her future students or pedagogical practices. This awareness (or lack of awareness) of representations is of utmost importance and demonstrates the argument that we attempt to make in this paper: the need for developing critical language awareness through reflexivity for both future teachers and researchers.

### Contextual Factors

#### Contradictory Realities in French Language Education in Canada

Renowned for its federal policies (e.g., the *Official Languages Act* [1968/1988] and *Canadian Multicultural Act* [1985]), Canada has been portrayed as a bilingual and pluralistic country. Despite immigration, increased mobility, and the emergence of trans-global identities, official educational policies and curriculum have not expanded to include the explicit development of multilingual repertoires or societal multilingualism in classrooms. In 2008, through its initiative, *Roadmap for Canada's Linguistic Duality*, the federal government invested \$1.1 billion in ways to support official French/English bilingualism in both the public and private sectors. The *Roadmap* (2008) views bilingualism as a major asset for the economy and for the building of better integration and stronger links with international partners. This initiative, however, has neither accounted for nor capitalised on the resources of the growing number of multilingual immigrant youth (Byrd Clark, 2009, 2012; Lamarre & Lamarre, 2009; Prasad, 2009).

In the Canadian context, a monolingual view of languages pervades schooling as many studies have focused on two homogeneous, essentialised groupings of learners in second language education: Anglophones and Francophones. By implementing these policies, the Canadian government is trying to balance how to maintain individual rights (universalistic), and at the same time, is setting up a pluralistic framework to give recognition to both multicultural groups and English and French minority communities (particularistic), thus recognising the specificity of the cultural and linguistic community to which individuals belong. However, the notion of community is becoming blurred. Recognising difference can become problematic because an individual may belong to several cultural and linguistic communities (Quell, 2000) and, more importantly, not all groups are perfectly homogeneous (Marcellesi, 1979; Rampton, 2007). This is particularly evident when one poses the questions, who or what constitutes an Anglophone, or a Francophone? The responses are not so clear-cut or straightforward.

Simply put, there is an increased number of linguistically and culturally diverse youth in French language learning programs, who speak L1s other than English or French (e.g., Mady, 2008; Roy, 2008). According to 2006 Statistics Canada data, four out of five immigrants speak a language other than French or English. At the same time, there are a large number of youth who speak diverse linguistic varieties of French while living in a minority context (e.g., Francophones in the province of Ontario<sup>3</sup>; e.g., see Labrie & Lamoureux [2003], Madibbo [2006], Mougeon & Heller [1986]) and who likewise participate in FSL programs (Byrd Clark, 2008, 2009, 2010; Makropoulos & Byrd Clark,

2011). Yet, current policy and pedagogical practice do not reflect nor recognise the different linguistic varieties of languages with which these youth have had contact, and which make up or form part of their linguistic repertoire(s), nor do they reflect their multiple, social identities (or ways of identifying).

Shohamy (2006) has explained that educational institutions have often been required to subscribe to the “ideological aspiration” of monolingual competence. Blackledge and Creese (2010) have further asserted that a common-sense understanding of the relationship between language and nation disregards the diversity and variety of languages spoken in many states. Nevertheless, because of the intersections between nation and an idealised language(s) in the form of a standard linguistic variety, language teachers have an enormous amount of pressure from society to fit within the “norm” regarding their language proficiency and linguistic competence. They are often critiqued and under scrutiny by other teachers (parents and students) if they happen to speak another linguistic variety of French or speak French with a “different” accent other than what is ideologically deemed the standard linguistic variety and legitimised accent (see Byrd Clark, 2008, 2009). Kramsch (2006, as cited in Pennycook, 2010) has argued that the competence of language teachers should not be based on their performance in one language in a specific context, but rather “as the ability to translate, transpose, and critically reflect on social, cultural, and historical meanings conveyed by the grammar and the lexicon” (p. 141).

## Methodology

### Research Questions

Taking into account these complexities and the current demands placed on today’s language teacher professionals, our main questions centred on addressing the following:

1. How do future French language teachers represent and co-construct their understandings of multilingualism, particularly as regards CS?
2. Does engagement in an interactive virtual space with student teachers in different contexts foster the development of reflexivity, particularly when it comes to being aware of language use(s)?

In the next section, we explain in more detail the choice of methodology and analysis as well as a rationale for the selection of certain data. Additionally, we explain the procedure for collecting data and the questions that we posed to the student teachers for their online discussions.

The data presented in this paper were collected as part of a larger, longitudinal, multisite ethnographic study<sup>4</sup> entitled, *The Pedagogical Experiences of Multilingual Student Teachers in French as a Second Language in Ontario: From Volition to Professional Insertion*. The data analysed for this paper come primarily from an international virtual exchange vis-à-vis an online, asynchronous, forum discussion (Google Groups) with student teachers in three different French language teacher education programs. The participants were from Canada ( $n = 35$ ) and France ( $n = 20$ ) and were organised into small groups that had representation from each of the three participating institutions. In the first week, the participants introduced themselves to their group in the virtual space. For the rest of the term, group discussions were guided by questions provided



by the research team. Three topics, including a series of questions, were discussed over the course of the term. Participants were instructed to post a personal response and then respond to other group members' postings. In this paper, we share the findings from the responses to the question: How will you integrate/include your students' multiple identities in your teaching (practices)?

The initial aim of the analysis was to document the student teachers' responses and highlight any differences between the groups of participating student teachers as identified by nationality and language background. Each message was coded for the nationality (Canadian vs. French) and language background (Francophone vs. non-Francophone and bilingual vs. multilingual) of the writer (student teacher). Table 1 presents a tally of the messages contributed by the Canadian, French, bi/multilingual and non-Francophone student teachers. Table 2 shows the distribution of the messages by nationality and language background. Table 3 indicates the language background of the student teachers who wrote the forum messages. The numbers in the three tables do not necessarily correspond to the actual number of student teachers because some student teachers contributed single messages while others posted several messages. In this case, the message is used as the unit of analysis.

