

A Qualitative Research Study on the Interplays between Plurilingualism and Identity

by

Arlene Kent Spracklin

M.Sc., (Speech-Language Pathology), University of North Dakota, 2003

B.A., University of Manitoba, 2001

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

in the

Languages, Cultures and Literacies Program
Faculty of Education

© Arlene Kent Spracklin 2018

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Summer 2018

Copyright in this work rests with the author. Please ensure that any reproduction or re-use is done in accordance with the relevant national copyright legislation.

Approval

Name: Arlene Kent Spracklin

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Title: A Qualitative Research Study on the Interplays
between Plurilingualism and Identity

Examining Committee:

Chair: Ena Lee
Assistant Professor

Steve Marshall
Senior Supervisor
Associate Professor

Danièle Moore
Supervisor
Professor

Geneviève Brisson
Internal Examiner
Assistant Professor

Shelley Taylor
External Examiner
Professor
Faculty of Education
Western University

Date Defended/Approved: 08 14, 2018

Ethics Statement

The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

- a. human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics

or

- b. advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University

or has conducted the research

- c. as a co-investigator, collaborator, or research assistant in a research project approved in advance.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed with the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

Update Spring 2016

Abstract

The aim of this research study is to provide further insight into the interplays between plurilingualism and identity among first year academic literacy students in university. The participants were from a university located in Metro Vancouver, British Columbia. A qualitative methodology with an interpretivist ethnographic approach was used. I analyzed the data based on the theoretical concepts linking plurilingualism and agency (Coste & Simon, 2009; Marshall & Moore, 2013), multiliteracies and the ways in which identity can be negotiated (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009), discursive practices and their influence on identity (Gee, 2005) and lastly the concepts of identity negotiation and contestation (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2001; Hall, 1996; Leung, Harris & Rampton, 1997). Participants revealed their perspectives on how they perceived their multi/plurilingualism and how they were able to use their languages across space and time. The participants expressed multiple layers of identity that intersected with ideas of legitimacy, competency, performance and agency in accordance with the physical spaces they occupied.

Keywords: Plurilingualism; Identity; Discourse; Multiliteracies.

Dedication

To my family,

Thank you for your endless love and support.

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my gratitude to all the participants who shared their stories and experiences.

Thank you to the examining committee. Your suggestions and support were helpful and encouraging. I sincerely appreciate the time you took to review my study and all of your recommendations.

My sincerest appreciation and gratitude to Dr. Steve Marshall. You have been a guiding force in helping me complete this study. I appreciate your patience, expertise, and kindness throughout this process. You are truly an inspiration for plurilingual educators and I have learned so much from you. I would also like to thank Dr. Danièle Moore for your consistent encouragement and for sharing your wealth of knowledge in plurilingual education. You are a pioneer in this field, and I feel fortunate to have worked with you.

I would like to extend love and gratitude to my family. To my father, mother and brothers, thank you for the endless support and encouragement. Without your help, I would not have been able to achieve this. To my husband and daughter, thank you for your patience throughout this process. You have been a strong support and I appreciate that this was a family endeavour. Above all, I thank God for His grace and blessings.

Table of Contents

Approval.....	ii
Ethics Statement.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Dedication.....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables.....	xi
List of Acronyms.....	xii
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2. The Context of the Study.....	7
Chapter 3. Literature Review.....	11
3.1. Lingualisms.....	12
3.2. Plurilingualism.....	13
3.3. Code-switching, Translanguaging and Code-meshing.....	16
3.4. Multiliteracies.....	19
3.5. Discursive Practices.....	22
3.6. Cultural Capital and Investment.....	25
3.7. Theories of Identity Construction and Negotiation.....	28
3.8. Conclusion.....	33
Chapter 4. Qualitative Research Methodology and Data Collection Methods.....	35
4.1. Historical Overview of Qualitative Research.....	35
4.2. Ethnography.....	37
4.3. Interpretive Ethnography.....	38
4.4. Narrative Text.....	39
4.5. Semi-structured Interviews.....	39
4.6. Advantages of Ethnography.....	42
4.7. Limitations of Qualitative and Ethnographic Research.....	43
4.8. Data Collection Methods.....	45
4.8.1. Participants.....	45
4.8.2. Data collection.....	47
4.8.3. Data analysis.....	49
4.9. Ethical Considerations.....	51
4.10. Researcher Reflexivity.....	53
4.11. Conclusion.....	54
Chapter 5. Data Analysis, Part 1.....	55
5.1. The Categorization of Languages.....	56
Excerpt 5.11.....	56
Alka.....	56

Narrative Excerpt 5.11	58
Anna	58
Excerpt 5.12.....	59
Jack	59
Excerpt 5.13.....	61
Amar	61
5.2. Self-Perceptions of Multi/Plurilingualism	63
Excerpt 5.14.....	63
Mari.....	63
Excerpt 5.15.....	64
Saleem.....	64
5.3. Perceptions of Multilingualism at University and in ALL 99	65
Excerpt 5.16.....	65
Mari.....	65
Excerpt 5.17.....	66
Mariyam	66
Excerpt 5.18.....	67
Mari.....	67
Narrative Excerpt 5.12	69
Mariyam	69
Excerpt 5.19.....	69
Sue	69
Excerpt 5.21.....	70
Rahul	70
5.4. Conclusion.....	72
Chapter 6. Data Analysis, Part 2.....	74
6.1. How Monolingual and Plurilingual Identities are Performed	74
Excerpt 6.11.....	75
Puja	75
Excerpt 6.12.....	75
Bartholomew.....	75
Excerpt 6.13.....	76
Mari.....	76
Excerpt 6.14.....	77
Alka.....	77
Excerpt 6.15.....	78
Saleem.....	78
Excerpt 6.16.....	78
Mariyam	78
Puja	79
6.2. The Labelling of Identity.....	81
Narrative Excerpt 6.1:	81
Mari.....	81

Excerpt 6.18.....	81
Mari.....	81
Excerpt 6.19.....	84
Mari.....	84
Excerpt 6.21.....	85
Saleem.....	85
Excerpt 6.22.....	86
Alka.....	86
Excerpt 6.23.....	88
Bartholomew.....	88
Excerpt 6.24.....	89
Puja.....	89
6.3. Conclusion.....	91
Chapter 7. Analysis, Part 3.....	92
7.1. The Impact of Institutional Discourses.....	92
7.1.1. Institutional Discourse.....	92
Excerpt 7.11.....	93
Rahul.....	93
Excerpt 7.12.....	93
Puja.....	93
Excerpt 7.13.....	93
Kate.....	93
Excerpt 7.14.....	96
Adrian.....	96
Excerpt 7.15.....	96
Rahul.....	96
7.1.2. Familial and Home Discourses.....	97
Excerpt 7.16.....	98
Rahul.....	98
Excerpt 7.17.....	98
Mariyam.....	98
Excerpt 7.18.....	100
Kate.....	100
7.1.3. Perceptions of Plurilingualism and Agency.....	101
Excerpt 7.19.....	101
Alka.....	101
Excerpt 7.21.....	102
Keon.....	102
7.2. Conclusion.....	105
Chapter 8. Conclusion and Implications.....	106
8.1. Overview of the Study.....	106
8.2. Research Questions and Findings.....	106

8.2.1.	Findings Related to Research Question 1.....	107
8.2.2.	Findings Related to Research Question 2.....	109
8.2.3.	Findings Related to Research Question 3.....	110
8.3.	Summary of Findings.....	112
8.4.	Research Limitations.....	114
8.5.	Pedagogical Implications and Future Directions.....	115
8.6.	Concluding Remarks.....	116
References.....		118
Appendix A.	Sample of Interview Questions.....	129
Appendix B.	Sample 1 of Reflexive Field Notes.....	131
Appendix C.	Sample 2 of Reflexive Field Notes.....	132

List of Tables

Table 4.1	Participant Characteristics.....	46
Table 4.2	Research stages, participants, data	47

List of Acronyms

ALL	Academic Learning and Literacies.
UWC	University of the West Coast

Chapter 1.

Introduction

As the linguistic tapestry continues to change in Metro Vancouver due to globalization and population movement, new forms of intermeshing multilingualism (Marshall & Moore, 2013) are permeating within schools and universities. Within Canada there are 200 languages spoken (Statistics Canada, 2011) and in Metro Vancouver alone, 45% of the population speaks a non-official language (Statistics Canada, 2011). As researchers, it is critical to question and understand how such a substantial part of the population is negotiating their plurilingualism in a society that often promotes institutional monolingual discourses.

In Metro Vancouver, the changes brought about by globalization, population movement, and transnationalism have resulted in an increase in the number of international and immigrant students in all levels of schooling. These changes affect the dynamics within the classrooms, as more and more students are from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds, which inevitably impacts student learning and pedagogy.

In higher education, the internationalization also creates new dynamics within the university classrooms. Students are bringing multilingual and multicultural knowledge and experiences into the classroom, and pedagogical approaches employed by instructors play an important part in defining how students' experiences and knowledge are valued. In this sense, an increase in linguistic diversity raises challenges for both educators and students. Educators need to re-consider their pedagogy in order to incorporate new ways to help students succeed while still including and valuing their linguistic and cultural assets. At the same time, students from multilingual backgrounds may face challenges in succeeding in various academic disciplines. In order to assist multilingual first-year students making the transition to higher education, many institutions have set up academic literacy courses to help students build the skills needed to succeed across the disciplines in higher education. In addition to challenges

related to languages and academic literacies, students often face the additional challenges related to legitimacy, belonging and identity.

There are a number of different terms used to describe those who speak multiple languages. This spectrum of terms ranges from a traditional bilingual approach, which views languages as separate entities and speakers requiring native like competencies (Bloomfield, 1933; Weinreich, 1953) to a more dynamic plurilingual approach, which allows for fluidity between languages, with less emphasis on competence and more on agency and how languages are used within social and cultural contexts (Coste & Simon, 2009). A plurilingual lens will be used to further an understanding of how identities are negotiated, constructed, perceived and performed among first year university students. In order to gain a better understanding of plurilingualism, a detailed description of bilingualism and multilingualism will be put forth prior to the discussion of plurilingualism, in the literature review chapter. With globalizing changes occurring in relatively short periods of time, not only is understanding plurilingual individuals and their identities important, it is important for researchers and educators to lead pedagogical changes.

I have chosen to address the pedagogical and theoretical issues related to plurilingualism, and the interplays related to identity and multiliteracies, in a qualitative study, that employs features of ethnographic research. Participants in my research study are first-year students at University of the West Coast (UWC) enrolled in an academic literacy course, called Academic Learning and Literacies (ALL 99). UWC is a multicultural, multilingual university located in British Columbia. The ALL 99 course is structured for students who did not meet the written English requirement set by the university. In order to enroll in higher-level writing courses, students must first pass ALL 99. The plurilingual participants from this study speak the following languages as well as English: Mandarin, Cantonese, Urdu, Hindi, Farsi and Korean. The research study was conducted in three parts. In stage one of the research project, I interviewed three students from a previous research project for which I was a research assistant. In stage two, I interviewed six students from different ALL 99 classes during one semester, and in stage three, I interviewed ALL 99 students from one class and was involved in the class as a participant observer. In total, fifteen students participated in the study. All participants were interviewed about their language use, literacy practices, identity, and transitions to university (whether it be from high school to university or from their country

of origin to university). Some participants submitted narrative texts that were about their transition to university and this was discussed further during the interviews.

I have chosen to use a plurilingual theoretical approach to analyze my data, as it has a strong focus on valuing agency as well as “individual repertoires” (Marshall & Moore, 2013, p. 3). In their study on plurilingual university students, Marshall and Moore focused on plurilingual theory, but also incorporated the term multilingualism. They defined multilingualism as the “the broader social language context/contact(s) and the coexistence of several languages in a particular situation” (p. 3). I have chosen to adopt a similar framework when analyzing data. The term multilingualism is used with participants as it is a more familiar term for them, particularly when responding to questions related to identity and the use of multiple languages. Additionally, theories of cultural capital and the commodification of language, the forming and re-forming of identities, and discursive practices will be used to analyze and synthesize the collected data.

I chose to research plurilingual students in higher education for a number of reasons. Universities implement and reproduce institutional and societal discursive practices and house an ethnically and linguistically diverse population. Thereby, the university is an ideal site to explore issues of plurilingualism and identity. According to Moore and Castellotti (2008), plurilingualism relies on the social actor that dynamically engages within a specific context and is able to navigate through these contexts by using their “linguistic and cultural resources, enacting various facets of his or her identity” (as cited in Coste & Simon, 2009, p.174). In education, the notion of the plurilingual speaker as a social actor is an important frame of reference as it creates space for agency, subjectivity and social context (Stille & Cummins, 2013) all of which are used to negotiate, form and reform identities.

By gaining insight into plurilingual identities, it is also important to consider the ways in which identities can be expressed, negotiated and contested. Plurilingual identities can be performed not only through verbal modalities but also through written text. Multiliteracies as viewed by the New London Group (1996) refers to “the multiplicity of communications channels and media, and the increasing salience of cultural and linguistic diversity” (p. 63). Multilingual students enrolled in university perform monolingual academic English within specific academic spaces but use multiple

languages including code-switching, translanguaging and code-meshing in the process of learning, for example, when texting or using social networking. In this regard, Marshall, Hyashi, and Yeung (2012) found that participants in their study "...conform(ed) by excluding the multi in assessed work to produce a text that meets the hegemonic norms and hegemonic discourse of standard academic English" (p. 50). Thereby, for this study, it is important to further investigate how students use their spoken language and other modalities (including written) to negotiate their identities (Marshall et al., 2012).

In order to understand the challenges the participants faced and what role plurilingual identity played, the following research questions were chosen:

- How do plurilingual students in a first-year academic literacy course perceive and perform their identities in a university setting?
- How do plurilingual students form and re-form their identities in the academic setting using verbal and written modalities?
- What role do social and institutional discourses about plurilingual students play in their perceptions and performances around language and identity?

This study and the research questions have significant personal, pedagogical and broader importance. On a personal level, as a multilingual visible minority who grew up in a small Canadian city, I too have had to explore issues of identity negotiation. I grew up in the suburbs of a small prairie city in Canada. Throughout my younger years of school, I was one of three visible minorities in my class. I felt different than the other children, and I was seen as different by classmates and teachers. I would often deny that I spoke another language at home, in order to belong. I remember doing my family tree in elementary school and anglicizing the names of my Indian relatives, so that I would appear the same as my peers. My grandmother, who spoke Punjabi would attend my childhood birthday parties and in front of my friends I would pretend I did not understand what she was saying. Teachers at school would often put me on display as representative of my culture during multicultural events. As an Indian-Canadian, growing up, my ethnicity was often reified, and my 'Canadianness' was overshadowed by my 'Indianness'. This conflict between people's perceptions and my own inner identity was impactful in the way I identified myself.

Although my linguistic competence in Punjabi and Hindi pales in comparison to my English language skills, I still identify as plurilingual speaker and am able to navigate within these cultural worlds. However, navigating between these worlds was a struggle, as my school and social circles did not create a space for this negotiation. Growing up in the prairie provinces in the 1980s, there was not a space for expressing my “plurilingualness.” There were a handful of essentialized days (“multicultural day”) where we were meant to bring our traditional foods or wear our cultural clothing. Only until I came to Vancouver in my mid-twenties was I really exposed to a more “multi/plurilingual” environment and perhaps that is because I sought out that situation. Stille and Cummins (2013) discuss the importance of plurilingualism in education by emphasizing that plurilingual identities are constantly being shaped and transformed and the classroom is one of the main epicentres for these changes. By creating space and acknowledging a student’s linguistic repertoires, cultural knowledge, multiliteracies and plurilingual practices, educators can help plurilingual and non-plurilingual students navigate through these academic spaces.

From a global perspective, studying plurilingual identity and multiliteracies is important because “our societies are and will remain plural in nature” (Coste & Simon, 2009, p. 175). If linguistic diversity and repertoires are appreciated and seen as valuable among society, then it is possible to create connections “...which assure social cohesion beyond differences in language and culture” (p. 175). By forming an understanding about the “other” in terms of identity and language, perhaps bridges can be built toward each other instead of more separation. As Glaser (2005) states, “Languages enhance people’s mobility and thus their readiness to cross borders, as the ability to communicate with people reduces the fear of “otherness...With every language we learn, we add a different perspective” (p. 207).

The organization of this thesis will be as follows: In chapter 1, the research questions and the contextualization of the background information will be discussed. Chapter 2 will detail the demographic and linguistic background information pertaining to the study. In chapter 3, an in-depth analysis of the literature related to this study will be reviewed, including a discussion of the different linguistics with a focus on a plurilingual framework, multiliteracies and how they pertain to plurilingual identity; and lastly theories of discourse, legitimacy and identity negotiation and formation will be discussed. Chapter 4 will include a discussion of methodology, including the qualitative methods used to

investigate the previously stated research questions. In chapters 5 to 7, an analysis and discussion of the collected data will be presented using the outlined theoretical framework; and chapter 8 will include the conclusion and theoretical and pedagogical implications of this study.