Table 1

*Number of Messages, Organised by Nationality and Language Background of the Writers*

	<u>Canadian</u>	<u>French</u>	<u>Francophone</u>	<u>Non-Francophone</u>	<u>Bilingual</u>	<u>Multilingual</u>
Number of messages	52	19	28	43	32	39

Table 2

*Distribution of Messages by Nationality and Language Background of the Writers*

	<u>Francophone</u>	<u>Non-Francophone</u>	<u>Bilingual</u>	<u>Multilingual</u>
Canadian	10	42	28	23
French	18	1	3	15

Table 3

*Distribution of messages by language background of the writers*

	<u>Bilingual</u>	<u>Multilingual</u>
Francophone	9	18
Non-Francophone	22	20

In the initial presentation of data, qualitative software was used to organise and categorise the conceptions of multilingual student teachers, particularly in regard to the inclusion of multilingual repertoires and identities in their future classrooms. The initial analysis (below) provides a broad overview of the data, and does so in a transparent manner. Following the presentation of these data, there is a critical discussion of the

findings in relation to interview data as well as critical reflections of the researchers on the initial analysis. A final result of the study concludes that both the researchers and the participants need to become aware of how they represent knowledge, and what the implications are of these representations.

### Data Description

The data for this paper consist of 71 forum messages contributed by 55 student teachers in France and Canada. The messages were written in response to the main question: How will you integrate/include your students' multiple identities in your teaching (practices)? The question included two sub-questions meant as examples of concrete situations student teachers could think of while addressing the main issue:

- For example, will you allow code-switching in your class? Why or why not? If yes, how?
- Can you think of ways to incorporate diversity and heterogeneity in the class by using new technology/media?

In addition to the software organisation, the forum messages were analysed inductively with a member of the research team deriving recurrent themes. Student teachers responded to the questions differently, with some choosing to focus on the main issue and others opting to address all three questions. As Table 4 shows, most messages addressed the question of the integration of multiple identities (MI). Only six messages addressed all three questions (usually in separate sections) and 24 messages addressed the issue of integration of MI with the question of CS.

Table 4  
*Attention to the Three Themes Raised by the Questions*

	<u>Integrating MI in the Classroom</u>	<u>CS in the Classroom</u>	<u>Use of New Technology to Integrate MI</u>
Number of messages	55	32	18

For the purposes of this paper, we focus our attention on the incorporation of student teachers' complex linguistic repertoires. Specifically, we focus on the question of CS, how it is defined in the messages, whether student teachers intend to allow it or not, the rationale for student teachers' choices and the classroom practices they intend to implement.

## Findings

### Code-Switching (CS)

#### Definition.

In the question posted online, the issue of CS was presented as an example of a practice that would promote the integration of MI in the class. Some student teachers built on this link and specifically addressed the issue of the relation between CS and MI integration ( $N = 24$ ), while others addressed CS as a separate question, with no clear connection to the overall question of MI. Some student teachers did not know what the French term for CS (*alternance de code*) means or misunderstood the term: Maida (Canadian, non-Francophone, multilingual) first asked “*est-ce que quelqu’un sache ce que ‘l’alternance de code’ veut dire?*”<sup>5</sup> She then interpreted *code* as *codes of discipline*, that is to say classroom procedures, and wrote “*Si j’interprète ‘l’alternance de code’ par en permettant à certains étudiants de casser le code de ma classe à cause de leurs identités culturelles et d’autres pas, puis, non je ne le permets pas.*”

Table 5 presents the number of messages that addressed the topic of CS, and the number of messages that contained a definition of CS (either explicitly stated by the student teacher or inferred through the message). It also shows that there were two dominant definitions: CS was defined as the alternation between L1 and L2 and/or the alternation between different registers.

Table 5  
*Defining CS*

	<u>CS</u>	<u>Definition</u>	<u>Language switching</u>	<u>Register switching</u>
Francophone ( $N = 28$ )	12	10	11	2
Non-Francophone ( $N = 43$ )	20	20	20	4
Bilingual ( $N = 32$ )	17	18	18	2
Multilingual ( $N = 39$ )	15	12	13	4
Canadian ( $N = 52$ )	25	24	25	5
French ( $N = 19$ )	7	6	6	1

A closer examination of the messages that define CS as register switching, revealed that student teachers were often referring to sociolinguistic and dialectal variations in the French language. Ofelia (Canadian, non-Francophone, multilingual) argued,

*je permettrai l’alternance de code entre les différents registres de la langue française. À mon avis, c’est très important pour les étudiants de FLS de savoir qu’il*

*existe plus qu'une seule forme « correcte » de la langue française. Je veux que mes élèves sachent qu'ils peuvent adapter leurs façons de s'exprimer, selon le contexte dans lequel ils se trouvent.*

Whitney (Canadian, non-Francophone, multilingual) wrote:

*Si le but de son emploi est d'enrichir les perspectives de nos élèves face à la langue française (c'est à dire, l'alternance des multiples dialectes francophones, par exemple le français parisien, québécois, haïtien, mauricien etc.), je me demande « pourquoi pas » ?*

Other student teachers equated CS with the use of slang. Kathy (Canadian, non-Francophone, bilingual) explained that:

*« l'alternance de code »...veut dire l'utilisation d'une autre langue en conjonction avec le français. Quand moi j'étais en secondaire mes enseignantes l'appelaient le « franglais », (mais vraiment ils sont des anglicismes) c'est aussi comme un slang et peut être utilisé avec toutes les autres langues, non seulement l'anglais. Par exemple, on utilise les mots comme « party », « weekend », « Hello », etc. quand on parle.*

Finally, some student teachers had even broader definitions that encompassed a wide range of linguistic and behavioural variations. Madonna (Canadian, Francophone, bilingual) wrote:

*Selon moi, l'alternance de code dans une classe de français mettrait de l'importance sur l'aspect linguistique. En changeant (aussi dit comme alternance), est quand tu utilise deux ou plusieurs codes linguistiques (ex. langues, dialectes, ou registres linguistiques). L'alternance de la langue est quand tu utilises différents signes linguistiques<sup>6</sup>. Par exemple, vocal, graphique, ou des gestes.*

Clarise (French, Francophone, multilingual) argued:

*« l'alternance de code » parle des différentes langues qui sont parlées par les étudiants car il est question d'identités multiples. D'ailleurs pas que de langue mais d'attitude, de comportements et tous ce qui peut faire une différence par rapport au contexte dans lesquels tu enseignes ou même par rapport à toi, à comment tu vois les choses et comment tu vois ton enseignement.*

The next section explores how student teachers will handle the issue of CS in class and whether they plan to allow it or not. Table 6 shows that the messages seemed equally divided into three groups: messages whose writers will accept CS in their classes, those who will not tolerate it and those who put specific conditions on whether they would allow it or not.

Table 6

*Distribution of Messages of Student Teachers Who Are Clearly For or Against CS and Those Who Gave Hedged Answers*

	<u>CS</u>	<u>Yes,</u> <u>allowed</u>	<u>No,</u> <u>not</u> <u>allowed</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Hedged</u>	
					<u>No,</u> <u>but...</u>	<u>Yes, but...</u>
Francophone (N = 28)	12	6	3	2	1	1
Non- Francophone (N = 43)	20	7	5	10	4	6
Bilingual (N = 32)	17	7	2	8	3	5
Multilingual (N = 39)	15	6	6	4	2	2
Canadian (N = 52)	25	9	8	10	4	6
French (N = 19)	7	4	0	2	1	1

### Messages in support of CS.

Student teachers who maintained that they would allow CS in their classes gave seven different rationales (see Table 7). Juniper (Canadian, non-Francophone, multilingual) focused on the fact that CS does not interfere with genuine communication; she stated *“l’alternance de code est une méthode de communication tout à fait naturelle. En outre, comme enseignants, nous devrions mettre l’emphase sur la communication du message et pas sur la structure du message.”* On the other hand, Madelaine (French, Francophone, multilingual) and Agathe (French, Francophone, multilingual) highlighted the impact of CS on the establishment of a positive classroom environment. Agathe wrote *“[CS] peut aussi rendre l’apprentissage plus efficace et plus personnalisé ce qui peut amener à une implication différente dans l’apprentissage en ne niant pas la langue source”* and Madelaine wrote *“je pense que j’autoriserai le recours à une langue autre dans le but de valoriser les compétences autres des étudiants afin d’instaurer une bonne ambiance de travail.”*

Other student teachers’ positions were based on observations they made in the classrooms either as teachers or learners. Jen (Canadian, non-Francophone, bilingual) wrote *“je vais le permettre à l’avenir parce que c’est trop difficile pour les étudiants au programme cadre à parler complètement en français.”*

Table 7  
*Rationales for Allowing CS in FSL Class*

	<u>Yes, allowed</u>	<u>Emphasise meaning</u>	<u>Supportive environment</u>	<u>Validate L1s</u>	<u>Difficulty</u>	<u>Use of English</u>	<u>Reinforce- ment</u>
Francophone (N = 28)	6	0	2	2	0	1	2
Non- Francophone (N = 43)	7	1	1	1	1	0	0
Bilingual (N = 32)	7	0	0	1	1	0	1
Multilingual (N = 39)	6	1	3	2	0	1	1
Canadian (N = 52)	9	1	1	1	1	0	1
French (N = 19)	4	0	2	2	0	1	1

Another important point was made by student teachers who agree that the L1 and L2 can actually positively impact one another. Agnes (French, Francophone, multilingual) argued:

*je pense que « grammaticalement » et d'un point de vue de la structure de la langue, il peut aussi être intéressant de connaître la langue de l'apprenant pour prendre appui ponctuellement sur cette langue en faisant des ponts, des comparaisons avec entre les deux (ou plus) modes de fonctionnement. Cela peut aussi rendre l'apprentissage plus efficient et plus personnalisé.*

Renée (Canadian, Francophone, bilingual) stated:

*il est vrai que faire référence aux registres linguistiques (le jargon) et à des valeurs communes (la langue maternelle) peut envisager un intérêt plus énorme parmi les élèves parce qu'ils sont capables de faire des connections entre les deux langues.*

Advocates of the use of CS in the FSL classroom proposed a few teaching practices that would support their choice (Table 8).

Table 8  
*Classroom Practices Proposed by Student Teachers Who Support the Use of CS in Class*

	<u>Classroom practices</u>	<u>L1 to translate</u>	<u>Alternate activities that use L1 and L2</u>	<u>Reward system</u>	<u>Sandwiching</u>	<u>Comprehension and reformulation</u>
Francophone (N = 28)	4	1	1	2	1	0
Non-Francophone (N = 43)	3	2	0	0	0	1
Bilingual (N = 32)	4	1	0	2	0	1
Multilingual (N = 39)	3	2	1	0	1	0
Canadian (N = 52)	5	2	0	2	0	1
French (N = 19)	2	1	1	0	1	0

A few student teachers suggested that learners who share the same L1 should be allowed to translate for each other. Michelle (French, Francophone, multilingual) advised:

*Cependant, j'ai appris que tout était une question de dosage, on peut demander occasionnellement « comment dit-on cela dans votre/vos langue(s) ? » pour vérifier la compréhension par exemple. Si on a plusieurs apprenants de la même nationalité, on peut alterner le travail en groupe en langue autre ou uniquement dans la langue cible.*

Other student teachers discussed how they would bring the learners' back to French following a CS episode. Maryse (Canadian, Francophone, bilingual) acknowledged that learners may not always be able to maintain a fluent conversation in L2, she therefore "never forbids the use of English" but she added "j'encourage au moins qu'ils essayent de communiquer en français et j'offre plusieurs manières d'agrandir leur vocabulaire français."