Chapter 2.

The Context of the Study

As a plurilingual Canadian, I was fortunate to have lived in different provinces across the country. I have experienced the ways in which my plurilingualism has been received and has evolved according to space and time. When living in the suburbs of the prairies in the 1980s and 1990s, my own plurilingualism was often seen as a difference between myself and others. Moving to Metro Vancouver, where the linguistic diversity is vast and multilingualism is more prevalent, has allowed me to exercise my own plurilingualism in new ways.

Canada, once an established French colony and then a British colony, is divided into ten provinces and three territories. According to the 2016 general census (Statistics Canada, 2016) Canada has a population of approximately 36 million people. The two official languages are English and French. There are 200 languages spoken in the country and 21% of the population identify a non-official language as their mother tongue. The statistics have shown an increase in the number of non-official languages spoken at home. There has also been a 20% increase in the number of people who speak a non-official, immigrant language. In Canada, between 2011 and 2016, there has been a 34% increase in the number of people who speak English and a non-official language. The three most common non-official languages are Mandarin, Cantonese and Punjabi. The most recent statistics available at the time of my study (Statistics Canada, 2017) found that 7,321,065 people in Canada speak a non-official language (a language other than French and/or English) and 50% of Canadians speak both an official language and a non-official one. In British Columbia, 27% of the population speaks a non-official language, while 69% of the population surveyed speak only English.

British Columbia (BC) has a population of over 4.6 million people, with over 40% of British Columbians living in Greater Vancouver (Statistics Canada, 2017). According to the BC Ministry of Citizens Services (2017), the majority of the population growth can be attributed to international migration, with 61% of immigrants relocating to BC coming

from Asian countries. Of the total population in B.C., 28.3% are immigrants, and 40% of the population of Metro Vancouver are immigrants.

Metro Vancouver is an urban setting made up of twenty-three subdivisions and is the third-largest metropolitan area in Canada. According to Census Canada's most recent published statistics, there are 2,463,431 people living in Metro Vancouver (Statistics Canada, 2017) and 40% of Vancouverites speak a non-official language. The three most common non-official languages are Punjabi (6.4% of the population), Cantonese (5.8% of the population), and Chinese (5.0% of the population). Similar to the national statistics, there has been a trend indicating an increase in non-official languages being spoken at home (Statistics Canada, 2017).

The statistics highlight an important trend: an increase in the immigrant population and an increase in non-official languages being spoken. Block (2006) discusses the influx of immigration populations in terms of transnationalism. Block views transnationals as more than immigrants, as people who established themselves in a new territory and continue to have strong religious, social, economic, and political ties with their home country. Jordan and Duvell (2003) (as cited in Block, 2006) refer to transnational social spaces as places where groups are formed based on ethnicity, religion, geography, or nationality and these groups have strong cultural and economic connections to their homeland. An increase in the transnational population creates a shift in how social, economic, and political spaces are used. In contrast, "immigrant communities" are described as being part of a defined group but not necessarily having the same loyalty and commitment to their country of origin. The increase in transnationals will continue to impact the way these groups occupy social and political spaces and will play a role in identity and how languages are used.

My study occurred at the University of the West Coast (UWC) in Metro Vancouver, where the student population is considered diverse. The population consists of over 34,000 students. Half of the first-year undergraduate students reported speaking more than one language at home. The top three languages spoken were Cantonese, Mandarin and Punjabi. There are approximately 800 students enrolled in the ALL 99 course. The majority of the students (close to 90%) speak a heritage language, or

another language other than English at home. Most of the students attending ALL 99 have completed part of their education (elementary or high school) in Canada.¹

The UWC students who participated in my research study were undergraduate students enrolled in ALL 99, a preliminary course for students who do not meet SFU's writing requirements. The aim of ALL 99 is to improve students' academic literacy skills so they can pursue writing in the disciplines (W) courses at the university.

As stated, ALL 99 is a required course for students who did not meet the writing pre-requisites set by the university. The pre-requisites include achieving 75% or higher in English 12 (for students coming from high school) or obtaining a minimum overall score of 7.0 on the *International English Language Testing System (IELTS)* exam (for international students with English as an additional language (EAL)). In order to pass ALL 99, students must receive a grade of C or better, and are then eligible to take a W course. Students required to take ALL 99 may not be able to take other courses of their choice, and as a result may not feel like legitimate university students. As previously mentioned, approximately 90% of the students enrolled in ALL 99, use languages other than French or English in their homes. However, it is important to stress that enrollment for ALL 99 does not separate students based on their linguistic backgrounds, therefore these percentages are not represented consistently across all sections of ALL 99.

For this study, participants were recruited from different sections of ALL 99 in the spring and fall 2015 semesters. The course was divided into five units: writing about yourself; active and critical reading; thinking and writing critically; paragraphs, introductions and conclusions; writing about arguments. In Unit 1, students wrote about a major life event while learning how to use a narrative style of writing and engage in peer review practices. In Unit 2, students critically engaged with text by scrutinizing the sources of information, unpacking different voices and opinions embedded in the text, formulating their own opinions, writing summaries and annotating text. In Unit 3, students learned to write critiques by identifying logical fallacies, stating arguments, and supporting those arguments with reliable sources. In Unit 4, students learned the structure of writing paragraphs, introductions, and conclusions while addressing cohesion, verb usage, and formal writing practices. In Unit 5, students practised writing a

¹ Due to reasons of anonymity, citation is not provided.

formal essay by creating an outline, gathering ideas, and synthesizing supporting arguments.

Due to the increase in non-official languages being spoken at the university, it is critical to further investigate how these multi- and plurilingual students are using languages both within and outside the classroom and how institutional and societal discourse affects language use. As discussed by Marshall, Hayashi, and Yeung (2012) and Leung, Harris, and Rampton (1997), it is also critical to see how identities are being negotiated and contested among multi- and plurilingual students, including linguistic agency and feelings of belonging.

The instructor who taught the course in which I was a participant observer often emphasized the importance of creating a space for multilingual, multiliterate practices. During peer group work, he allowed students to speak in languages other than English and to use both English and other languages of their choice in the process of writing in-class assignments. Although all academic papers in the ALL 99 class I participated in were written in English, many students wrote their outlines or rough drafts in their home language and then translated them into English. When working in small groups, students often spoke languages other than English and used their home language to explain the instructions to other students, to generate ideas about the exercise or to have a social conversation.

In this chapter, I have provided a picture of the linguistic demographics that are the backdrop for this research investigation. These statistics have shown an increase in the use of non-official languages nationally, municipally, and at the university level. Within the microcosm of the university, these globalized changes and the influx of migrants and transnationals have created new dynamics for plurilingual individuals to explore and express agency, contest and negotiate their identities. At the same time the hegemonic nature of structural and institutional discourses constrains students' agency in many learning contexts.

Chapter 3.

Literature Review

Linguistic diversity and demographic changes in society, and specifically higher education, underpin the lives of the multi/plurilingual students in this study. Multi/plurilingualism permeates all levels of society, from social networking and social media to globalization, migration and economic changes. In terms of the lives of plurilingual students in higher education, broader social factors and discourses about multi-plurilingualism find representation in their interconnected languages, literacies, and identities.

This chapter will be divided into four parts. The first section of this chapter will discuss different lingualisms and specifically the role of plurilingualism and the connections between identity and agency as discussed in Coste & Simon (2009) and Marshall & Moore (2013). In this section, the contextualization of multilingual practices, such as code-switching, translanguaging and code-meshing will also be theorized (Canagarajah, 2011; Li & Hua, 2013). The second section in this chapter will focus on multiliteracies in relation to higher education and identity (Barton, Hamilton, & Ivanič, 2000; Cope & Kalantzis, 2009; Gee, 2010; Heath & Street, 2008; Marshall & Moore, 2013; Mills, 2009; New London Group, 1996). In the third section a theoretical lens will be used to contextualize discursive practices (Bakhtin, 1981; Gee, 2005; Heath & Street, 2008; Preece, 2009), cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1991; Heller, 1996; Kubota, 2016; Norton, 1997;) and lastly the construction and negotiation of identities will be presented (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2001; Hall, 1996; Leung, Harris & Rampton, 1997; Lee & Marshall, 2012; Marshall, 2009; Norton, 1997). It is my hope that in theorizing the data in my thesis through these analytic lenses, I will be able to build upon existing understandings of plurilingual identity and multiliteracy pedagogy in tertiary institutions.

3.1. Lingualisms

In this section of the literature review, I will discuss various lingualisms including bilingualism, multi- and plurilingualism, code-switching, translanguaging and code-meshing. The way words and languages are used plays a critical role in how multilingual and/or plurilingual speakers affirm and negotiate their identities. As stated by Giampapa (2004), “In order to understand the connection to language as an avenue for identity performance, one must first understand the participants’ views of language and language practices, including code-switching/code-mixing” (p. 200).

Definitions of bilingualism have continually morphed and adapted to societal changes. The monolingual ideology that reigned over much of Europe “encouraged unity, liberty and nationalism” (Heller, 2007, p. 4). However, by the end of the 1940s, a shift toward bilingualism began to occur. It is important to understand the roots of bilingualism as partly stemming from Bloomfield’s (1933) conceptualization. Bloomfield (1933) described the bilingual speaker as having “native like control of two languages” (p. 55). He argued that bilingualism was the result of immigration, foreign travel, or study. At the time of Bloomfield’s early work, bilingualism was perceived to be common among children who spoke an immigrant language at home and English outside. Eventually the children he researched used less of their mother tongue and instead acquired their “adult language,” English.

Another pioneer of bilingual research, Uriel Weinreich (1964), described bilingualism in terms of individuals using two languages alternately. Weinreich discussed the agency of bilingual individuals in exercising their choice of using specific languages: “Some bilinguals, too, are accustomed to use only one language with a given person and find the transition to another language extremely difficult” (p. 81). Weinreich found that bilingualism requires balanced competence in both languages and “the ideal bilingual switches from one language to another according to appropriate changes in the speech situation (interlocutors, topics) but not in an unchanged speech situation” (as cited in Romaine, 1995, p. 5).

Haugen (1956), a scholar in the field of dual language learning, referred to a bilingual individual as knowing two languages with the ability to produce meaningful utterances in either language. Interestingly, Haugen also defined the multi/plurilingual

individual as knowing three or more languages. In his work, he emphasized the importance of keeping both languages apart to avoid “linguistic interference,” which referred to accents, mixing languages and using “loan words” (p. 11).

Early scholars focused on bilingualism in terms of the acquisition of a ‘dominant’ language, which in many cases was English. This perspective has since shifted from a segmented view of language to a more blended approach. Heller (2007) adopts a more sociolinguistic stance to describe bilingualism, as being hinged on the national regime and discourse. She illustrates that bilingualism is moving away from its static past and can instead be viewed from two angles, the first being the political connections that fuel the ideologies of bilingualism, including national discourses and the value systems that are related to language. The second angle emphasizes the function and uses of bilingualism among people and the social practices surrounding it. Moyer and Rojo (2007) discuss how national ideologies regarding monolingualism within the secondary school system in Madrid perpetuate the rhetoric that minority languages are not valued. The authors reported how some of the teachers who participated in their study held the strong belief that teaching students in multiple languages would hinder their competencies in any language. Their study found that many teachers subscribed to the idea that the monolingual environment was helping the students because they would have “more linguistic and cultural capital they need to integrate and progress in Spanish in society” (p. 147). This is an example of how monolingual ideologies can influence educational practice and fuel political agendas.

3.2. Plurilingualism

Plurilingualism can be viewed as an alternative lens to understand multiple languages, identity, and multiliteracies. Multilingualism and plurilingualism are often seen as interchangeable because they both involve the use and interactions of multiple languages (Marshall & Moore, 2018). García and Li (2014) emphasize the commonality between the terms bilingualism, multilingualism and plurilingualism, by stating “they have one thing in common—they refer to a plurality of autonomous languages, whether two (bilingual) or many (multilingual), at the individual (bilingual/plurilingual) or societal level (multilingual)” (p.11).

As discussed by Marshall and Moore (2018), plurilingualism encompasses more than the individual's language practices, it also includes people's history and knowledge (circumstances, languages and cultures) which are ever evolving. Along with the ideologies of plurilingualism, comes plurilingual competence. Plurilingual competence refers to the dynamic way individuals use their linguistic toolbox to interact socially, linguistically, and culturally and where their own agency is central to the process (Marshall & Moore, 2018). Coste, Moore, and Zarate (2009) define plurilingual competence as more than just linguistic competence highlighting "the ability to use languages for the purposes of communication and to take part in intercultural interaction, where a person, viewed as a social actor has proficiency of varying degrees, in several languages and experience of several cultures" (p. v). When viewing concepts of language and identity through a plurilingual lens, it is important to understand the development of the plurilingual social actor. According to Coste (2001), Moore (2006) and Blanchet (2007), plurilingual and pluricultural competence stems from a wholistic and interconnected view of language, identity and culture. The focus on plurilingual and pluricultural competence does not emphasize individual competencies, but instead stresses a "balance of skills." The emphasis is placed on the dynamic nature of competence, which is changing. The competencies are individualized and amalgamated according to an individual's "life path and personal biographies" (Coste, Moore & Zarate, 2009, p. v) and thus depend on context and situations. Coste and Simon (2009) refer to the idea of the plurilingual social actor as "...the relationship between action taken within a specific context and recourse by the social actors involved to different languages, linguistic plurality" (p. 168). They discuss this concept by relating the needs of the actor as being more than functional; instead, the ultimate goal of plurilingualism is to strive for harmony in their surroundings by creating a space for diversity and acceptance. Although this is the idealized hope of plurilingualism, the emphasis continues to be placed on the importance of valuing the individual's linguistic and intercultural competencies and the development and agency of the social actor.

As mentioned by Coste and Simon (2009), the importance of plurilingualism reaches beyond the individual, as it has great societal impacts, and therefore in the case of the participants in this study, institutional impacts. Marshall and Moore (2018) chose a plurilingual lens when researching first-year university students in an academic writing class. In their example, Ah Yeon, a student whose first language is Korean, was paired

with two native English speakers. The professor used a plurilingual approach in his/her classroom and students were not discouraged from using their linguistic and cultural identities to enhance their classroom engagement. Ah Yeon chose to complete the exercise by using both Korean and English and explained that she normally texts in Korean and because of the instructor's openness to using multiple languages, she felt it was like "free writing" (p. 10). When her native English-speaking partners were asked why they encouraged her to write in Korean, they responded by concurring that they had previously seen her texting in Korean. The students together used this opportunity to expand their understanding of each other's worlds. Ah Yeon chose to use a language that her partners could not understand to enhance her learning, and her partners chose to encourage her to use Korean, thereby acknowledging that aspects of her linguistic and cultural identity. Other students followed suit and chose to include multiple languages in their texts. Marshall and Moore's (2018) work brings theoretical significance to my current study for a number of reasons. By creating a space for plurilingualism in the classroom, some participants in their study were able to express their plurilingual agency and utilize their plurilingual competence. Ah Yeon was using her plurilingual agency to not only perform a linguistic identity but share an intercultural experience with her classmates. Secondly, this study emphasizes the importance of valuing linguistic diversity as an asset. In Heller's (1996) study, she discusses the importance of institutional legitimization of languages, and how some languages are considered legitimate and valued over others. Heller (1996) states

"It is about constructing the value of the different languages in a community repertoire and about defining who has the right to use them under what circumstances. What goes on in classroom interaction teaches students about their position both in the school and in the community and shows them what their chances are of being able to acquire the forms of language that count" (p.19).

This idea of legitimization and valuing languages relates to Marshall and Moore's (2018) study, because in the academic literacy classroom, not only was a space created for linguistic diversity, but there was value to it. The contextualization of plurilingual pedagogy and plurilingual agency will be further discussed in the data analysis chapter.

In an earlier study, Marshall and Moore (2013) discussed the importance of plurilingual pedagogy in a university setting. They interviewed first-year university students about their multi/plurilingual selves and found that some participants saw their

plurilingual tool box as an asset. One participant felt that being plurilingual allowed him to help others, while another expressed that being plurilingual at university allowed him to communicate as he does in his home environment. Marshall & Moore (2013) emphasized that plurilingual competence goes beyond cultural and linguistic understanding and involves the sharing of knowledge. To have an educational space where plurilingual students can feel a sense of belonging and use their plurilingual tool box to enhance their learning will help to “address the social and political dimensions of language learning, language education...” (p. 149). Marshall and Moore’s (2013) study brings relevance to my current study on a pedagogical level. As will be discussed in the data analysis chapter, many of the participants expressed similar views about feeling a sense of belonging in the academic literacy classroom because it encouraged plurilingual interactions among students.