### **Messages against CS.**

Objection to the use of CS was obvious in eight messages. Table 9 shows the distribution of the messages according to the nationality and language background of the writers. Not all the messages included a rationale for not allowing CS in the FSL class, but the ones that did focused on two reasons for not tolerating CS.

Table 9  
*Rationale for Not Allowing CS*

	<u>No, not allowed</u>	<u>Fairness and coherence</u>	<u>Only opportunity for French</u>
Francophone (N = 28)	3	0	1
Non-Francophone (N = 43)	5	1	2
Bilingual (N = 32)	2	0	1
Multilingual (N = 39)	6	1	2
Canadian (N = 52)	8	1	3
French (N = 19)	0	0	0

Whitney, among others, argued that the French language class is the learners' only opportunity to speak and interact in French and that it is important to maximise this opportunity. Whitney (Canadian, non-Francophone, multilingual) warned that:

*si le but de permettre l'alternance de code dans la salle de classe est de permettre à nos élèves de parler des langues autre que le français, je pense que là, il faut se méfier. Vu que le but des études de français est d'apprendre le français et de ne pas apprendre une autre langue, je pense qu'il faut réserver l'emploi d'une autre langue pour les contextes où c'est absolument nécessaire.*

Ofelia, on the other hand, related the use of L1 in class to the issue of fairness and coherence in her teaching approach. She stated:

*je comprends bien que mes étudiants ne seront pas un groupe homogène et qu'il existe des identités multiples dans la salle de classe. Cependant, c'est un cours de français et tout le monde sera obligé de parler strictement en français. Étant donné que c'est un cours de français comme langue SECONDE, on suppose que la langue maternelle de tous les élèves n'est pas le français. De cette façon, chaque élève sera obligé de suivre les mêmes règles. Comme je ne permettrai pas aux élèves de langue maternelle anglaise d'alterner de code entre le français et l'anglais, je ne permettrai pas aux élèves de langue maternelle chinoise d'alterner de code entre le français et le chinois. Les mêmes règles s'appliqueront à tout le monde, peu importe leurs origines.*

Student teachers who opposed the use of CS in class were aware of the challenges that their choice might cause for the flow of communication in the classroom (Table 10).



One student teacher suggested that all teachers should build activities around the vocabulary that the learners know already, while other student teachers recommended the use of visuals and gestures to fill in the possible gaps in communication.

Table 10

*Classroom Practices Proposed by Student Teachers Who Do Not Allow CS in Their Classes*

	<u>X classroom practices</u>	<u>Teach the necessary vocabulary first</u>	<u>Use visuals, gestures to communicate</u>
Francophone (N = 28)	1	0	1
Non-Francophone (N = 43)	2	1	1
Bilingual (N = 32)	2	1	1
Multilingual (N = 39)	1	0	1
Canadian (N = 52)	3	1	2
French (N = 19)	0	0	0

### **Exploring Reflexivity: A Critical Reflection and Discussion**

We, the authors, in the spirit of developing reflexivity in our language awareness, have included a critical reflection of our analysis, which details three main points. The first reflection has to do with representation and the problematic use of categories for these data. The second reflection has to do with the ways in which the student teachers responded to the questions in relation to how they performed while interacting with fellow student teachers in the discussion forum. Finally, upon doing an analysis of the analysis, the third reflection necessitates the development of reflexivity for language awareness in today's globalised world.

If we only compare the data from the online discussion with the ways in which the participants self-identified, then, at first glance, the data do not seem problematic. In fact, they seem straightforward and transparent. However, after interviewing 20 of the student teachers, and upon reflection, we found that the categories used in this analysis do not adequately match all of the student teachers' views, and are, in fact, problematic. First and foremost, if we look back to contemporary definitions of multilingualism, such as the one offered by Weber and Horner (2012)<sup>7</sup>, we can state that all of the participants in this study are multilinguals, though at varying degrees. They are also heterogeneous with complex identities and very different life trajectories, life chances, and schooling experiences as regards French. For instance, several of the participants who were listed as non-Francophones actually challenge traditional monolithic conceptions of Francophones. For example, Marcus grew up in the United Kingdom, and then lived and taught in La Réunion for two years, and then in Paris, France for four years. He is married to a French Canadian from Montreal. Ofelia grew up speaking Italian, English, and French in Sault Ste. Marie,

Ontario, in a French-speaking community. She attended French language school (*école de langue française*) from Junior Kindergarten to Grade 5. In addition to pursuing a Bachelor's degree in French, she worked as a bilingual operator for a large banking corporation. Whitney grew up speaking Spanish and English, attended French immersion from Kindergarten to her final year of high school, lived and studied in France, has a Master's degree in French, and has a fiancé from France. Finally, Juniper, who grew up in a small English-speaking community, pursued her Master's degree in French at Laval University and lived in Quebec for five years. When Juniper did her practicum (student teaching) in France, everyone (students and teachers) recognised and called her *La Québécoise* because of the linguistic variety of French she spoke. These are just a couple of examples, yet all of these participants were categorised as non-Francophones. Bourdieu's (1980/1991) work is helpful in understanding this discussion, as he reminds us that without a reflexive analysis of the ways in which we judge students' academic work as well as their linguistic proficiency, we will continue to unconsciously reproduce a degree of class prejudice, particularly as regards who can claim ethnolinguistic membership and be seen as a legitimate, authentic member of such a group. In other words, teachers/academics will continue to favour students who adhere to a rigidly scholastic linguistic register and whose writing appears polished, while marking down or chastising students who use colloquial language or in this case, CS. As we can see from the samples here, students do not all live the same linguistic reality as concerns French, and there are many different ways of being and becoming Francophone as well as multilingual.