3.3. Code-switching, Translanguaging and Code-meshing

The concepts of code-switching, translanguaging and code-meshing are ways in which linguistic exchanges can be theorized. When analyzing the data from this study, these concepts were important links to the participants’ exercising their linguistic agency. Code-switching is a means for bilingual/plurilingual individuals to create meaning that is socially and communicatively valuable (Auer, 1999). There are many different definitions and perspectives on code switching in the literature. For example, Poplack (2010) refers to code switching as the “mixing by bilinguals (or multilinguals), of two or more languages in discourse” (p. 15). Heller (1998) defines code-switching as the use of two or more languages in a “communicative episode” (p. 1). The functionality and importance of code-switching stems from its power to establish and reaffirm social boundaries, networks and relationships (Heller, 1988). Researchers first studied code-switching as linguistic variations and forms of language, but in the last three decades it has taken a more functional direction, where its purpose and use come into play. Situational code-switching, is one type of code-switching that depends on the social situation and roles in which the languages are used. This type of code-switching ties into the discursive and social practices that are related to language use and identity negotiation in specific settings. Metaphorical code-switching relates to the symbolism that represents the

unconventional/unexpected use of code-switching in specific situations. As with all language use, code-switching should not be seen as a neutral form of communication, but instead as one that carries issues of social hierarchy and social class (Heller, 1988). Code-switching is thus a way in which plurilingual speakers may demonstrate and negotiate their identity. Heller (1995) found that when researching a monolingual francophone high school, some participants used code-switching as a means to exhibit agency, resistance, and identity: “Here, then, is a school which is concerned with using French to resist the domination of English, in which students set up their resistance to the school through the very language which is oppressing (at least some of) them” (p. 400).

The term translinguaging has been used with reference to the ways languages change according to transnationalism and mobility. The idea of a global citizen is becoming the new norm for many, as individuals settle in new territories and have been “materially affected by global and transnational processes” (Li & Hua, 2013, p. 518). The term translinguaging stemmed from Cen Williams, who conducted research with Welsh and English students in the 1980s. The original concept of translinguaging referred to as “both languages [are] used in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner to organise and mediate mental processes in understanding, speaking literacy, and, not least, learning” (Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012). Williams’s original concept focused on the pedagogy that is involved in switching languages between receptive and expressive language use. His notion of translinguaging involved the input of information in one language, where the child has to integrate and understand the information in order to respond and express the idea in another language (Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012).

Some researchers have re-conceptualized the term translinguaging to include more of a hybrid, fluid perspective. Canagarajah (2011) and Velasco and García (2014) refer to translinguaging as the involvement of different languages being integrated into one linguistic system. García and Li (2014) argue that “a translinguaging approach to bilingualism extends the repertoire of semiotic practices of individuals and transforms them in to dynamic mobile resources that can adapt to global and local sociolinguistic situations” (p.18).

Li and Hua (2013) define translinguaging as the creation of a new social space, where one is able to express his/her multilingual self and use their “linguistic resources”

(p. 519). Translanguaging involves the interplay of language, social contexts, and communities of practice which in turn shape the multilayered reconstruction of identities (Li, 2011; Li & Hua, 2013). It is emphasized that translanguaging is not about mixing or hybridity but rather about the development of “new language practices” that reflect the identities and histories of individuals (García & Li, 2014, p. 21). In Li’s (2011) research on multilingual Chinese university students in Britain, he found that some participants wanted to exercise their multilingual agency without restrictions from parents or teachers. The participants wanted to “be able to pick and mix amongst the language they know at various levels” (p. 1228).

Finally, code-meshing (like the later understandings of translanguaging) refers to the use of languages as part of an “integrated system” (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 403), unlike code-switching, which involves switching from one language to another. One feature that distinguishes code-meshing from code-switching/translanguaging is the presence of different modalities of communication, including symbols (text), languages, and communicative codes in texts or utterances that are combined. Canagarajah describes his participant’s incorporation of code-meshing by using a sample of her writing from a graduate course. He discusses the four strategies of code-meshing used in the sample:

- Recontextualization strategies, which refer to the writer/speaker gauging the receptivity of the reader to use code-switching or their multilingualness.
- Voice strategies allow the speaker/writer to freely use their dominant linguistic codes. This strategy allowed Canagarajah’s participant to establish her identity as a Muslim in her writing and use codes to transfer her message.
- Interactional strategies involve interacting with the reader and form a negotiated understanding and “co-construct [the]meaning” (p. 408) of the text.
- Textualization strategies refer to writing as being a performative social interaction that involves multimodal textual development.

Michael-Luna and Canagarajah (2015) argue that the old ways of analyzing lingualisms as separate linguistic repertoires do not correspond with the current state of transnationals and multilinguals. Code-meshing offers an alternative way to view

language as part of a multimodal, multiliterate continuum, instead of compartmentalized segments of language. Code-meshing is recognized as context dependent with context playing an “integral part of the observable interaction and cannot be separated from it” (Michael-Luna & Canagarajah, 2015, p. 57). In contrast, code-switching has traditionally focused more on the set of rules that are used to distinguish when a specific language is used (Canagarajah, 2011). Of particular relevance to the plurilingual participants in this study are the use of code-switching/translanguaging/code-meshing as means to negotiate or affirm linguistic identity, as will be discussed in the upcoming chapters.

3.4. Multiliteracies

Individuals’ literacy practices are a different modality in which identity can be constructed and negotiated. “Writing is an act of identity” (Burgess & Ivanič, 2010, p. 228), thus literacies play a key role in how multilingual students perform their identities in tertiary institutions. In the contexts of this study, multiliteracies play an important role in how students draw upon their linguistic resources during their first year of university, and how they choose to express their plurilingual agency and identity.

New Literacy Studies (NLS) reconceptualized literacy by emphasizing the sociocultural perspective: “Literacy needed to be understood and studied in its full range of contexts-not just cognitive but also social, cultural, historical and institutional” (Gee, 2010, p.166). The concept of NLS acknowledges the following:

- In different circumstances people’s written language changes;
- There is a contextual and cultural component to languages, whether they switch styles or not;
- Written language cannot be isolated from oral language, because they are linked;
- Reading and writing is not just a cognitive or one-dimensional task; it involves people learning to read and write in certain way that involves their cultural or societal beliefs;

The term multiliteracies was coined in the mid 1990s by the New London Group. The New London Group's aim was to address the nature of new literacies during the age of new innovative technologies, transnational activity, and new usages of "social language" (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009). From a social constructivist viewpoint, literacy is seen as a social practice that involves culture and context (Barton, Hamilton, & Ivanič, 2000, p. 6). Barton et al. outlines six components of literacy practices that must be considered:

- Literacy is best understood as a set of social practices; these can be inferred from events which are mediated by written texts;
- There are different literacies associated with different domains of life;
- Literacy practices are patterned by social institutions and power relationships, and some literacies are more dominant, visible and influential than others;
- Literacy practices are purposeful and embedded in broader social goals and cultural practices;
- Literacy is historically situated;
- Literacy practices change and new ones are frequently acquired through the process of informal learning and sense making. (p. 8)

Literacies are practised and (per)formed in domains, or structured spaces and contexts (e.g. school, home, community). Select literacies are propagated and reinforced by institutions. These literacies are culturally constructed and are continually changing within the context of society. Barton et al. emphasize that a social constructivist approach requires that all literacy practices be examined by situating the practice within the social and situational contexts and identifying the motivation behind the act.

When looking at power dynamics and marginalization within literacy practices, multiliteracies offer an alternative literacy perspective. In their work, the New London (1996) group described the term multiliteracies as an evolving literacy that is the result of cultural and linguistic diversity, institutional orders and multimedia changes that are globally occurring (i.e. Internet, media) (Marshall & Moore, 2013; Mills, 2009; New

London Group, 1996). Multiliteracies create spaces that acknowledge different forms of literacy including: visual, performative, emotional and information literacy (Mills, 2009). Multiliteracies also emphasize “the need for literacy curricula to incorporate a widening range of digital text types with their associated boundaries of generic structure that are less visible than those of time honoured, written forms” (Mills, 2009, p. 105). Expanding the idea of literacy in education to include different forms of learning among diverse learners from varied backgrounds allows for “more powerful learning [to] arise from weaving between different knowledge processes in an explicit and purposeful way” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p 187). By creating a space for multiliteracies pedagogy within the classroom, marginalized cultures are able to “have a stake in literacy practice” (Mills, 2009, p.105) not just conform to the dominant antiquated literacy norms.

Multiliteracy practices relate to the students in my current research study on many levels. The participants are enrolled in an academic literacy class, ALL 99, where they are required to produce a level of academic English that is acceptable to the institution. The institutional discursive practices influence the oral and written language. When considering the incorporation of multiliteracies pedagogy, it is important to consider the culture and history of multilinguals and their forms of literacy practices (multiple languages, narrative literacy, visual literacy).

Heath & Street (2008) refer to academic literacies as a form of social practice that depends on “context, culture and genre” (p. 105). Academic literacies encompass academic skills and the construction of knowledge, but also include issues of power and institutional discourse. However, academic literacies alone do not acknowledge the multilayers of identity many marginalized students possess: “While institutions espouse policies on equal opportunities and student diversity, studies consistently find that students from non-traditional backgrounds experience institutional practices as exclusionary, marginalising and silencing” (Preece & Martin, 2009, p. 4)

Identity and academic literacy (the specific context of this study) are closely inter-related, as “writing demands in educational settings are also identity demands” (Burgess & Ivanič, 2010, p. 228). Burgess conducted an ethnographic study in an adult literacy class in the United Kingdom. Her study found that students were in an ambivalent state of identity construction, “partially desiring and partially resisting being constructed as someone in education; however, this is an aspect of their identity that they cannot

ignore” (p. 230). Some students in her study resisted their situational identity, as students in an adult literacy class because this was not what they had imagined for their future identity. Canagarajah (2011) found similar results in his study when using a translanguaging lens to understand the writing of one of his participants. In his research, Canagarajah found “multilinguals choose the extent to which the different languages in their repertoire are to be emphasized” (p. 413) instead of usage being seen as an automatic response. The participant in his study was given provisions to use multiple languages in her writing and was using this modality to bring ‘light and shade’ to aspects of her identity, knowledge, and linguistic repertoire.

3.5. Discursive Practices

Before delving into theoretical understandings of identity, it is important to examine the power relations and social constructions of discourse, which I consider to be part of the backdrop for identity negotiation and construction. Discursive practices can exist in various forms, including the written, oral, tacit, and hidden forms of language. Weedon (1997) emphasizes that within discourses lie structures of power relations of inclusion and exclusion, and these discourses construct one’s subjectivity and identity. Language encompasses more than speech and writing; it stems “out of a particular social identity (or social role), an identity that is composite of words, actions, and (implied) beliefs, values and attitudes” (Gee, 2005, p. 26). When we begin to unpack identity, we see layers of discursive practices that have helped us form and negotiate our sense of self. From a post-structural perspective, identity is ever-changing, and is in relation to how one understands their world (Weedon, 1997). Therefore, subjectivity is formed through changes in discursive fields: “These ways of thinking constitute our consciousness and the positions with which we identify structure our sense of ourselves, subjectivity” (Weedon, 1997, p. 32).

When looking further into discursive practices, it is useful to consider Bakhtin’s perspectives on discourse. Bakhtin (1981) examined discursive practices as contributing to one’s identity. He referred to these practices as the negotiation of voices: the internally persuasive voice and the authoritative voice (Bakhtin, 1981; Farnsworth, 2010). From Bakhtin’s dialogic perspective, meaning is constructed from a dialogue between speakers. Thus, everything that is said has meaning, and this meaning is a

result of an interaction with another (Gee, 2000). Closely related is a symbiotic relationship between individual identities and the social world: “the individual influences the social world, just as the social world influences the individual” (Freedman & Ball, 2004, p. 7). Subjects construct self from the interplay between authoritative discourse and their internally persuasive discourse. The authoritative discourse presents as a powerful hierarchical discourse that “demands our unconditional allegiance” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 343). In contrast, the internally persuasive discourse, which refers to using one’s own words as an appropriation of other discourses or others’ words, “is half-ours and half-someone else’s...It is not finite, it is open...and able to reveal ever new ways to mean” (p. 345-346). This allows for creativity and a form of discourse that is “denied all privilege, backed up by no authority at all” (p. 342). The struggle and interplay between these discourses “are what usually determine the history of an individual ideological consciousness” (p. 342). Bakhtin’s views on discourse and identity can be envisioned as an ever-changing kaleidoscope: by changing the colour of the lens, one alters the perspective. Similarly, by changing the outer discursive practices (authoritative discourse), one also changes the internal persuasive self, and vice versa.

Language ideologies or discourses are systems of representation that consist of the meanings and values of an institution. James Gee (2005) refers to *Discourse* (with a capital D) as a “socially accepted association among ways of using language, of thinking, feeling, believing, valuing, acting and of interacting, in the ‘right’ places at the ‘right’ times with the ‘right’ objects (associations that can be used to identify oneself as a member of a socially meaningful group or ‘social network’)” (p. 26). Discourse centres on the notion of recognition: how others perceive and identify you, or what is acceptable according to an acted-out set of beliefs, values, symbols, and objects. In contrast, Gee refers to discourse (with a lower-case d) as being the different forms of language in use, arguing that these discourses make up the broader Discourse (Gee, 2011, p. 177). Discourses allow individuals to re-enact specific identities: “Discourses are about being kinds of people” (p. 178). Gee (2005) outlines several essential points about Discourse, using his distinction between the big and small d, including:

- Discourses can separate and form two distinct Discourses or can amalgamate and form a new Discourse;

- When Discourses differ from the past it can be problematic due to the similarities and parallels from the past re-entering the new Discourse;
- New Discourses are constantly created and old Discourses 'die';
- Discourses rely on the relationships between other Discourses;
- Discourses do not require a 'large scale,' they can occur in typical environments;
- Discourse can involve the meshing of other Discourses, creating a hybrid Discourse;
- Discourses are borderless and limitless;
- Discourses are embedded in social institutions, but they are ever-changing (p.35).

The term Discourse encompasses many sociocultural aspects including situated identities; performance; objects used to coordinate with people and things; and ways of acting, feeling, dressing, gesturing, speaking, knowing, reading, and writing. However, behind these forms of Discourse are the power relations and notions of legitimacy that have brought them into existence. Throughout the remainder of this paper, I will use discourse (with a small d) to refer to Discourse, with a capital D.

Select researchers have studied discursive practices and identity negotiation among multilingual students in tertiary institutions. Preece (2009) refers to linguistic orbits when discussing some of her multilingual university participants. The orbit refers to the heritage or additional languages orbiting around the centre (English language). The students in her study were silently encouraged to adopt English as their preferred language due to the institutional discourses, as "heritage languages carried little value within the institution and very few lecturers accorded opportunities for the students to use these" (p. 33). Preece (2009) confirms that some of her multilingual students had to be flexible with their speech, to form new social groups or integrate with peers. She describes a group of female students as "accommodating to the accents and conversational styles of their fellow peers as a way of fitting in (however) they do not expect 'posh' students to use slang; the onus is on them to adapt" (p. 31). These are

examples of the silent or hidden discourses that dictates the way we speak and use language. In Preece's study, the participants felt they needed to conform to the accepted "posh" way of speaking, instead of being able to express the "slang" they would normally use. In the data analysis section, I will further discuss how similar discursive practices, such as authoritative and internally persuasive discourses influence how participants view their identity and linguistic performativity.

3.6. Cultural Capital and Investment

Language is power, and its legitimacy is fuelled by political, economic, and cultural forces. Bourdieu's (1991) cultural capital framework provides a valuable platform to examine how language, legitimacy, and power interact within an institution. Bourdieu refers to the term capital, particularly linguistic capital, as "the capacity to produce expressions for a particular market" (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 18). The value of linguistic capital is linked to other forms of capital (economic, social); the more linguistic capital one possesses, the more gains one receives. Bourdieu & Passeron (1970) refer to cultural capital as a cultural understanding and experience over time, which then equates to cultural and linguistic expertise and asset (as cited in Hinton, 2015). Cultural capital is seen as specific forms of culture that are valued within a specific context which equates to an increase in social or economic possession (Darvin & Norton, 2015).

When discussing cultural capital, notions of what is deemed legitimate are critical. Heller (1996) refers to Bourdieu's concepts of legitimate language (or discourse) and outlines the components necessary for legitimacy: "a legitimate speaker, addressing legitimate interlocutors, under specific conditions, in language that respects specific conventions of form" (p. 140). A cultural capital framework has been employed in several studies in educational contexts. For example, in Heller's (1996) study on multilingual language learners in a francophone high school, she focuses on how the French language is legitimized because of the discursive practices within the institution: "the use of French becomes a symbol of the acceptance of school authority" (p. 146). She also discusses the value placed on specific forms of French expression, particularly the style of French that is spoken in middle or upper-class homes. By valuing this form of French within the institution, students who are from English or other multilingual backgrounds

(e.g. Iranian) may not have the same form or style of language that is valued, thereby perpetuating a degree of marginalization within the institution.

In a similar research study in the United States, Liang (2012) researched high school Spanish-speaking English language learners. From the survey data, Liang found that participants “were searching for an English-speaking identity” (p. 9). They wanted to learn English quickly, to be successful in their education. Liang noted that the students equated “speaking English with being American” (p. 9). An investment in learning English would allow acceptance into American society, and academic success.

Norton (1995) expands Bourdieu’s theories of cultural capital to include the interplays between the language learner, the social world, and the notion of investment:

“The construct of investment seeks to collapse the dichotomies associated with traditional conceptions of learner identity (good/bad) and recognizes the conditions of power in different learning contexts can position the learners in multiple and often unequal ways, leading to varying learning outcomes” (Darvin & Norton, 2015, p. 37).

Darvin & Norton (2015) compare the fluidity of identity to that of the process of investment: both are dynamic and are influenced by power and the social world. When language learners invest in learning a new language, they have the desire to increase their symbolic and material resources, thereby increasing their cultural capital (Pittaway, 2004). According to Pittaway (2004), a speaker’s legitimacy is key to the understanding of investment. Language learners need to feel like they will be considered legitimate speakers by imagined communities when making the investment to learn a new language. To be accepted into these communities, one needs to have the appropriate degree of symbolic, cultural, and linguistic capital.

As mentioned, Darvin & Norton (2015) compare the role of investment and identity and how they continuously change. They describe identity as an important aspect in understanding the English language learner. Norton (1997) defines identity as a means for people to “understand their relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how people understand their possibilities for the future” (p. 410). She describes the connection between one’s identity and desires for material resources as interconnected. Norton references West’s (1992) work by stating, “it is people’s access to material resources that will define the terms on which they will

articulate their desires” (p. 410), thereby creating a symbiotic relationship between how one defines their identity and their social and material capital.

In a study of multilingual students in British higher education, Preece (2009) looked at factors of linguistic capital and agency and how they influence identity. Preece (2009) researched ethnic minority undergraduate students from working class backgrounds and found that they were able to use their linguistic repertoires to position and identify themselves. She found some students used their heritage language when defining the main part of their identity and were able to educate others about their culture and ancestral community: “This can be seen as a way of subverting asymmetrical lecturer student relationships and of coping with or countering an institutional positioning as ‘remedial’ and in need of English language remediation” (p. 35). Many other participants chose to use English when defining their identity and their heritage language was considered less dominant. These students identified strongly with English and to the institutional discourse, symbolic capital, and the appeal of being considered popular. As discussed by Norton (1997), these students subscribed to the dominant discourse and defined their identity based on the social, material, and symbolic capital they imagined receiving. In this thesis study, many participants subscribed to a monolingual approach at university, where some participants described choosing to speak only English. Perceptions of university as being an English only zone will be seen to be of importance in the data analysis chapters.

Researchers have also addressed the role of English in a neo liberal society and the ramifications for education. Kubota’s (2016) research on Japanese and Chinese workers offers another perspective on theories of capital. She discusses the perpetuation of the English language as capital in neoliberal society but suggests that in some globalized countries this is not the case. Kubota brings into play the importance of not focusing on the English language as capital or as a means to a better job, money, or status, but instead the importance of developing “border-crossing communication, which enables mutual understanding not only in English but also other languages, and promotes active, critical, and reflective engagement in communication across various kinds of differences” (p. 477). In her study, Kubota found that communicating in English did not create a more harmonious or beneficial work situation for her participants, but participants who had xenophobic and racist attitudes continued to display these attitudes in either language. She found that some participants deliberately chose not to

communicate solely in English but to learn their business partners' language to have more success. From her research, she concluded that having English as the dominant linguistic capital is not necessarily the best or only advantage for many globalized transnationals, but "dispositional competence," such as cultural and historical knowledge, antiracist attitudes, and mutual respect were seen as imperative for success among some of her participants. Kubota's research challenges the neoliberal ideal of capital and provides research to demonstrate that English should not be propagated as the sole medium of success in a globalized world, and that there is value in different communication modes and styles. Although, I agree that English should not be the only language valued in a neo liberal society, I concur with Marshall and Moore's (2018) stance that in an educational setting we must account for student agency and their perspectives and that "their vision of plurilingualism does not always meet ours, nor does such a vision normally serve their investment in learning" (p.26). As educators in a linguistically diverse climate, is our role to provide students with the tools to become successful while creating a space for them to express their own agency, including English as part of that linguistic repertoire (Marshall, Moore, & Spracklin, 2016).

3.7. Theories of Identity Construction and Negotiation

Multilingual identity has been discussed and theorized by many researchers with definitions that are not always in agreement (Lee & Anderson, 2009), due perhaps to the complexity of identity theory. In this section on negotiating identities, I have highlighted select theories that view identity as socially constructed, and practices that involve the negotiation, construction and contestation of identities. This section will focus on identity formation using the constructs of hybridizing and fluidity of identity (Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 1996; Blackledge and Pavlenko, 2001; Leung, Harris & Rampton, 1997).

Blackledge and Pavlenko (2001) deconstruct the term '*identity negotiation*' by referring to Davies and Harré's (1990) work on positioning. Positioning involves discursively and reflexively locating oneself. Weedon (2004) describes one part of identity as "repeatedly performing modes of subjectivity and identity until these are experienced as if they were second nature" (p. 7). By internalizing these experiences, they "become part of lived subjectivity" or if these experiences are contested, they become part of a "counter-identification" (p. 7). Once a subject position is occupied, the

subject views the world from that lens. Just as discursive practices are changing and moving, so are the ways people inhabit subject positions: "Subject positions are not stable entities...people are continuously involved in the process of producing and positioning selves and others" (Blackledge and Pavlenko, 2001, p. 249). Weedon describes identities as being performed through "cultural signs, symbols and practices" (p.7), where discourse is involved in shaping these performances.

Bhabha (1994) discusses hybridity and the "third space" as part of his post-colonial take on identity theory as being in a position of flux. Although the contextualization of identity research has changed with globalization, transnationalism and neoliberalism, these over-arching ideologies are still important to consider. According to Bhabha (1994), when looking at cultures, hybridity refers to the in-between state that one may feel. It can be seen as "a space of negotiation where power is unequal, but its articulation may be equivocal" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 59). There is no "pure culture" (p. 36); instead, culture is translated, represented, and viewed through and by the Other. Therefore, the in-between space is where post-colonial identity resides. Within cultural hybridity lies an ambivalent third space where meaning is reconstructed from institutional discourses and our own interpretations of these utterances: "It is the third space, though unrepresentable in itself, which constitutes the discursive conditions of enunciation that ensure that the meaning and symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity" (p. 37). For the "marginalized or culturally displaced," the third space can be seen as a place where identities are potentially reformulated or constructed (Pindi, 2017, p. 24; Bhabha, 1994).

Gee (2000) considers all identities to be multiple and that identities are not dependent on one's internal state but contingent on their "performance in society" (p. 99). Therefore, it is important to not just assume that plurilingual individuals will identify themselves as hybridized. Instead, identity may not be fluid and dynamic but can be dependent on space and time as well as on how identity is performed in society (Lee & Marshall, 2012).

Gee (2000) defines identity as "what it means to be a certain kind of person" (p. 100). He views identity as four interacting entities that are part of an interpretive system:

- The nature identity perspective (N-identities) refers to a form of identity that is determined by nature. N-identities are determined by nature but exist because they are seen as meaningful.
- Institutional perspective (I-identities) refers to identities determined by institutions or authorities.
- The discursive perspective identity (D-Identities) refers to characteristics or behaviours that are not innate but established through discourse with others.
- The affinity perspective (A-Identities) refers to a group of people who share similar experiences or interests, but within this group they demonstrate an “allegiance to, access to, and participation in specific practices that provide each of the group’s members the requisites experiences” (Gee, 2000, p. 105). A-Identities focus on common participation and social practices, not directly on the institution or discourse.

These identity perspectives are interpreted differently by each individual in relation to their unique historical and cultural experiences. One label (e.g. Indo-Canadian) can be interpreted differently among different groups. Some may see this identity as N-identity, while others may view it as D-identity in terms of the discursive practices that co-construct this identity label. Gee further adds that identities can be accepted, rejected or negotiated: “at root human beings must see each other in certain ways and not others if there are to be identities of any sort” (p. 109).

Gee’s take on perspectives of identity is applicable to my study. He offers another avenue to understand the multiple layers of identity while still creating a space for acceptance, contention, and negotiation. Although some participants in my study responded with similar answers regarding their identity (“I am Chinese” or “I am Korean”), analyzing the data further showed that although the responses were similar, the interpretation of identity was different. Some responses lean toward the N-identity, while other responses seem more like D-identities.

Hall (1996) and Leung, Harris and Rampton (1997) define identity as being in constant motion, where minority groups are remaking and negotiating their identities to create “dynamic new ethnicities” (Leung et al., 1997). Hall (1996) refers to identity as a form of connections:

“I use identity to refer to the meeting point, the point of suture, between on the one hand the discourse and practices which attempt to *interpellate*, speak to us or hail us into place as the social subjects of particular discourse, and on the other hand, the processes which produce subjectivities...Identities are thus points of temporary attachment to the subject position which discursive practices construct for us” (p. 6).

With regard to the concept that identities are sutured, Hall (1992) refers to *hybridity* as being able “to inhabit at least two identities, to speak two cultural languages, to translate and negotiate between them” (p. 310, as cited in Lee & Marshall, 2012).

Looking at this concept from a tertiary institutional perspective, language can be seen as a means by which people create both reified, essentialist identities that position students in specific categories, and more fluid, hybrid perceptions of identity. In their study with British secondary school students, Leung, et al., (1997) highlight the interplays between identity and the social discourse among ethnic minority students. Leung et al. (1997) reviewed literature that focused on TESOL practices in England and highlighted the categorization of students based on assumptions of identity and institutional markers. Their article discusses the pedagogy of TESOL and classroom teachers who categorize and reify ethnic minority students in terms of ESL categories, and the tendency to label visible minority speakers as having lower levels of English expertise. The labelling of these students as ESL was found to affect not only their identity within the school, but also their actual sense of belonging (i.e. they felt forced to belong within an ESL group).

Similarly, Marshall (2009) conducted a study focusing on the prescribed ESL identity label among multilingual students enrolled in an academic literacy course at a Canadian University. Instead of discussing the reifications institutions place on the students, he focuses on the students’ voices, and how they describe themselves. He found that many of the students in the academic literacy course felt they were relabelled as ESL. Marshall describes these students as ‘re-becoming ESL’ due to institutional and social positioning. These labels affect how the students identified themselves and were

identified by others: “Students who feel that they have been accepted as a member of the university community find in their first semester that they have to overcome the hurdle of re-becoming ESL before they are accepted as a legitimate university student” (p. 54).

The previous two research investigations (Leung et al., 1997; Marshall, 2009) demonstrate how identity is negotiated and constructed based on institutional-educational discursive practices and individuals’ own subjectivities. For participants in both of these studies, the way they were perceived or identified by others was contingent upon the institutional practices of being labelled as ESL or questionable assumptions about their identity. A similar study by Ortemeir-Hooper (2008) investigated multilingual speakers in a US university and examined identity construction and negotiation among the participants. She found one of the participants resisted the role of an ESL student and felt that institutions cajoled students “to define themselves in a singular way, cast in a role they do not want to play and forced to choose one identity over another” (p. 406).

There are, however, limitations to viewing identity as seamless, fluid and hybrid as a norm in the world today. This view of identity was critiqued as far back as 2001 by Stephen May (2001), as follows;

“The world is increasingly one of fractured, and fracturing identities. But these identities are generally not hybrid; just the opposite in fact...In short, hybridity theory might sound like a good idea, but it is not in the end consonant with many people’s individual and collective experiences” (p. 42-43).

Equally, we should avoid the assumption that plurilingual identity must fit into ‘neat’ categories. Moreover, if we view identities as being “sutured together” (Hall, 1996), then we include the historical, political and social baggage they carry.

As discussed in Lee and Marshall (2012), not only can identities be seen as a seamless fluid blend or a hybridization, but, identity negotiation can also be essentialist, choppy and contentious. In their study they found that individuals were able to perform different identities along a hybrid, essentialist spectrum. These performances were context dependent, and within this context language played a key role. For example, one participant spoke specific languages (Taiwanese or Chinese) in certain spaces, and with certain people depending on the acceptability and legitimacy of these practices. As stated by the authors, “The performing of multilingualism at PCU as implied in George’s

constructions of 'weird' language use may require downplaying of linguistic repertoires due to the legitimacy and acceptability of certain Chinese languages (and identities over others, therefore causing George to perform a monolingual Chinese identity)" (p. 72). Therefore, in order to understand the complexities of identity, we must look at identity theory as a combination of multiple approaches.

3.8. Conclusion

Over the last five decades, significant changes and transitions have occurred in the field of multi-language learning. The spectrum of understanding the multilingual self is vast, from the stark binaries of early bilingualism to the fluidity and open competencies of plurilingualism. The concept of plurilingualism allows researchers to view plurilingual individuals as more than the sum of their linguistic repertoires. Through this lens, we are able to see the plurilingual self as an ever-changing entity that never reaches full linguistic competency because social aspects, identity and life histories all play a factor in its dynamic nature. This lens has the potential to further influence the pedagogies embedded in educational institutions. Within tertiary educational settings, students' ability to use their plurilingual tool box will not only benefit their sense of belonging but will also create a space for shared knowledge and an understanding of diversity (Marshall & Moore, 2013).

In addition to employing a plurilingual lens, I also understand the theory and practices of my participants through my own lenses as a plurilingual visible minority Canadian. Through these lenses this research project has allowed me to reflect upon my own transitions, experiences, and identity. I imagine if I were a participant in this study, I would have subscribed to the idea that universities were a monolingual space because that is what I had been exposed to in my elementary and high school years. Growing up in the prairies, there was really no space for plurilingualism, other than those essentialized days of celebration. I think this brings forth the power of discourse and how the idea of symbolic domination can quietly permeate one's belief system. As discussed in chapter 5, much like some of the participants in this study, I became more exposed to diversity (linguistically and culturally) at university. I associated with a group of Hindi, Punjabi, and Urdu speaking students that frequently used their plurilingualism and pluriculturalism in the leisure spaces of the university. Interestingly enough, I needed to

feel as though I belonged to a group of plurilingual speakers before I could exercise that part of myself. I used my linguistic and cultural capital to gain access to friendship groups and to feel a sense of belonging. When I moved to Vancouver in my mid-20's, I was exposed to an even wider plurilingual community. I found people were much more public about speaking their heritage languages and I would often get mistaken for other ethnicities, as people would speak to me in their own languages. As will be discussed in the data analysis chapters, I subscribed to the idea of linguistic boundaries, where certain languages should be used in certain spaces. This was the discourse of my upbringing and it has taken quite some time for me to challenge this belief. Now as a parent, I am much freer with my plurilingualism in various spaces, as I am encouraging my daughter to speak and understand my heritage language. Similarly, to some of the participants in the study, I also feel that my heritage language is a connection to my family and my culture, a connection I want to encourage for my own child. When listening to and observing the participants in this study, it is hard not to relate to how some of them experience their plurilingual identity. It is a challenge to put aside personal bias and experiences because I can relate so closely to much of what they are saying and for that reason I must remind myself that I am not truly an insider. I come with my own bias, assumptions and experiences that prevent me from truly being an impartial researcher. This will be discussed further in the next chapter.

As stated earlier, the plurilingual lens is one perspective through which I view theories of identity in terms of participants' perceptions and practices. Theories of cultural capital and investment, and the power dynamics of discursive practices demonstrate how identity is co-constructed: reflexively and discursively. Theories of multiliteracies allow for a new forum for identity expression and negotiation. Identity is thus viewed from so many different angles: hidden institutional discourses, conversational speech, informal text messages, and formal academic writing. Although many researchers have delved into the world of identity, identities will continue to shift and evolve along with the flux of societal discourse, political and institutional ideologies.

Chapter 4.

Qualitative Research Methodology and Data Collection Methods

In the first part of this chapter, I will discuss the methodological approaches set out in this research study. I will outline key features of qualitative research and the selected ethnographic features that were incorporated. I will also detail the data-gathering approaches used in this study, including autobiographical narratives and semi-structured interviews and their importance and limitations.

To investigate how first-year university students in an academic literacy course navigate and negotiate their identities and multi/plurilingual selves, a qualitative methodology approach was implemented. Qualitative research can be defined in different ways due to the many subdivisions within this umbrella term. Qualitative researchers focus on the “socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 8). According to Hammersley (1992), qualitative research involves the analysis of words and images; natural occurring data; a focus on meaning, not behaviour; a rejection of natural science as the basis for research and using an induction method to generate a hypothesis. Therefore, we can loosely define qualitative research as involving an activity in which the observer is interpreting that world, at times in a naturalistic way, while creating representations (field notes, pictures, interviews, conversations) (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000).