The second part of our reflection deals with the ways in which the student teachers represented their understandings of CS. Many of the student teachers' messages revealed misunderstandings of CS as well as dominant representations and ideologies of languages and cultures, and of a prescribed L1 and L2 (Chomsky, 1965). Through their online responses with one another, one can see that languages are still viewed as autonomous, separate systems (similar to the view of identities and cultures as separate, homogeneous groups). The notion of MI is likened to traditional representations of multiculturalism where students learn about cultures as separate, homogeneous groups through festivals. CS (for those participants who see positive and negative elements) is still looked upon as the alternating between one's mother tongue or L1, and the L2 (French, in this case). For those opposed to CS, it appears to represent something that is detrimental or a deficit, or something that should only be allowed in class if there is a breakdown of communication. The enumerating of languages (L1, L2, L3) reduces (essentialises) knowledge of languages and the spaces in which such knowledge is acquired as fixed, sedentary traits.

Interestingly, the student teachers did not reflect on their own uses of CS, and when looking at the different ways in which they interacted with one another in the online discussions, there were a number of times where both the student teachers from Canada and France code-switched during discussions in their respective groups (student teachers were placed in groups of five to six participants). However, when organising the data for this paper, we did not select examples of the student teachers "doing"<sup>8</sup> the language, but rather focused on their comments and reactions to these specific questions. Another important reflection relates to the fact that the student teachers knew we (the researchers) would be reading their responses to these questions, and perhaps in wishing to perform well, shaped their answers to suit what they assumed would be our expectations.

However, when discussing new technologies, the student teachers did demonstrate reflexivity and critical thinking. The use of new technologies permitted us to observe the

student teachers' co-construction of knowledge through their peer interaction and choices they made, but more importantly, how those interactions affected the restructuring and expanding of their understandings (Kramsch, 2006; Swain, 2006; Vygotsky, 1978). As researchers, we had the advantage of being able to debrief and discuss the interactions, exchanges, and experiences that took place in the online discussions. One of the most noteworthy discussions held in class at the end of the course revealed how some of the student teachers were becoming reflexive and inclusive of diversity. For example, many of the student teachers, both in Canada and France, were not aware that there are Francophones outside of Quebec. This exchange (for the majority) was their first encounter with Franco-Ontarians. The international online exchange also fostered self-reflexivity in the sense that several student teachers became empowered and began to value their multilingualism and uniqueness. This quote from the closing interview with one of the student teachers, Brad Zakamoto<sup>9</sup> sums this up nicely:

Actually, I never knew about or encountered Franco-Ontarians until I entered this Faculty. The focus of our courses at university always focused on French from France...I used to think that Québécois was the French language of Canada, and I didn't realise until now that there are so many varieties of French in Canada. It's like this information was just left out from our education, and to me, that's crazy.

For many other student teachers, the use of CS became more frequent as they became more comfortable in their discussions with one another and began to challenge one another's traditional notions of language and culture. Here is a remarkable example of two student teachers, Nadia and Nella, in France, who negotiate meanings about culture, identities, and CS (in this case, shifting between French, English, and Arabic) during the online discussion. The use of bolding is to highlight and emphasise the negotiation of the notion of culture going on throughout this exchange. The bold italics signify the multilingual CS.

Nella: Pour te répondre ma chère Nadia, en ayant 2 origines, tu peux ressentir le côté « étranger ». Ça a complètement marché pour mes cours et mon premier contact avec mes apprenants. Ils se sentaient plus à l'aise. Mon origine algérienne a suscité beaucoup de questions. Ils étaient vraiment intéressés.

***I HOPE i've answered your question Nadia!! By the way you should be more here habibti :D***

Nadia: ***I'm doing my best here honey! ;)*** Ok, j'avais bien compris ce que tu voulais dire Nella. Mais tu sais, je voulais te lancer sur le côté « la ou les culture(s) » etc. Si tu te considères franco-algérienne (et je t'épargne la question de la langue maternelle! ***Lol***) et que tu dis avoir « 2 cultures » est-ce que ça veut dire que c'est 1 culture française + 1 culture algérienne?! ***Je parlais avec une camarade de M1 FLE et elle me disait qu'étant « franco-française » (je la cite!) elle se sentait malgré tout appartenir à différentes cultures (les différentes cultures françaises et non pas l'idée d'une correspondance exacte entre la langue et la culture!), celles des pays qu'elle a visités, les lieux où elle a vécu ou tout simplement celles qui lui tiennent à coeur...Alors, elle me disait, qu'avec ses apprenants, c'était pareil... Elle se sent « multiculturelle » et par exemple l'espagnol pour elle n'est ni une langue seconde, encore moins une langue étrangère mais une langue « de***

**cœur », d'affection particulière**, avec toutes les cultures liées...Alors je comprends tout à fait ce que tu veux dire Nella, je suis dans le même cas (ou presque!), mais je **pense que c'est un peu plus compliqué que ça, ou du moins un peu moins facile. Enfin, you know what I mean! ;)**

Nella: Ok ok j'avoue que sur ce coup Nadia tu as réussi à m'épater. Ayant vécu qu'à Tours et ce depuis ma naissance, je n'ai été imprégnée que de la culture tourangelle *lol* **Si on part du principe que dès qu'on aime plusieurs pays et du coup plusieurs cultures alors je serais « plurimulticulturelle »** alors!! J'aime le Moyen-Orient, je cuisine indien, syrien, libanais, marocain, algérien, « états-unien » (tmtc), turc, etc...**et j'écoute non stop** la musique arabe, turque, hindi et anglaise sans parler des langues...Donc oui, la définition de « culture » **est extrêmement complexe!**

From these few selected examples the student teachers both in Canada and France demonstrated some reflexivity, showing an openness to diversity as well as becoming more critical of simplistic ways of seeing languages and cultures as homogeneous singular entities. These citations, in particular, show the development of a reflexive awareness of varied multilingual purposes. In this study, the use of new technologies created some wiggle room (see Byrd Clark, 2010) and added further purpose to develop and explore reflexivity for a deeper awareness.