4.1. Historical Overview of Qualitative Research

Qualitative research stems from sociological and anthropological roots of studying and understanding the “other” (Lincoln & Denzin, 2000). Anthropological and sociological qualitative research in North America has a rich history that began in the 1900s. Denzin and Lincoln describe the seven historical periods of qualitative research

in North America as having a continual influence and impact on qualitative research today. These periods are:

1. Traditional (1900-1950), which includes the positivist foundation.
2. The modernist or golden age (1950-1970), including the start of new qualitative branches like phenomenology, semiotics, cultural studies, feminism, hermeneutics, and structuralism.
3. The blurred genres (1970-1986), which includes the researcher taking a bricoleur perspective and being able to combine from different modalities of research.
4. The crisis of representation (1986-1990), which includes researchers reflexively looking upon themselves and their participants from new perspectives and representations.
5. Postmodern experimental period (1990-1995), which includes experimenting with new types of ethnographies.
6. Post-experimental inquiry (1995-2000), including the alternative criteria for evaluation.
7. The future (2000 and beyond), which includes moral discourse and sacred texts, as well as looking into globalization, race, gender, class, and community issues (p. 3).

These chronological categories can be helpful when looking at historical influences but are quite limited when looking at the future. "The future" timeline is slightly skewed because it was published in the year 2000. Although race and gender are mentioned as future impacts on qualitative research, areas of language, multiliteracies and identity are not. Also, many of the qualitative influences that are placed in the future category have been studied during previous decades, not just after the year 2000. Therefore, it is important to think of these categories as more fluid than rigid boxes of time.

Cooley (2013) discusses the long history of qualitative research in the field of education. The introduction to the field of education had much to do with Margaret Mead's sociological work in public schools in 1951. One form of qualitative research, ethnography, took flight in the field of education due to the "nature of the questions that arise from educational environments and the formative experiences that occur during school years" (p. 250). Data collected from narratives and ethnographies gave researchers a way to challenge and change the public education system. Research studies using a qualitative methodology reportedly grew 67% from 1978 to 2008 (Cooley, 2013). This demonstrates the usability and the growth in educational knowledge offered by this form of research. By researching students in and around academic literacy classrooms, I was able to observe and participate in their in-class experiences. For many participants, this was their first semester of university, a significant transition period. Some of the students described different opinions and views of themselves from the beginning to the end of first semester and I was able to document and observe these changes as well. The nature of qualitative ethnography also offers a space for pedagogical change, which can be enhanced through deeper understandings of plurilingual students and their needs in an educational setting.

4.2. Ethnography

Within the qualitative framework, I drew from selected ethnographic approaches. Ethnography is often difficult to define succinctly because of its diverse historical origins (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). Like other qualitative approaches, ethnography stemmed from studying the "other." It grew from the nineteenth-century field work of anthropologists studying cultures outside the West to the expansion of twentieth-century anthropological ethnographies in Western society. By the 1960s, sociologists adapted and reformed some of the anthropological approaches and began cultural studies within North America and expanded to other disciplines of study (psychology and human geography).

Ethnographic research consists of certain key features and involves multiple components. Firstly, it is "theory-building and theory-dependent" (Heath & Street, 2008, p. 38). Secondly, an ethnographic approach generally includes the study of culture where observations and explorations of a cultural or social setting occur (Mason, 2002).

In addition, ethnography emphasizes the importance of generating knowledge by immersing oneself in a cultural setting, and testing and creating theoretical perspectives by observing, collecting data, and analyzing human behaviour within the specific cultural setting(s) (Street & Heath, p. 38). With that said, there are different qualitative approaches, including interpretivist approach, biographical approach, conversation analysis and discourse analysis, and psychoanalytic approaches. In this study, I have chosen to use a qualitative methodology, with an interpretivist ethnographic approach (Mason, 2002).

Ethnography has evolved over the years into a complex research tool encompassing more than observations and journalistic storytelling: “The worlds we study are created, in part, through the texts that we write and perform about them. These texts take four forms: ordinary talk and speech, inscriptions of that speech in the form of transcription, written interpretations based on talk and its inscriptions, and performances of those texts” (Denzin, 1997, p. xiii). Furthermore, it is important to remind ourselves of the dialogic nature of ethnography; it is a co-creation of ideas and interpretations and performances between the “other” and the author (Denzin, 1997).

4.3. Interpretive Ethnography

Much like ethnography, there are different meanings attributed to interpretivism. Williams (2000) defines interpretivism as “those strategies in sociology which interpret the meanings and actions of actors according to their own subjective frame of reference” (p. 210) but also expands the definition to include the methods used to observe the actors and make sense of their actions within a natural setting. The interpretivist approach includes the participant’s interpretations, perceptions, meanings, and understandings along with some participant observation, as the primary data source. This approach does not require the “total immersion in a setting... and can happily support a study which uses interview methods” (Mason, 2002, p. 56).

For this study, I incorporated an interpretivist ethnographic approach that allows for the exploration of the social actors’ understanding, reasoning, and perspectives of social norms (using narrative and interview data) and observations within their reality and social contexts (using participant observations) (Mason, 2002; Blaikie, 2000).

4.4. Narrative Text

Participants were also asked to discuss and share a narrative text about a personal experience pertaining to their multilingual experiences and transitions. The autobiographical approach allows for a focus on the social actor and a forum for participants to express parts of their life story using narratives. De Fina (2008) found that narratives have been used as important research tools as “work on narrative and identity has illustrated how shared ideologies and stereotypes about social categories of belonging become a resource for local self and other positioning and identity construction” (p. 422). Participants’ autobiographical narratives allow the researcher to analyze data using multiple angles. Narratives are a way for people to report their experience, and narrative discourse offers a place for the participants to negotiate their reality (De Fina, 2008). Atkins (2005) argued that personal narratives are forums for identities and biographies to be expressed (as cited in Hale, Snow-Geronon, & Morales, 2008). Using narrative text allowed the participants in this study to have a space to negotiate their identities and locate themselves. Narratives generally consist of the following components: an introduction that prefaces the story and a conclusion; anecdotes that describe the experience; vivid thought, vocabulary and verbs to create a connection to the human experience; writing with a first-person point of view; and writing that demonstrates the authors’ personal style (Hale et. al., 2008). For this research study, participants were asked to submit the written narrative and then to discuss their narratives orally to allow for deeper understanding and interpretation of data.

4.5. Semi-structured Interviews

Interviews are perhaps the most common form of data collection in qualitative research (Mason, 2002). Semi-structured interviews were conducted in this study to add depth to the understanding and perspectives of the participants. The interviews were based on four categories: language use, identity, multiliteracies, and transitions. Qualitative semi-structured interviews allow the researcher to gain insight in to the participant’s world from the perspective of the participant. The interviews are referred to as semi-structured because although stylistically they are similar to a conversation, they still maintain a degree of structure as questions are methodically based on themes. Key

features of semi-structured interviews include dialogue interactions; an informal approach involving a conversational dialogue; questions centred on a specific theme or topic; and within the interaction, meanings, perspectives, and understandings are created (Mason, 2002). It is important to note that interviewing (“inter-views”) is an exchange between two people, and together this exchange produces knowledge (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015).

In this study, semi-structured interviews allowed for a more in-depth exploration of “people’s situated or contextual accounts and experiences rather than a more superficial analysis” (Mason, 2002, p. 65). Many of the participants in the study have multiple intersectionalities of identity. Therefore, creating an opportunity for them to voice their perspectives during the interviews allowed for richer and deeper data. Another interview style used was oral history, which allows participants to discuss the “perceptions involved and the changes they have seen” (Blaikie, 2000, p. 234). During the interviews, I asked the participants questions about their challenges (if any) with academic transitions and provided them a space to recapture these histories. The participants often included the changes they encountered when immigrating to Canada, graduating high school, and entering university.

Interviews provide layers of data and information to consider. Brinkmann & Kvale (2015, p. X) discuss seven features to consider when trying to unpack and understand interview data:

- Knowledge as produced; this refers to the knowledge produced as a result of the interaction between the interviewer and interviewee.
- Knowledge as relational; this refers to the knowledge considered to “inter-subjective.”
- Knowledge as conversational, where conversations allow for meaningful descriptions, discourse and narratives of everyday life.
- Knowledge as contextual; this refers to knowledge produced contextually and that may not be transferable to other contexts and situations.
- Knowledge as linguistic; this refers to the oral interview, which will be transcribed.

- Knowledge as narrative; this includes the social reality conveyed by participants through narratives which are elicited during interviews.
- Knowledge as pragmatic; this refers to “human reality is understood as conversation and action, knowledge becomes the ability to perform.”

One possible limitation of using semi-structured interviews relates to power relations. Brinkmann & Kvale (2015) outline types of asymmetrical power relations that occur in research interviews. These power relations are important to consider pre- and post-interview, as they bring a necessary awareness to the “structural positions,” which in turn impact how the interviewee responds to the questions. These power relations are discussed as follows:

- The interview is a one-way dialogue.
- The interview is an instrumental dialogue.
- Manipulative dialogue refers to the interviewer having a hidden agenda about the direction of his/her research.
- Monopoly of interpretation positions the researcher as the main interpreter of the interviews statements.
- Countercontrol refers to participants who counter the interviewer’s dominance by withholding information, question the interviewer, or withdraw from the study.
- Exceptions refers to interviewers trying to create an equal stance between the interviewee and the interviewer by providing the interviewee the opportunity to question, report, and interpret the data. (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p. X)

In the interviews I conducted for this study, the most prominent types of asymmetry I became aware of related to manipulative dialogue and the interview as an instrumental dialogue.

To account for the power asymmetries in my own research, I acknowledge that regardless of how I frame the interview, there will still be perceived power differences. As discussed by Brinkmann and Kvale (2015), the role of power in an interview may not

necessarily need to be eliminated, but instead interviewers should look reflexively at their position when producing interpretations from the interviews. After completing some of the research interviews, I wrote reflexive field notes documenting the power asymmetries I noticed². Although I was interested in the conversational aspect participants were discussing, as previously discussed, I was also keen on the richness of their responses, and on finding specific answers to questions.

The monopoly of interpretation plays a key part in analyzing collected data that are intersubjectively constructed. To account for this asymmetry of power, I attempted to empower the participants by allowing them to speak to my interpretations. As a result, after completing my data analysis, I shared interpretations with participants and aimed to give them an opportunity to provide feedback or counter analysis.

4.6. Advantages of Ethnography

Qualitative ethnography was well suited for finding answers to my research questions for many reasons. First, an ethnographic approach is reflective (Hammersley, 2000); it refers to being able to view the world and one's own behaviour within it. As stated by Hammersley, "By documenting this (what actually goes on), rather than what is thought to be or what ought to be going on, qualitative work can play an important role in highlighting problems that need to be tackled" (p. 397). This style of methodology allows the researcher to form interpretations, and an "autobiographical" ethnographic approach gives participants in this study the opportunity to voice their own perspectives about personal issues through their narrative texts. I see this as an interactive exchange of information between myself and the participants. The power dynamic is not equal, but this exchange allows participants a degree of agency in what they chose to express and how.

When conducting research with diverse ethnic groups, the participants' multilayered intersectionality (race, language differences, and gender differences) must be considered. I use the term intersectionality here to refer to the underlying power structures that perpetuate the inequities of people, based on their gender, social class, culture, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and other identity markers (Crenshaw, 1989;

² See appendix B for a sample of the reflexive field notes.

Pompper, 2014). I have used the term intersectionality as more of a concept rather than a critical lens or analytical framework. Intersectionality is not the focus of this research study, but because many participants have multilayered identity positions (visible minorities, gender, sexual orientation), I feel it is important to consider these positions when collecting and analyzing data. As stated by Segal and Chow (2011)

“Individuals occupy intersecting positions in social structures. Those positions represent the socially constructed multiple inequalities of everyday life, an inequality regime in which diverse women and men are privileged or oppressed in many ways, sometimes simultaneously. Their positions afford them agency and options, but also impose barriers” (p. 3).

Each participant has a unique story to tell, and it is related to their unique layers of identity. As ethnographers, we have the ability to tell this story: “Ethnographic analysis gives particular importance to the locations of social identities as gender, ethnicity, sexuality and social class” (Marshall et al., 2014, p. 8). When focusing on a topic like identity and viewing it as a fluid process, ethnographic research allows for detailed descriptions of behaviours constructed by the individual in relation to his/her space (social, cultural, and linguistic worlds) (Hammersley, 1995, as cited in Marshall & Moore, 2013).

4.7. Limitations of Qualitative and Ethnographic Research

Qualitative research offers many benefits including the ability to have involved contact with the people being researched, so that they are less like objects and numbers, and more like people. Qualitative research seeks answers within the “socially constructed nature of reality” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 8), and can present a deeper view of a situational context because one has the ability to pull from different methodologies, observations, representations and perspectives (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). We live in a socially constructed reality; therefore, to employ methodologies that reflect the nature of society, it is important to understand various cultures, climates, and people. However, as with all research, qualitative research is open to critique, especially due to a perceived dependence on the interpretation of the researcher. In this respect, proponents of positivist research would view qualitative research as subjective instead of actual and objective. Moreover, qualitative research is often seen as lacking the

evidenced based method of quantitative research with many policy makers and governments seeing qualitative research as having less impact on policy and systematic changes (Cooley, 2013).

With regard to educational research, Hammersley (2010) discusses the importance of qualitative research and the notion of reflective capacity. “By documenting this (what actually goes on in schools and classrooms), rather than what is *thought* to be or what *ought* to be going on, qualitative work can play an important role in highlighting problems that need to be tackled” (p. 397).

Equally, ethnographic research has been critiqued for being at the mercy of the researcher as the data collected through observations and transcriptions is left to the subjective interpretation of the researcher. Hammersley (1992) outlines some of the weakness of ethnography:

- Data collection is reliant on the researcher’s subjectivity and assumption of the social world and because of this factor, the data analysis will correspond with the researcher’s pre-existing assumptions.
- Interpreting data based on a ‘natural setting’ that has been somewhat orchestrated by the researcher (interviews) leads to implicit generalizations.
- Researchers cannot simply depend on what individuals say about their beliefs because their behaviours may not align with their attitudes and therein lies discrepancies that can misinterpreted.
- There is a danger that qualitative analysis neglects to acknowledge the idea that social phenomena will change and the results are not fixed
- With qualitative analysis, the assumption that societal and psychological factors are the sole contributors to people’s behaviours neglects to account for the role an individual’s cognition and their behaviour in group situations play (p. 12).

As a qualitative-ethnographic researcher, my goal is not to provide evidence-based research but to advance the understanding of my research questions using

descriptive methods. These methods allow the voices of participants to be heard and can raise additional questions that require a forum to be addressed. As stated by Cooley (2013) “a driving aim of ethnography and qualitative work must be to attempt to understand a social experience or phenomena in the terms of those involved and to think through it in terms of an observer (laden, of course), with one’s biases” (p. 258).

4.8. Data Collection Methods

In the second half of this chapter, I will present the specific procedures and methods used, the participants in the study, the three stages used to develop the research and ethical implications involved. The research design for this study follows an interpretivist ethnographic framework which includes participant observation, semi-structured interviews, narrative inquiry and reflexive field notes.

My interest in multilingual identity research began as a research assistant (RA) during my second year as a PhD student. The particular research project I was involved in examined identity and the use of multiliteracies among multilingual students in an academic literacy class. My involvement as an RA included observing and interviewing students. After being an active ‘researcher’ in this project, I realized that I wanted to further pursue this area of research. I felt I was able to form a genuine connection with some of the participants that I interviewed, and from that experience was able to look introspectively at my own experiences as a plurilingual student.

4.8.1. Participants

Participants were selected from the ALL 99 course, as prior permission was granted by the director of the program and the individual lecturers. Students enrolled in ALL 99 are generally from a range of cultural and linguistic backgrounds including the following: international students, Canadian born students who speak and write English as an additional language (EAL), and some students for whom English is their first or dominant language. Over 80% of the class I observed spoke an additional language other than English. Multilingual diversity as well as the methods in which multiliteracies were explored within the class allowed for a rich space for research.

All of the participants in the study were first-year students at UWC and were enrolled in an ALL 99 course. Students were between the ages of 18 and 21 years, and all of the participants spoke an additional language other than English, including Mandarin, Cantonese, Urdu, Hindi, Farsi and Korean. See table 4.1 for descriptions of participant characteristics.

Table 4.1 Participant Characteristics

Stage	Participant Name	Nationality	Languages Spoken	Years in Canada
1	Amar	Indian	Hindi, Punjabi, English	2
	Keon	Iran	Kurdish, Farsi, English	8
	Alka	India, Kerala	Malayalam, Hindi, Punjabi, English	12
2	Bartholomew	Korean	Korean, English	8
	Puja	Indian	Punjabi, Hindi, English	Born in Canada
	Adrian	China	Cantonese, English	Born in Canada
	Marie	Canada	English, French	Born in Canada
	Kate	Canada	Cantonese, Mandarin, English	Born in Canada
	Jack	China	Mandarin, English	7
3	Rahul	Canada	Hindi, English	Born in Canada
	Saleem	Pakistan	Urdu, Hindi, English	2
	Mari	Korea	Korea, English, Hindi	1
	Anna	Chinese	Mandarin, Cantonese, English	10
	Mariyam	Iran	Farsi, English, Arabic	3
	Sue	China	Mandarin	2

4.8.2. Data collection

Data was collected in four forms: interviews, field notes as a participant observer, narrative text and reflexive notes. The research process was conducted in three stages. During stage one, I interviewed three participants as part of a previous research project, where I was a research assistant. During stage two, I interviewed six participants over the course of a semester and was provided with one student's narrative to analyze. The narrative was from an in-class assignment about a major event in their life. During stage three, I interviewed six participants, and conducted four post-interview sessions, on the last day of class. I was provided with five student narratives and took reflexive field notes after the interviews.

Table 4.2 Research stages, participants, data

Stages of research	Participants	Interview Data-1	Post-Interview Data	Student Narratives	Arlene's retrospective field notes
Stage 1	3	√	x	x	x
Stage 2	6	√	x	1 sample	2 samples
Stage 3	6	√	√	√	√

Interviews were conducted using a list of open-ended questions, allowing for participants to respond to a set of questions using independent responses (De Munck, 2009, p. 100). At the time of the interview, participants were provided with approximately 20 interview questions subdivided into four categories: languages used or exposed to (home, school, social); forms of identity; transition from high school to university; and multiliteracies used at school or at home (reading, writing, social media).³ These categories were chosen as they corresponded to study's focus on how participants use plurilingual and multiliterate practices to negotiate their identity, and how language, culture, and social aspects are at play within the institution. These subcategories were also developed as a result of my previous work as an RA (as previously mentioned).

³ See Appendix A for the interview questions.

Stage one and two were similar to a pilot stage. I recruited six participants from three different ALL 99 classes and was involved in some non-participant classroom observations. I saw myself as a 'passive observer,' in terms of how I perceived myself. I positioned myself close to the front of the class; I was not sitting beside the students, and was not involved in classroom discussions, but felt as though I was there to observe, collect data and recruit interview participants. I was able to interview six participants and audio record their responses. I was hoping to have multiple interviews with these students, but when I re-contacted them, they had declined. In contrast, the stage three participants appeared eager to be interviewed for the post-interview and were happy to share their narrative stories.

I believe that the different responses between the two groups of participants was due to the fact that within stages one and two, I was not an active participant observer; in contrast, with the stage three group, I feel that I was considered a member of the classroom. Blaxter, Hughes and Tight (2001) discuss the importance of a pilot study as being valuable and quite different than envisaged. This reigns true for stage one and two of my study. I had envisioned that the participants would be more forthcoming in their interview responses and would be eager to participate in multiple interviews. From the experience, I learned that to gain trust and access to an individual's most personal property (their thoughts, perspectives and insights) requires far more than being given permission to recruit and observe. Throughout this research process, I was reminded that "...within ethnography, access is a continuous process and that, even after those with power within a school or educational organisation have been persuaded to give access, the researcher has continually to negotiate further access to observe classrooms and to interview teachers and students" (Walford, 2008, p. 16).

Stage three of the data collection included a more in-depth involvement in the ALL 99 class over the course of one semester. During this time, I was an 'active' participant observer for seven classes, conducted pre- and post-interviews, and discussed their submitted narrative texts. As an 'active' participant observer, I was involved in class discussions, participated in group exercises and helped students complete in-class activities. During these observations, it seemed as though I was considered to be a member of the class dynamic. The instructor made a concerted effort to include me in group exercises and discussions, thereby altering my position from researcher to class participant/researcher. During stage three of data collection,

participants shared a narrative writing sample that was part of an assignment they submitted in ALL 99. The assignment was a biographical narrative about the most significant event in their life. The students submitted a printed copy and discussed it during their interviews.

During stages two and three, I took retrospective field notes describing the views, perspectives and 'between the lines' information exchanged between myself and the interviewees. The retrospective field notes added more depth to the research because they created a space for me to discuss my own experiences as a multilingual learner and related it back to the participants' experiences. Thereby, "the researcher's personal experience becomes important primarily in how it illuminates the culture under study" (Ellis & Bochner, 2000, p. 740).

The three stages of data collection allowed for a multidimensional approach to this research project. Participant observation and the post interviews offered a 'dialogue' and collaboration between me, the researcher, and the participants, thereby creating a relationship that offered more than the ethnographer's voice, judgements and perspectives (Angrosino & Mays de Perez, 2000).

4.8.3. Data analysis

Data collection was based on in-class field notes, narrative text, interview transcripts and retrospective field notes. The audio interviews were transcribed, and the field notes and narrative texts were analyzed using microanalysis as a preliminary step. Microanalysis involves researchers attempting to understand how the interviewee is interpreting the event. Strauss & Corbin (1998, p. 65) discuss the twelve points necessary when doing microanalysis: 1. Being open to different positions when interpreting data; 2. Being able to look at the data in individual parts (sentences, phrases, word choice) and "reconstruct them to form an interpretive scheme" (p. 65); 3. Listening and understanding the interviewee's viewpoint to avoid hasty theoretical assumptions; 4. Asking theoretical questions that allow for the recognition of patterns and connections; 5. Focusing on the data presented and not the "specifics of an individual or a collective"; 6. Categorizing events and relationships that allow for theory development; 7. Grouping important concepts based on similarities and differences; 8. Developing broader categories that "show variation according to their various properties

and dimensions”; 9. Beginning to make theoretical comparisons in order to start building theory; 10. Making comparisons of categories and patterns in order to identify these variations; 11. Creating a ‘provisional hypothesis’ which essentially refers to how the concepts are related; 12. Acknowledging the researcher’s own subjectivity and assumptions when making interpretations. Upon doing the microanalysis, I attempted most of the steps to achieve a broader understanding of the data. I chose to defer the second step of the microanalysis until the axial coding stage. It was easier to analyze the specific word choices and sentences when excerpts were grouped together in their thematic categories.

Open coding was used as a second step to analyse the data. Open coding includes the segmentation of data into smaller parts to discover commonalities, differences or patterns which are referred to as concepts. These concepts (salient ideas, events, acts) allow the researcher to “classify like with like and separate that which we perceive as dissimilar, we are responding to characteristics, or properties inherent in the objects that strike us as relevant” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 105). The concepts or categories were further divided into subcategories, which contain information such as common properties, and the ‘where, why and how’ a phenomenon can occur. Line by line analysis was also used to code the data; this is “often the most generative” (p. 119) type of coding.

Following open coding, axial coding was used as a third step to help piece together the fragments from open coding by linking the categories to subcategories. According to Strauss (1987), axial coding has four tasks: open coding, where categories are listed; listing the conditions related to the categories (actions, interactions, consequences); detailing how the categories and subcategories are related; and finding cues that relate how the categories are linked together. It is important to keep in mind that with axial coding, the aim is to answer the questions of why, who, when and how and express the relationships among categories. Data is then pieced together in a paradigm or an organized schema.

When analyzing the data, I decided to focus on the following thematic categories as I had noticed that these were emerging themes during the data collection, and because I believed they would provide insights into how students’ experiences could relate to my research questions: transitions from country of origin to Canada, and from

high school to university; identity in a social context; identity in an academic context; identity in a familial context; identity when writing; contexts and spaces where multiple languages are used; contexts and spaces where one language is used; multiliteracies used.

I analyzed the narrative text data using open and axial coding and concepts from the multilayered approach, referred to as “layered readings” (Sorsoli, 2007). For this study the layered reading approach involved examining the categories, subcategories and themes, and how meanings were communicated. In stage one open coding helped to generate the emerging categories and a second layer of axial coding was used to further identify themes, subcategories and create patterns and differences. Thirdly, while the participants discussed their written narratives, new questions were asked and new information was discussed, thereby creating a “co-production of new narratives” (p. 308). This new narrative allows for the potential generation of new concepts and themes and offers more clarification and understanding for the original narrative. Sorsoli (2007) found that this multilayered approach was well suited for emotionally complex narratives that involved traumas like racism and social life events: “Adopting a layered method of analysis allows the sensitive listening required to hear complex stories as well as those that are marginalized” (p. 306).

From the analysis of narrative text, the following categories or themes emerged: the transitory period of coming to a new country; transitioning from elementary to high school or high school to university; familial dynamics related to identity, institutional discourse, family discourse; and identification of self (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

4.9. Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations were carefully considered at all stages of my study. After drawing up interview questions and following the consent form protocols, the university’s ethics approval was sought and was confirmed prior to starting the study. One issue I faced early on was ethical representation. When beginning my data collection, my first inclination was to carry out semi-structured interviews with 10 to 15 participants from the ALL 99 class. At that time, I felt this would allow participants to voice their opinion and tell *their* story in *their* own voice. I conducted the pilot study in this manner. I interviewed

six participants and did some participant observations. After looking at the data collected, it was obvious that there was a missing piece. In order to do ethnographic research for this project, I needed to connect more with the participants and a 30-minute interview was not sufficient. After discussions with my supervisor and reading articles related to ethical practices, I reconsidered this approach. For this research project, solely relying on semi-structured interviews would have allowed for mis-interpretation and mis-representation. Although the interviews were conducted with the participants, the analysis and the interpretation are subjective to the researcher's positionality. Therefore, the interpretation of the data would essentially be coming from my own lens, which is made of my own cultural and social experiences.

As previously discussed in the methodology section, I chose to use a combined approach of ethnographic participant observation, biographical narratives and semi-structured interviews. This multi-layered methodological approach allowed for the participants to have more opportunities to share their comments. A deeper and more representative analysis resulted from using an emic perspective and giving the participants the opportunity to discuss interpretations and record their feedback (Marshall, Clemente, & Higgens, 2014). Marshall et al. discuss the importance of emic research as follows: "At a truly emic level, we should also involve our participants as much as possible in our data analysis, though which we make our judgements about their social, cultural and linguistic practices" (p. 7). Therefore, I also attempted to provide a space for participants to feel included in the construction of the analysis.

A second point of ethical consideration relates to the benefits and harm for participants. Participants are vulnerable in the sense that they are sharing their life stories, which may involve issues of deception, confidentiality, and private hardships (Plummer, 2007 as cited in Marshall et al., 2014). In order to maintain participant privacy for this research study, I have used pseudonyms for the participants' names, for the institution and for the academic literacy class. Further attention was placed on how the research is disseminated: "...there is always the risk that some harm could come to a participant due to researcher negligence or through identification through deduction by a reader" (Marshall et al., 2014, p.16).

4.10. Researcher Reflexivity

In addressing the ethical issues above, I drew upon my reflexivity as a researcher to ensure ethical practices. Conducting research using qualitative methods is an ideal way to address many types of research questions. However, when analyzing qualitative ethnographic data, it is imperative that researchers consider their own position and the influence on data interpretation. I have introduced myself as a multilingual visible minority, born and raised in Canada. I am also a woman, who has often felt like the 'other' in many contexts due to the layers of intersectionality that I possess. It is important to tread carefully when conducting research with participants that feel like the 'other,' particularly when the researcher shares a similar position. When discussing her own research, Ilieva (2014) discusses the potential limitations of the researcher, who considers herself/himself an 'insider' among participants. The danger lies in the "instability and fluidity of identification as Others, and thus of limitations in acting as the representative of Others" (p.61). Ilieva chose an auto-ethnographic approach to mitigate these issues. Using an autoethnographic approach, Ilieva was able to chronicle her position about issues that were pertinent to her research in order to develop a deeper understanding of her perceptions, which influenced how she interpreted her data. Ilieva used a bricolage framework for her research, as it allows for the researcher's experiences and perspectives to have a voice: "The bricoleur understands that research is an interactive process shaped by his or her personal history, biography, gender, race, social class, and ethnicity and those of the people in the setting" (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, as cited in Ilieva, p.79). As a researcher who has felt like an 'other' and whose participants may consider themselves as marginalized, it is important to tread carefully when interpreting and analyzing data. It is imperative to understand and express my own intersectionality and positioning, as this has inevitably influenced my data analysis. In order to account for this factor during participant observations and interviews, it was important for me to recognize my own personal narratives about my experiences as a multilingual learner and at times as the marginalized 'other.' By doing this, I feel I was better able to better acknowledge my position as a researcher and the subjectivity that I bring when interpreting data.

4.11. Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed qualitative methodology and summarized the data collection methods used for my research. I have had the opportunity to conduct research in three stages, which has allowed me to compare the 'thickness' (Geertz, 1973) of data within each stage. In stages one and two, I primarily used interview data, some observations and reflexive field notes as my main data sources. I found many of the participants seemed guarded and more apprehensive to share their personal stories, as opposed to stage three. In stage three, I was a regular participant observer, whom many of the students greeted by name. During these interviews, I found the participants were more willing to share very personal stories, including those of racism, exclusion and marginalization. These participants were also interested in locating me as the researcher and often asked about my educational background, my ethnicity and multilingualism. I found the main difference between the two stages was related to my relationship with participants and how they constructed me and my research. In stage one, I did not have a close relationship with the class, lecturer, or students. I was a participant observer in a few select classes but was not involved in discussions. The tone of the interviews felt similarly distant. Although some participants were forthcoming about their language use and personal difficulties with transitions, a sense of distance between me and the participants was felt. Another difference may have been the way in which I was included in the classroom. In stage one and two, I felt more like an outsider that was meant to do a 'job' with the students, whereas in stages three, the professor would often include me in class discussions and attempted to locate my position in the classroom as part researcher and part student. I believe this helped students feel more comfortable with sharing personal details about their lives.

When comparing the data within stages of data collection, I found the relationship between myself and the participants and the way in which I was perceived and positioned were key factors. By using retrospective field notes I was able to view the differences between how I positioned myself and how the participants may have positioned me. The reflexive field notes were critical in forming these insights. Using an ethnographic approach has helped me understand my own perspectives and also attempt to understand the perspectives of my participants.

Chapter 5. Data Analysis, Part 1

The data analysis section will be divided into three chapters, with each chapter highlighting the salient themes that emerged from the research. As mentioned in the methodology chapter, data was collected in three stages. Stages one and two served primarily as pilot studies. Data collection was based on interview data (pre and post), reflexive field notes and participant observations (see Table 4.2).

Analyzing the data revealed several themes and subthemes. The overarching themes most relevant to this research project included the ways languages are perceived and used in different contexts, the ways identities are performed and labelled, and the ways plurilingual agency is performed and the contexts related to the performance, including space and time, and ideas of linguistic capital and investment. This chapter analyzes how participants use and perceive multiple languages, which focuses primarily on research question one; how do plurilingual students in a first-year academic literacy course perceive and perform their identities in a university setting?

Within the broad theme of language perceptions, three subthemes emerged: categorization of first, second, and third languages; self-perceptions of being multilingual; and the dynamics of being in multilingual environments like UWC and ALL 99. These emergent themes relate to the first research question on many levels. In order to understand how students perceive their plurilingualism and perform their plurilingual identities at university, it is important to understand how participants view their linguistic repertoires, especially because of the subjectivity between what one person would consider a first language versus another. The other two subthemes analyze individual perceptions of multilingualism/plurilingualism and how space and time impact the performance of this identity. In order to consider pedagogical changes that incorporate plurilingual teaching, the students' perspectives on how they view their own plurilingualism, and how they utilize this within the confines of the university is imperative.

5.1. The Categorization of Languages

Before analyzing how and why participants exercised their agency and plurilingual competence as a resource for learning in higher education, it was important to learn how the participants understood and categorized their languages, and the extent to which these categorizations reflected or challenged pervasive institutional discourses about multilingualism and students' speaking and writing in English as an additional language. One subtheme that emerged from the data involved the ways participants categorized their first, second, and third languages.

To examine how languages were viewed by select participants, I present the analysis of four of the participants' data together. Alka is of South Asian descent and has lived in Canada for 12 years; she categorizes her languages based on chronology rather than linguistic competency. Anna, was born in China but has lived in Canada for 10 years; in her written narrative, she discusses her lack of English proficiency. Jack was born in China and has lived in Canada for six years; he discusses his languages based on competency. Amar was born in India and moved to Canada two ago; he discusses his languages based on competency

Excerpt 5.11

Alka

Arlene: So what kinds of languages did you speak at home or do you speak right now?

Alka: I speak Malayalam. I don't know how to read and write in that language but, yeah, that's my mother tongue, that's the language. And I speak English, obviously. And I can also somewhat speak Hindi, but fluently understand it. And I know how to read and write in Punjabi.