Finally, in light of these reflections, and the data presented in this study, it is pertinent to develop a reflexive process (that takes into account criticality and awareness of languages and cultures) for future teachers of languages as well as researchers in language education. Reflexive approaches that allow both teachers and researchers to revisit their own writings/analyses, to learn how to conduct a discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1995) of texts and transcripts, including their own, and to seek out ways that help us to challenge our own and others' assumptions and invested representations about languages, identities, and cultures would prove beneficial to the advancement of language education (be it second, foreign, additional, etc.). Such reflexive approaches (developing reflexivity) can only serve to enhance critical language awareness in a globalised, multicultural world.

### Conclusion

In order to create conditions for the inclusion of multilingual repertoires, to have more opportunities and fewer constraints, we need to reconceptualise multilingualism by constructing pedagogy that values heterogeneity and questions the ways in which realities are constructed as well as how they get prioritised. In other words, we need to teach in ways that reflect and include people's use of language, rather than simply seeing people as language users. Ultimately, we need to enact Cook's (1995) definition of multicompetence by acknowledging all forms of linguistic knowledge as linguistic capital (Bourdieu, 1980/1991). For example, in addition to encouraging students to use their linguistic repertoire for additional language learning, teachers would model the use of code mixing, multiple languages and instruction of commonalities between languages. At the same time, we need reflexive pedagogical approaches that help us to go beyond measuring competence based on singular performances of categorised skills. We need to be aware of individuals' particular life and learning experiences in multiple spaces, their social and political realities

of what it means symbolically to be and become pluri- or multilingual French language teachers. Recognition of such diverse student experiences may lead to the development of a more student-centred approach to L2 teaching. But as educators and researchers, we also need to continually be reflexive and question our own and others' assumptions about languages, cultures, and identities.

Working with teachers, we need to draw upon flexible methodologies that foster the development of reflexivity, but which also allow and make more visible the complexities of multilingual practices and complex, hybrid identities. Qualitative methods are useful, particularly discourse analysis combined with ethnography, as one can not only get more in-depth data that are difficult to capture with large surveys and questionnaires, but more importantly, one has the potential to become aware and begin to notice one's own use(s) of language and ways of interacting as well as one's own ideological investments. Upon reflection on this study, we recommend that researchers, teachers and future teachers be trained in discourse analysis so that both the researcher and research participants can actively be involved in the research process, especially when analysing their own writings. The samples shared in this paper could potentially serve as discourse analysis samples for further discussions and debate on contemporary understandings of language, identity, and culture.

To conclude, we can no longer look at language, identity, or community as separate categories, nor as stable, fixed representations. The conception of a nation-state ideology (one language, one culture) does not hold in today's globalised world nor does it reflect the social realities of today's youth. By working with future language teachers to explore reflexivity through the social, contemporary realities of youth and by supporting the development of their heterogeneous linguistic repertoires, society would not only profit economically, but would also facilitate better integration and develop a more inclusive, pluralist democracy.

Correspondence should be addressed to Julie Byrd Clark.  
Email: jbyrdcla@uwo.ca

### Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> By process, we do not mean a series of steps taken to achieve a particular end, rather we use the word process as more of a practice or different dimensions of practices that we use to continually permit us to become aware of (and at times challenge) our preconceived notions or ideological representations; in other words, of how we use certain linguistic practices as well as why we use them when we do.

<sup>2</sup> Norton, Norton Peirce and Peirce represent the same author.

<sup>3</sup> The province of Ontario has the largest percentage of immigrants to Canada as well as the largest percentage of Francophones outside the province of Quebec (Government of Canada, 2011). In the province of Ontario, there are 18 teacher education programs. However, there are only two bilingual universities in Ontario (Laurentian University and Université d'Ottawa) where French immersion graduates and Francophone students can pursue their postsecondary education and obtain a teaching degree to permit them to teach

---

in French as a First Language schools. Because of many constraints (geographical, social, linguistic, financial), FSL teacher education classrooms have students with diverse French language learning experiences.

<sup>4</sup> This is a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) funded research study, 2011-2014, led by Julie Byrd Clark.

<sup>5</sup> Quotations are direct quotes as written by the participants.

<sup>6</sup> Madonna distinguishes between CS and language switching here, as she associates CS with using different linguistic codes, such as languages, dialects, or linguistic registers whereas language switching has more to do with multimodality, using different sounds, graphic images, or gestures.

<sup>7</sup> “Hence, multilingualism is a matter of degree, a continuum, and since we all use different linguistic varieties, registers, accents, styles, and genres, we are all to a greater or lesser degree, multilingual” (Weber & Horner, 2012, p. 3).

<sup>8</sup> The “doing” here signifies what the student teachers actually do with language strategically, reflecting a reflexive component, whereas one might “use” language but not actually be aware of one’s use in particular contexts with particular interlocutors.

<sup>9</sup> This was the student teacher’s chosen pseudonym, requesting the use of full name.

### References

- Aull Davies, C. (2010). *Reflexive ethnography: A guide to researching selves and others* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Barnett, R. (1997). *Towards a higher education for a new century*. London, United Kingdom: University of London, Institute of Education.
- Behar, R. (1993). *Translated woman: Crossing the border with Esperanza’s story*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London, United Kingdom: Continuum.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (J. B. Thompson, Ed.; G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1980)
- Budach, G., Roy, S., & Heller, M. (2003). Community and commodity in French Ontario. *Language in Society*, 32(5), 603-627.
- Byram, M. (2010). Linguistic and intercultural education for Bildung and citizenship. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(2), 317-321.