Arlene: Oh, wow. So how do you know all of these different languages?

Alka: Hindi I know because I was born in India. So, I was born in Kerala, that's where I learned my Malayalam because that's where my parents were born and raised. And then we lived in

north India for six years until I turned six, and there the first language is Hindi, so I automatically learned how to speak Hindi. But after we moved here in Grade 1, it was like, you don't speak Hindi to anyone. So, when I used to watch movies and stuff like, I remember, I completely understand it but I don't have the accent to really speak it properly, but I can manage. And Punjabi because it is very similar to Hindi, and I got a lot of Punjabi friends, so I understand most of what they say. So, in school I was like, "I have been taking French for many years, why not try something different?" So, I took Punjabi. So, I know how to read and write in that.

Arlene: So many languages, wow! So, would you say that you are fluent in all of those languages?

Alka: No, I would say in Malayalam and English fluent but to speak Hindi and Punjabi, not fluently, but I can, like, manage.

Arlene: Wow, that's awesome. So, your first language you would say is?

Alka: It is very difficult. My first language is Malayalam.

Arlene: So that's what you would identify as your first language. And your second language would be?

Alka: Hindi. And then the third language I learned was English.

When discussing her linguistic repertoire, Alka refers to Malayalam as her first language, yet she states that she is unable to read and write in that language. The concept of dividing linguistic abilities into parts according to functionality is discussed by Spolsky (1998). Spolsky discusses the functional division of repertoires, by stating that it is "not uncommon for people to speak one language and read and write another" (p. 46). When discussing her plurilingualism, Alka stated that she speaks Malayalam but added the caveat that she could not read or write in this language. When discussing her competencies in Hindi and Punjabi, Alka states she can understand both Hindi and Punjabi but is unable to converse using a native Hindi accent. Therefore, when

classifying her main languages, she does not include Hindi and Punjabi but emphasizes Malayalam and English. Alka's hesitation to include Hindi and Punjabi in her linguistic repertoire, and the fact that she felt the need to explain her competency in Malayalam, relates the historical ideology of bilingualism. Weinreich's (1964) ideology of bilingualism: that in order to be considered bilingual, one must demonstrate equal competencies in both languages. As García and Li (2014) reiterate, traditional bilingual research focused on the idea that bilingualism was often equated with two separate and complete linguistic systems. These ideologies have been re-produced by Alka.

When describing her knowledge of Hindi, Alka felt compelled to explain that she can understand Hindi but cannot speak it due to her lack of a legitimate native-speaker accent. The notion of legitimacy was also discussed in Anna's narrative assignment. Anna moved to Canada 10 years ago from China and writes about her immigration experience.

In her written excerpt, Anna discusses her struggles with learning English and the feelings that were associated with her struggles.

Narrative Excerpt 5.11

Anna

I was first a different person that doesn't talk much. Probably it's because I don't speak English at the first place. It took me more than three years to learn how to speak a brand-new language and be able to communication with others like a normal person.

In the above excerpt, Anna describes the challenges of her transition to Canada, and learning to speak English. She describes a lack of legitimacy in her English proficiency, so much so that she does not qualify herself as a "normal person." It is unclear whether Anna's legitimacy was based on her accent or her English competency or possibly both. For Alka and Anna, the feeling of being considered legitimate infiltrates their discussions about language. The idea that one needs to have a native-speaker-like accent to be considered an authentic speaker of a language was discussed by Lippi-Green (2012). Lippi-Green refers to language subordination as the idea that one's version of language (accent or dialect) is considered to lack legitimacy and value over another. She relates this to the accents of Black and Asian Americans and how their

dialects of Standard American English have been considered subordinate, reified and racialized. For Alka, her inability to produce an authentic Hindi accent seemed to create a belief that her production of Hindi was inferior to those of a legitimate speaker with a 'proper' accent. Heller (2006) discusses the idea of 'proper' language use by referring to the idea of linguistic regimentation. In order for linguistic regimentation to exist, people have to subscribe to the beliefs of symbolic domination (Heller, 2006). This refers to the belief that someone else's ideas of what is right and natural becomes the societal rules, and only certain privileged people get to make and benefit from these rules. The second aspect of linguistic regimentation involves the use of 'proper' language and how the values and ideologies associated with 'proper' language are circulated within "social categories and social relations" (p. 11). When people do not use 'proper' language and believe that their language is not legitimate because of the ideas of symbolic domination, then the idea of symbolic power becomes legitimate power (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2001; Bourdieu, 1991; Heller, 2006). This finding resonates with Lee and Marshall's (2012) research, that first year multilingual students taking an academic literacy course monitored their language use. For example, some of the Cantonese speaking participants avoided speaking Mandarin due to their perceived "funny" accents. The idea of linguistic regimentation is continually perpetuated through everyday life but also through institutions like the school systems, the media and family.

In the following two excerpts, Jack and Amar discuss how they categorize their linguistic repertoires and their proficiencies.

Excerpt 5.12

Jack

Arlene: Can you tell me about the languages you speak?

Jack: My first language in Mandarin, my second language is English.

Arlene: What is your strongest language?

Jack: For me I guess Mandarin.

Arlene: Has Mandarin always been your strongest language?

Jack: Yes.

Arlene: What about when you use social networking?

Jack: English.

Arlene: How come you never use Mandarin when using social networking?

Jack: We always communicate in English.

Arlene: Can you tell me how you use languages here at UWC?

Jack: Majority is English.

Arlene: When would you ever switch languages?

Jack: I never because I don't think anyone here uses Mandarin in the classes, so I stick to English.

Arlene: I noticed there are a lot of Mandarin speakers in your ALL class.

Jack: There are some, but I don't think I ever use Mandarin.

Arlene: How about at home?

Jack: Majority is Mandarin.

Jack initially describes not using Mandarin in class because there are no other Mandarin speakers. When I point out there are many Mandarin speakers in his ALL 99 class, he restates that he does not speak Mandarin in class. It appears that Jack is subscribing to the monolingual discursive practices at university, where English is the acceptable and legitimate form of language at university, and Mandarin is appropriate for his home environment. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) refer to this as agents "who have internalized its specific necessity in the form of habitus and who are active producers even when they consciously or unconsciously contribute to reproduction" (p. 140). Jack seems to use these invisible boundaries of language use as part of his understanding of the covert linguistic parameters that govern the university.

Amar is identifiable as a South Asian Sikh, who wears the traditional turban or *patka*. Amar describes his first, second, and third languages based on his linguistic competencies, not on his inherited language.

Excerpt 5.13

Amar

Arlene: Okay. And do you have kind of a first language, second language, third language among those?

Amar: Hindi would be my first language, and English would be my second language.

Arlene: And what about Punjabi?

Amar: Punjabi is . . . I barely use it. My family does but I'm more comfortable with Hindi. It is kind of the same, it's like the dialect is almost the same, the word pronunciation in Hindi and Punjabi are always the same, it is the way you speak it that makes it a different language. So, I prefer Hindi to Punjabi.

Arlene: And what about today, which would you describe as your stronger?

Amar: English.

Arlene: So, the question that is interesting is that when you look at sort of your first—the chronological order of your language—English wasn't your first language, but it is your stronger language today.

Amar: Yeah.

Arlene: So how does that emerge?

Amar: Because—so Hindi is my mother tongue, but I have been learning English from Grade 1 while I was in India. So, I moved to Canada two years ago, but I've been learning English since Grade 1 because English is—like you know how you have official

languages of country and English could be your second official language so—

Arlene: How much Punjabi would you say you use here?

Amar: Barely.

Arlene: Really? That surprises me, because just looking at the dynamics of UWC, like, there are a lot of Indo-Canadians.

Amar: I know, yeah. Like I suppose Punjabi should be my first language but it's not. It's not. I prefer Hindi.

Participants ranked their first, second, and third languages based on chronology, while others ranked their languages based on linguistic competency. There was no general pattern to how participants chose to rank their languages. Some participants who have lived in Canada for 10 or more years or were born in Canada ranked their heritage language as their first language, while others who have lived in Canada for less than five years ranked a non-heritage language as their first language. Jack and Amar ranked their first and second languages with minimal hesitation, while Alka's responses were more fluid, in that she acknowledged that her linguistic repertoires carry various degrees of competency. In Preece's study (2009) she asked participants to rank their languages based on a continuum of affiliation to their heritage language or to English. Preece describes the participants who viewed themselves as having a stronger affiliation to English as having their heritage languages orbit around the English centre. For Preece's study, most of the second-generation participants felt similarly about their stronger affiliation to English. For Amar, this was not the case. He discussed having a stronger affiliation to English even though he had just moved to Canada less than two years ago. Similar to Alka, some of Preece's participants described a balance between their heritage language and English. Alka describes her heritage language as a connection to her culture and family, which is an important link: the connection between language and being included in the family.

Another finding relates to some participants who may be considered visible minorities or who spoke with a non-anglicized accent. These participants did not necessarily describe their first language to be their heritage language. Often students who are visible minorities have their language skills linked to their ethnicity. For example,

Amar discusses this ethnic reification by saying, “I suppose Punjabi should be my first language,” because as a visible Sikh, his heritage language is historically tied to Punjabi. According to Leung et al. (1997), this assumption reifies ethnicities and impacts the pedagogy of the classroom. Leung et. al (1997) found similar issues when researching TESOL practices among multilingual students in England. They found that multilingual students were “frequently attributed a kind of romantic bilingualism and turned into reified speakers of community languages, and in the process their ethnicities are also reified” (p. 553). They also found that the urban multilingual does not necessarily show a link between their linguistic identity and their inherited language. Therefore, it is imperative for pedagogies to acknowledge the “societal inequalities between ethnic and linguistic groups, inequalities that can indeed often lead pupils to respond ambiguously to questions about their linguistic expertise, affiliation, and inheritance” (p. 558). When teachers position students’ linguistic competencies based on their visible ethnicity, they fail to acknowledge the individual’s own perceptions about their linguistic repertoires and thus disregard their plurilingual assets.

5.2. Self-Perceptions of Multi/Plurilingualism

The second subtheme involves multi- and plurilingual perceptions. When interviewing participants about how they viewed their multi/plurilingualism, the term *multilingualism* was used in the interview questions, as it is a more familiar term for the participants than *plurilingualism*. Many participants were hesitant to view themselves as multilingual because of the perceptions they had about their linguistic competence in English. The following excerpts demonstrate this theme.

In the following excerpt, Mari a Korean born first year university student, who has been in Canada for one year discusses her perspectives on multilingualism.

Excerpt 5.14

Mari

Arlene: Are you multilingual?

Mari: I think I am bi . . . because even though I know French and Hindi, it is not, like, properly.

Arlene: What makes it proper?

Mari: I can express myself like well. I can tell whatever I want. I think that is properly.

In the next excerpt, Saleem a first-year university student, who was born in Pakistan, but moved to Canada one year ago, discusses his ideas of multilingualism.

Excerpt 5.15

Saleem

Arlene: How would you define the term “multilingual?”

Saleem: Multilingual is a person who can understand more than one language or speak, write.

Arlene: Do you consider yourself multilingual?

Saleem: Bilingual, yes. I don't think I can speak more than two.

For these participants, defining multilingualism involved degrees of competency and legitimacy. Mari lived in India for over a year and was able to communicate in Hindi in a social context, but she does not include this as part of her multilingual repertoire. Saleem is fluent in English and Urdu and can understand and speak some Hindi (which is similar to Urdu), but does not consider his level of competence to be sufficient. These participants are subscribing to the beliefs that in order to be bilingual or multilingual, one needs to have equal competency in both languages, rather than perceiving their linguistic repertoires as fluid systems that do not require native-like competency.

Issues of being a 'proper' multilingual and legitimacy were highlighted in excerpt 5.5, Mari questions the “properness” of her Hindi and French skills. She does not qualify these languages as part of her multilingualism because she does not feel she can express herself completely. Heller (1996) discusses legitimacy through Bourdieu's perspective by stating that legitimacy involves a “legitimate speaker, addressing legitimate interlocutors, under specific social conditions, in language that respects specific conventions of form” (p. 140). Much like Alka in excerpt 5.1, Mari subscribes to the idea that to be a 'proper' multilingual speaker, one must have equal competencies in

both languages. Therefore, she did not validate her Hindi and French language skills to the same degree as her Korean and English skills and instead viewed her language skills as subordinate.

This group of participants spoke about their multilingualism with pensiveness and hesitation. The participants defined multilingualism differently, as some based it on their competencies and others based it on the type of languages spoken. As stated by Byrd Clark (2009), the term *multilingualism* is a socially constructed term that depends on political, economic, and social positioning. It is difficult to provide a static definition to this term, as it can be interpreted in many ways. In the most general sense, multilingualism refers to the use of two or three languages during an interaction and is dependent on societal contact (Marshall & Moore, 2018). The modern definition of multilingualism does not include the separation of languages and the need for native-like competencies. Moore and Gajo (2009) highlight this by discussing the past interpretations of multilingualism: “Old prejudices coined multilingualism as an exceptional and hazardous phenomenon, defending a mystic need for separate, perfect, and well-balanced mastery of languages, while the ultimate goal for language learning was to become, feel and speak like an idealised native speaker” (p. 139).

5.3. Perceptions of Multilingualism at University and in ALL

99

Many of the participants described feeling ambivalent about the multilingual environment at UWC. When referring to the university in general, most of the participants felt their peers did not care about their multilingualism or it did not impact their learning.

Excerpt 5.16

Mari

Arlene: How do you feel like your peers view you because you are multilingual?

Mari: Like whenever I talk in Korean with my Korean friends, they are like, “Hey, stop it.” But sometimes, like, there is some

people who like Korean, who like listening to Korean even though they don't understand it. Like they find it like—I don't know, they just like hearing it. Then like even though I talk in English with Koreans in front of them and they are like, "Hey, speak in Korean." Then I speak in Korean and they were like guessing themselves and they were like laughing. It's like case by case. Yeah.

Mariyam, an Iranian-born first-year university student who came to Canada three years ago, discusses her perceptions of multilingualism at the university.

Excerpt 5.17

Mariyam

Arlene: How do you feel other peers view you in your multilingual classroom. So, let's say you are in ALL and not everybody is—like some people are English speaking only, and some people are multilingual—so how do you think other peers view students that are multilingual in your classroom?

Mariyam: In UWC mostly the people—because it is something that—it's not a weird thing to be from another country because Canada is like full of immigrants, right, so in UWC I think it is something that is understandable for everyone. And they treat you like equally. Maybe they are even more interested to know your culture, but it is really nice. It doesn't have any negative.

In describing their perceptions of multilingualism at university, Mari and Mariyam discuss their multilingualism as being perceived as neutral or, as in Mariyam's excerpt, "nice." The other participants are ambivalent rather than being positive or negative about their multilingualism. Educational institutions often indirectly perpetuate the value of monolingual learning without overtly condemning multilingualism. It is part of the hidden curriculum. As emphasized by Cummins (1997),

"No classroom is immune from the influence of the coercive power relations that characterize societal debates about diversity and national identity. The science and practice of pedagogy is never neutral in relation to these

issues in spite of its frequent self-portrayal as innocent and focused only on learning outcomes” (p. 107).

Although the participants do not feel that their peers looked negatively upon their multilingualism, they also do not discuss that their linguistic repertoires were positively embraced by the university or their peers as a whole. As Leung et. al (1997) discussed in their study, the educational system (in Britain) is based on a monolingual assumption, even though the majority of students are from diverse linguistic backgrounds. When pedagogies neglect to value a large part of the student population by embracing their linguistic assets, the students themselves may in turn not view their linguistic knowledge as an asset but instead view it with ambivalence. As emphasized by Cummins (1996, as cited in Leung et al., 1997), universities need to include pedagogies that value all learners’ expertise.

The following data focuses more specifically on how select participants viewed their ALL 99 class. I have selected data from the participants who were part of the ALL 99 class where I was a participant observer.

Excerpt 5.18

Mari

Arlene: How do you feel other peers view you in like a multilingual classroom like ALL?

Mari: Oh. I’m comfortable with that. Yeah, I’m really close to them. I think they feel the same, I think.

Arlene: Why are you so comfortable with them?

Mari: Because we understand each other. Like I know Mariyam. Like Mariyam is not fluent in English like me, and we understand when we are talking. It’s like you just get it. You just know that.

Arlene: Do you feel that you have walls up with those students?

Mari: No. No. I think that is because we all experienced the transition. Yeah. Whenever I talk to Joseph or Mariyam, it’s like no wall, like we are so comfortable. I think that’s—yeah, actually I

talked about my transition and like what I think to Mariyam and Joseph and they were like, "Oh, I felt the same thing there." And we talked about like the guy thing, about the boys, and we found like the similarities. Mariyam found their own country—Iranians—more attractive and I found Koreans attractive, so we could understand. But like if I talk about this to my other friends, they are like, "Oh, why do you like only Koreans? Why don't you like the others?" And I'm like I think there is something— "I cannot like the other people other than Korean"—and Mariyam understood it. Even she only like Iranese. It's like that is because we don't have wall because we understand how you feel.