- Byram, M. (2011). Intercultural citizenship—An education perspective. In M. Barrett, C. Flood, & J. Eade, *Nationalism, ethnicity, citizenship* (pp. 163-180). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Byrd Clark, J. (2008). So, why do you want to teach French? Representations of multilingualism and language investment through a reflexive critical sociolinguistic ethnography. *Education and Ethnography*, 3(1), 1-16.
- Byrd Clark, J. (2009). *Multilingualism, citizenship, and identity: Voices of youth and symbolic investments in an urban, globalized world*. London, United Kingdom: Continuum.
- Byrd Clark, J. (2010). Making some “wobble room” in French as a second language/français langue seconde: Reconfiguring identity, language, and policy [Special issue]. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 33(2), 379-406.
- Byrd Clark, J. (2011). La signification du plurilinguisme et la voix de jeunes italo-canadiens. *Cahiers d'ILOB (Institut des langues officielles et du bilinguisme)*, 2, 1001-1021.
- Byrd Clark, J. (2012). Heterogeneity and a sociolinguistics of multilingualism: Reconfiguring French language pedagogy. *Language and Linguistics Compass Blackwell Online Journal*, 6(3), 143-161.
- Byrd Clark, J., & Dervin, F. (2014). Introduction. In J. Byrd Clark & F. Dervin (Eds.), *Reflexivity and multimodality in Language Education: Rethinking multilingualism and interculturality in accelerating, complex and transnational spaces* (pp. 1-62). London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Byrd Clark, J., & Labrie, N. (2010). La voix de jeunes canadiens dans leur processus d'identification : les identités imbriquées dans des espaces multiformes. In S. Osu (Ed.), *Construction d'identité et processus d'identification* (pp. 435-438). Berlin, Germany: Peter Lang.
- Byrd Clark, J., & Stratilaki, S. (2013). Multilingualism and identity: A meeting of different discourses. In F. Dervin & A. Liddicoat (Eds.), *Linguistics for intercultural education in language learning and teaching* (pp.175-196). New York, New York: John Benjamins.
- Canagarajah, S. (1996). From critical research practice to critical research reporting. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 320-330.
- Castellotti, V. (2008). Au-delà du bilinguisme : quelle place en France pour une éducation plurilingue? In E. Jürgen, G. Budach, & M. Kunkel (Eds.), *Écoles plurilingues—Multilingual schools: Konzepte, institutionen und akteure. Internationale perspektiven* (pp. 169-189). Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.
- Cenoz, J., & Genesee, F. (1998). Psycholinguistic perspectives on multilingualism and multilingual education. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (Eds.), *Beyond bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education* (pp. 16-32). Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Citizenship & Immigration Canada. (2009). *Facts and figures 2009—Immigration overview: Permanent and temporary residents*. Retrieved from <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/statistics/facts2009/permanent/01.asp>.
- Cook, V. J. (1992). Evidence for multi-competence. *Language Learning*, 42, 557-591.

- Cook, V. J. (1995). Multi-competence and the learning of many languages. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 8, 93-98.
- Cook, V. J. (2002). Background to the L2 user. In V. J. Cook (Ed.), *Portraits of the L2 user* (pp. 1-28). Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Coste, D. (2002). Compétence à communiquer et compétence plurilingue. *Notions en Questions*, 6, 115-123.
- Council of Europe. (2011). *Common European framework of reference for: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Council of Europe. Retrieved from [http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Cadre1\\_en.asp](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Cadre1_en.asp)
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy. Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2001). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Los Angeles, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Cummins, J. (2004). Multiliteracies pedagogy and the role of identity texts. In K. Leithwood, P. McAdie, N. Bascia, & A. Rodrigue (Eds.), *Teaching for deep understanding: Towards the Ontario curriculum that we need* (pp. 68-74). Toronto, Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto and the Elementary Federation of Teachers of Ontario.
- Cummins, J. (2009). Pedagogies of choice: Challenging coercive relations of power in classrooms and communities. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(3), 261-272.
- Dagenais, D. (2008). Developing a critical awareness of language diversity in immersion. In T. Fortune & D. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to bilingualism and multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 201-220). Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Davies, A. (2003). *The native speaker: Myth and reality*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Dervin, F., & Badrinathan, V. (2011). *L'enseignant non natif : identités et légitimité dans l'enseignement-apprentissage des langues étrangères*. Paris, France: Proximités.
- Duchêne, A., & Heller, M. (2007). *Discourses of endangerment: Interest and ideology in the defense of languages*. London, United Kingdom: Continuum.
- Duchêne, A., & Heller, M. (2012). *Language in late capitalism: Pride and profit*. New York, New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Critical language awareness*. London, United Kingdom: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. London, United Kingdom: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2006). *Language and globalization*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Fishman, J. (2002). Endangered minority languages: Prospects for sociolinguistic research. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 4(2), 1-9.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: A global perspective*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., & Sylvain, C. (2011). Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(iii), 385-400.
- Gogolin, I. (1994). *Der monolinguale Habitus der multilingualen Schule*. Münster, Germany: Waxmann.
- Government of Canada. (1985). *Canadian multiculturalism act*. Retrieved from <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-18.7/>



- Government of Canada. (1988). *Canadian official languages act*. Retrieved from [http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/html/act\\_loi\\_e.php](http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/html/act_loi_e.php)
- Government of Canada, Department of Canadian Heritage. (2008). *Roadmap for Canada's linguistic duality 2008-2013: Acting for the future*. Retrieved from <http://www.pch.gc.ca/pgm/slo-ols/pubs/08-13-LDL/index-eng.cfm>.
- Government of Canada. (2011). *40<sup>th</sup> Parliament, 3<sup>rd</sup> session. Edited hansard, number 149*. Retrieved from <http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?Language=E&Mode=1&Parl=40&Ses=3&DocId=5072532#SOBQ-3827544>
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. New York, New York: International publishers.
- Grosjean, F. (1989). Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language*, 36, 3-15.
- Habermas, J. (1974). On social identity. *TELOS*, 19(Spring), 91-103. Retrieved from <http://journal.telospress.com/content/1974/19/91.abstract>
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society* (T. Burger, Trans.). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Polity Press. (Original work published 1962)
- Hammersely, M. (2007). The issue of quality in qualitative research. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 30(3), 287-305.
- Heller, M. (1994). *Crosswords: Language, education, and ethnicity*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heller, M. (2006). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. London, United Kingdom: Longman.
- Herdina, P., & Jessner, U. (2002). *A dynamic model of multilingualism. Perspectives of change in psycholinguistics*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1990). *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Hornberger, N. (2005). Opening and filling up implementational and ideological spaces in heritage language education. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 605-612.
- Hoskins, B., & Sallah, M. (2011). Developing intercultural competence in Europe: The challenges. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 11(2), 113-125.
- Hu, A., & Byram, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Interkulturelle kompetenz und fremdsprachliches lernen*. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr.
- Jovchelovitch, S. (2007). *Knowledge in context: Representation, community and culture*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Kramersch, C. (2006). From communicative competence to symbolic competence. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(2), 249-252.
- Labrie, N., & Lamoureux, S. (2003). (Eds.). *L'éducation de langue française en Ontario : enjeux et processus sociaux*, Sudbury, Canada: Prise de Parole.
- Lamarre, P. (2010, September). *Living multilingualism in Canadian cities: Challenges to theory and to the political accommodation of diversity*. Symposium conducted at the 18<sup>th</sup> Sociolinguistics Symposium Conference at the University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom.
- Lamarre, P., & Lamarre, S. (2009). Montréal "on the move" : pour une approche ethnographique non-statique. In T. Bulot (Ed.), *Formes & normes sociolinguistiques. Ségrégations et discriminations urbaines* (pp. 105-134). Paris, France: L'Harmattan.

- Lapkin, S., MacFarlane, S., & Vandergrift, L. (2006). *Teaching French in Canada: FSL teachers' perspectives*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Teachers' Federation.
- Lawless, E. (1992). "I was afraid someone like you... an outsider... would misunderstand": Negotiating interpretive differences between ethnographers and subjects. *The Journal of American Folklore*, 105(417), 302-314.
- Lüdi, G., & Py, B. (2002). *Être bilingue*. Bern, Germany: Peter Lang.
- Madibbo, A. (2006). *Minority within a minority: Black Francophone immigrants and the dynamics of power and resistance*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Mady, C. (2008). Opening the doors to official language learning for Allophones. *The State of French Second Language Education in Canada 2008*. Canadian Parents for French. Retrieved from [http://cpf.ca/en/files/04\\_Allophone\\_E.pdf](http://cpf.ca/en/files/04_Allophone_E.pdf)
- Mahboob, A. (2005). Beyond the native speaker in TESOL. In S. Zafar (Ed.), *Culture, context, & communication* (pp. 60-93). Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates: Center of Excellence for Applied Research and Training & The Military Language Institute.
- Makropoulos, J., & Byrd Clark, J. (2011, June). *Identity implications of French immersion engagement for Canadian high school students*. Paper presented for a panel at the ISLS Conference, Oranjestad, Aruba.
- Marcellesi, J. B. (1979). Quelques problemes de l'hégémonie culturelle en France : langue nationale et langues regionals. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 21, 63-80.
- Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-dimensional man—Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. New York, New York: Beacon Press.
- Martin, M. (2011). Finnish and Estonian in second-language acquisition research. In A. Haas & P. B. Brown (Eds.), *Proceedings of the XIVth, XVth, and XVIth conferences of the Finno-Ugric Studies Association of Canada* (pp. 137-148). Providence, RI: Rhode Island College.
- Moore, D., & Gajo, L. (2009). French voices on plurilingualism and pluriculturalism: Theory, significance and perspectives. *International Journal of Multilingualism and Multiculturalism*, 6(2), 137-153.
- Mougeon, R., & Heller, M. (1986). The social and historical context of minority French language school in Ontario. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 7(2/3), 199-228.
- Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 9-31.
- Pennycook, A. (2005). Performing the personal. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 4(4), 297-304.
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Pillow, W. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(2), 175-196.
- Prasad, G. (2009). *Alter(n)ative literacies: Elementary teachers' practices with culturally and linguistically diverse learners in one French-language school in Ontario* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1807/18108>
- Quell, C. (2000). *Speaking the languages of citizenship* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.

- Rampton, B. (2007). Linguistic ethnography and the study of identities. *Working papers in urban language and literacies* (Paper 43). Retrieved from <http://www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/departments/education/research/ldc/publications/workingpapers/43.pdf>
- Rampton, B., Tusting, K., Maybin, J., Barwell, R., Creese, A., & Lytra, V. (2004). *UK linguistic ethnography: A discussion paper*. Retrieved from [www.ling-ethno.org.uk](http://www.ling-ethno.org.uk)
- Risager, K. (2007). *Language and culture pedagogy: From a national to a transnational paradigm*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Roy, S. (2008). French immersion studies: From second-language acquisition (SLA) to social issues. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 54(4), 396-406.
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Statistics Canada. (2006). *Profil des communautés de 2006*. Retrieved from [www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/prof/92-591/index.cfm?Lang=F](http://www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/prof/92-591/index.cfm?Lang=F).
- Swain, M. (2006). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced language proficiency. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: the contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95-108). London, United Kingdom: Continuum.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Weber, J.-J., & Horner, K. (2012). *Introducing multilingualism: A social approach*. New York, NY: Routledge.