Mari explains how being in ALL 99 helped her connect with other multilingual peers because they shared similar immigrant experiences and a cultural understanding. Block (2006) describes these affiliations of belonging as related to creating communities based on collective trust and acceptance, not necessarily on demographics or ethnicity. It seems as though Mari has developed her own micro community within the ALL 99 classroom based on her shared experiences of transition and similar cultural values. In her excerpts, she appears to distance herself from Canadian students because they do not share the same cultural understandings as Mariyam and Joseph. In a similar dynamic, Heller (2006) found some of her participants created affiliation groups, where they were brought together not because of similar race and culture, but because they did not feel as comfortable with French and were marginalized due to race. They created a community of three for themselves, based on their lack of French proficiency and because of their cultural understandings, even though they were from different ethnic and religious backgrounds.

In her narrative essay, Mariyam also discussed the importance of belonging when referring to her high school experience.

Narrative Excerpt 5.12

Mariyam

At the end of the day no matter how much I had tried to fit in, I was isolated and rejected because of the country and culture I had come from...In grade nine, my simple decision of changing my school changed my life dramatically. Immediately I began to make new friends, get involved with clubs and make connections with my teachers. Not only did I not see myself as an outsider, but also I felt as part of a community.

In Mariyam's narrative, she brings forth a similar discussion to Mari. Although she is referring to her high school class, the ideas of feeling a sense of belonging are highlighted. When interviewed about her narrative, Mariyam describes creating new affiliation groups with Canadian-Persian girls. For Mariyam, her culture is a salient part of her life and she felt marginalized because of her nationality and culture. Within the ALL 99 class, Mari and Mariyam seemed to form a friendship (as discussed in Mari's earlier excerpt) based on their shared experiences and cultural values. The pedagogical implications of these understandings are imperative in creating a pluri-classroom, where not only linguistic diversity is valued, but cultural repertoires as well. This will be discussed in the latter paragraphs of this theme.

In the next excerpt, Sue, a Chinese-born first-year university student who came to Canada two years ago, discusses the impact that being in a multilingual classroom has had on her academics.

Excerpt 5.19

Sue

Arlene: How do you feel about being in a multilingual classroom, like ALL, where everyone was speaking/lots of people were speaking different languages, including you?

Sue: Yeah, I think it's fun. Like for this group because we have Anna and the other two guys [Rahul and Saleem], and it is so funny like they are always debating about something. It is fun to

watch them, and it is quite comfortable you can speak my own language with me and Anna.

Arlene: Are you able to do that in other classrooms?

Sue: Not really, especially lecture, like people don't really talk to each other so it is quite special in the ALL class and especially [the instructor], he is like really nice so we have time to discuss with some friends, so I can use both English if I want to communicate with the two guys, and in Mandarin if I can't really express my ideas in English, so maybe I can translate to those two girls and then we can like develop the idea in English more.

Arlene: So, do you think it has benefited you that you could speak—

Sue: Yeah, because some ideas I just can't find a way to express them in English and since my first language [is] Mandarin I find it like easier to think things in Mandarin, like in my mind and then translate into English, which is a bit difficult.

In his second interview (post interview), Rahul, a Canadian-born English and Hindi speaker, discusses the importance of being able to speak your heritage language and its ties to culture and identity.

Excerpt 5.21

Rahul

Arlene: Nice. How do you feel about being in such a multilingual classroom like this ALL class where people are speaking different languages?

Rahul: I think it is actually good. People like—I know like a lot of Indians, when they come to Canada they think Canadian, so they leave their culture and heritage back at home. So, I think it is good that these guys are still keeping their culture with them and that they are still like talking in like their mother tongue and like—and like that's like a good way of like becoming friends too, right. Like the thing that we [Saleem] got

attached with is we speak basically the same language, so that was like an instant spark on how we became friends. So, I think it is good that people still bring their culture and values with them when they come to Canada and they don't change.

In the above excerpts, Mari, Sue and Rahul raise different perspectives about ALL 99. Mari brings forth the idea of “the wall,” while Sue and Rahul focus more on the idea of comfort and pedagogy. These responses to their ALL 99 class can be viewed through two lenses: the social aspect and feeling a sense of belonging with their multilingual peers; and improved learning outcomes. Marshall, Zhou, Gervan, and Weibe (2012) conducted a research project on feelings of belonging in an academic literacy class. The majority of respondents felt that their academic literacy course improved their sense of belonging. Many of the students interviewed in Marshall et al. (2012) shared the same views as Mari, Sue, and Rahul, where they felt connections, comfortableness, and a sense of belonging among peers who shared similar experiences and linguistic diversities within the academic literacy course. These participants felt that the class was a positive space for them to share their multilingual experiences and diversities. This pedagogy of the plurilingual classroom, helped foster a sense of belonging and improved learning practices for many of the participants. The climate of the ALL 99 class encouraged and valued linguistic diversity and assets, where other spaces in the university did not.

Sue and Rahul describe the ALL 99 classroom environment as fun and as accepting of languages and cultures; they are referring to the pedagogy of the classroom. For Sue, the environment was not only fun, but by allowing the students to use their preferred language to communicate within their table groups, students could access their linguistic and cultural toolbox to enhance their learning. Sue was able to use her linguistic tool box to translate from Mandarin to English and this gave her a better understanding of the content. Rahul described his ALL 99 classrooms as a space where cultures and languages come together. This refers to the pluralistic classroom environment, where plurilingual and pluricultural identities can co-exist. Moore and Gajo (2009) refer to the terms *plurilingualism* and *pluriculturalism* as the use of two or more languages and cultural experiences used together or separately in different space and time situations with the understanding that different levels of linguistic competency can

co-exist. With this understanding, agency plays a key role in how plurilingual individuals express themselves. Moore and Gajo state that:

“...the definition emphasises the idea that the competence in several languages and cultures of one given speaker is single and unique. The plurilingual speaker is comprehended as a social actor who develops a repertoire made up of various languages and varieties of languages, and different forms of knowledge. These resources constitute linguistic and cultural capital, and multiple forms of investment. They can take contrasting values in different contexts, and they involve intentions that cannot be reduced to regulating norms” (p. 142).

The space of the ALL 99 classroom involved a pedagogical shift in comparison to other spaces at the university. Participants were able to express their plurilingual and pluricultural agency to the extent where it was accepted and valued. As a participant observer in this ALL 99 class, I was familiar with the instructor’s teaching style and his encouragement of plurilingual and multiliteracy practices. There was a constant space for students to have group discussion in the language of their choice, and they were able to use multiliteracy practices to write notes or answer questions during class activities. All six participants from the class agreed that the multilingual practices exercised in the classroom were beneficial to their learning and to the social climate of the classroom.

5.4. Conclusion

In this chapter, I analyzed the emerging themes of language and multilingual perceptions and performance. The key themes that emerged included the way participants ranked their linguistic repertoires; the personal and societal perceptions of multilingualism, which were entangled with ideas of legitimacy, competency and ambivalence; and the ways that plurilingual and pluricultural spaces impact feelings of belonging and learning practices.

The participants ranked their linguistic repertoires according to competency or chronology. For some of the participants it was difficult to rank their languages, as they viewed their repertoires as fluid. For many participants, multilingualism and levels of competency were interconnected ideas. When discussing how others perceived their

multilingualism, some participants expressed a feeling of belonging and improved learning practices within the ALL 99 classroom, but that their multilingualism was treated with ambivalence elsewhere in the university. These themes are relevant to research question 1 regarding linguistic perceptions related to space and time. I will return to the research questions and answers in detail in my concluding chapter.

Although educational institutions may see themselves as valuing multi- and plurilingual practices, this is not the case from the perspectives of some students. Valuing multi- and plurilingual practices requires a shift in the educational discursive practices, including creating space and opportunities for students to express their linguistic assets. The next chapter will continue the data analysis and discuss the theme of plurilingual identity.

Chapter 6. Data Analysis, Part 2

Part 1 of the data analysis discussed language perceptions in different contexts, including how participants viewed their own multilingualism and how they felt others perceived it. Part 2 analyzes the broader theme of identity, which is the main focus of my second research question; how do plurilingual students form and re-form their identities in the academic setting using verbal and written modalities? Two subthemes related to identity emerged from the data: the performance of a plurilingual identity according to space and time and the labelling of one's identity according to nation state, heritage culture, or linguistic identity.

The conceptualizing of identity has been theorized by academics and described by writers and play writes for centuries. An example of this would be from Shakespeare's play "As You Like It," where the character Jacques performs his famous monologue; "All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players" (Shakespeare, 1623, 2.7.138-139). The understanding of identity has piqued societies interest in many ways. From a sociolinguistic perspective, the performance of identity is based on social, political, institutional, and familial discursive practices that have been reiterated, emphasized, and valued. Identity is formed through negotiation and contestation. In Part 2 of the data analysis, participants discuss how they perform their identities according to space and time and how they perceive and label their own identity, and it will be seen that, in the process of negotiating and performing identities, language plays a key role

6.1. How Monolingual and Plurilingual Identities are Performed

Participants in this study were asked how they used their linguistic repertoires in different contexts. Most participants described using a monolingual identity at university and exercising their plurilingual repertoires in social situations or at home.

Puja, Bartholomew, and Mari describe performing a monolingual identity at university. Puja, is a first-year university student of Indian heritage who was born a raised in Canada.

Excerpt 6.11

Puja

Arlene Have you ever had to use the languages here at school?

Puja: No, not really.

Arlene You only speak English at school?

Puja: Yeah.

Arlene If you meet another Punjabi person do you ever speak in Punjabi or Hindi?

Puja: No, because I'm pretty sure like everyone else, like every kid my age, it's like the same thing with their friends, you're gonna speak English.

Excerpt 6.12

Bartholomew

Arlene So how do you use languages at UWC?

Bartholomew: 95% English and maybe 5% some Korean, depending who I'm speaking to. Otherwise, English.

Arlene Were there other Korean students in ALL 99?

Bartholomew: I believe there were two other students other than myself.

Arlene Would you ever speak to them in Korean?

Bartholomew: No. I try not to speak Korean if I can help it. It's a thing, if I'm here to learn a language, I would use it more than my native language. To me it's common sense. If I was taking French in France I would always speak French. No matter how bad I was, I wouldn't use English. I believe that's the way you

learn language, by using it in context, than knowing it and don't using it.

Excerpt 6.13

Mari

Arlene Can you tell me how you use languages here at University?

Mari: I use English. I don't know—what do you mean?

Arlene Are you mostly using English at the university, or do you also use Korean?

Mari: I use English. First when I was in India, there was not much Koreans, right, and I felt so embarrassing in front of like speaking in English in front of the Koreans there, but then here like I have—sometimes I hang around with other like foreign friends and Koreans that I have to use English, right, because my friends don't understand what we are talking about. Yeah. Then after that I realized that I should only speak English to improve my English because if I keep talking in Korean, I will never break the wall.

For these participants, performing a monolingual identity was part of their university experience. Puja felt that being part of the university meant that English should be a standard language spoken by all students. Bartholomew and Mari perceive the use of multiple languages at university as a hindrance to learning English, emphasizing the idea of language immersion as the best way to learn. The monolingual discourse of the university fuels the belief that to excel, belong, or be considered a legitimate university student, English must be your primary language; this feeds into the ideas of symbolic domination and linguistic regimentation (Heller, 2006). As highlighted by Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), the hidden discourse and inequities of power are reproduced at the school level. Gee (2011) reinforces this by stating that discourses shape our identity and behaviour; therefore, the monolingual discourse of the university shapes the ways students identify themselves and what is considered acceptable within that environment. Mari adopts a monolingual identity at university in an attempt to break

down the wall between her and the other university students. Mari perceives English as a valuable tool that will help her remove the barriers that prevent her from belonging, help her to achieve legitimacy, and allow her to fit in. The idea of symbolic power (Bourdieu, 1991) and English being the language of power comes into play for both Bartholomew and Mari. For these participants, English represents a form of legitimacy and asset that other languages do not possess. Blackledge (2002) describes this as “hegemonic ideologies of homogenisation,” where individuals are coerced into “comply[ing] with the symbolic domination in order to achieve symbolic resources” (p. 74).

In the following excerpts, participants discuss how they use their linguistic repertoires according to space and time.

Excerpt 6.14

Alka

Arlene So even when you are speaking to your parents at home, like will you switch between English and Malayalam in one sentence?

Alka: Yeah, in one sentence even—yeah. Like I just go off, like back and forth, because some things it just comes naturally to say it in English, it just makes more sense to me because I’m so—I’ve been brought up here in some ways and that comes more naturally to me.

Arlene And do you find that your parents are doing that too where they will put an English word in with Malayalam in a sentence?

Alka: Yeah, theirs is less common but they do do it like once in a while.

Excerpt 6.15

Saleem

Saleem: Urdu and English are the two languages that I speak. And if you count Hindi because I do understand it and I can't speak it.

Arlene And what is your stronger language?

Saleem: Writing and reading—English, obviously, but I think Urdu—I'm much more stronger in Urdu when I am speaking.

Arlene And what about social networking like communicating with your friends or family using Facebook or Instagram? Do you do it in Urdu or English?

Saleem: We mostly write in English or if we write in Urdu, it's in English though. It is like even if you want to say our own thing, we'll use the English letters, not Urdu.

Arlene And do you ever mix them?

Saleem: Yeah, when I talk to anyone who understands the language I always mix them.

Excerpt 6.16

Mariyam

Arlene Okay. And what languages do you speak at home?

Mariyam: Mixed English and Farsi. Yeah.

Arlene Do you speak English and Farsi with your mom and dad?

Mariyam: I speak English with my sister, and then sometimes like some words that I don't want my mom to know [chuckle], I say it in English. Yeah. But mostly with my parents I speak Farsi, but my sister and friends—English.

In these excerpts, Alka, Saleem, and Mariyam describe the fluidity of their plurilingualism. They use English and their heritage languages together and they exhibit a degree of agency as to when they feel like using a specific language. Alka felt that certain things were easier for her to express in English because she has grown up in Canada, but she does not discount her heritage language. Mariyam uses English as her social language for communicating with her friends and sister and uses Farsi as the primary language of communication with her parents. Saleem was educated in English and is accustomed to blending Urdu and English. As a participant observer in the ALL 99 classroom, I noticed Saleem would often speak to Rahul in Urdu. He spoke mostly English in the ALL 99 classroom, except when he wanted to make social comments to Rahul (a Hindi speaker) in Urdu. Their discussions, which I understood, were mostly social: about food or sports. From these different types of data, it is clear that for Saleem, Alka, and Mariyam, the agency they use to express their plurilingual identity is not compartmentalized but can be seen as fluid. Flexible plurilingualism emphasizes agency and uses the individual's linguistic system to "perform different social identities" (Blackledge & Creese, 2010, p. 109). These participants are performing a flexible plurilingual identity by using what Li (2011) defines as translanguaging:

"create[ing] a social space for the multilingual language user by bring together different dimensions of their personal history, experience and environment, their attitude, belief and ideology, their cognitive and physical capacity into one coordinated and meaningful performance and making it into a lived experience" (p.1223).

In the next excerpt, Puja describes a more compartmentalized version of plurilingualism.

Excerpt 6.17

Puja

Arlene And did you take on your Indian identity, your Canadian identity, or what identity, when you were writing?

Puja: Canadian.

Arlene Do you ever think in Punjabi, like other than the Hindi movies?

Puja: Yeah.

Arlene You do?

Puja: Yeah.

Arlene Can you tell me about that?

Puja: Like these kinds of things I never really thought about it, so it's sort of funny to talk about, but I don't know, sometimes my thoughts, when I think, it just kind of comes naturally. I'm not really, oh I'm thinking Punjabi now, oh I'm thinking English now. When say I am talking to my mom or like someone I am thinking Punjabi, and then speaking Punjabi, or like my Grandma, or my Grandpa. I don't know. Yeah, I do think in Punjabi if that is the question, but I can't really think of an example, it just comes naturally.

Arlene Does your identity change at school and at home?

Puja: I'd say it's pretty much the same. I mean I'd say I'm Canadian cause I'm born here, and it's just like a Canadian culture because I went to school here my whole life. Whereas at home it's like an Indian culture, like don't go out wearing this or this. So it's like when I'm with a certain group, like my family like anytime we go to a gathering, so it's like I'm a different person in a way. But when I'm like out like more Canadian in a way.

In Puja's excerpt she discusses a type of separate plurilingualism. Instead of the blending and translanguaging that were described by Alka, Saleem, and Maryam, Puja creates linguistic boundaries. Blackledge and Creese (2010) refer to separate bilingualism as a way of separating languages, so only certain languages can be used in specific spaces or times. Perhaps the rhetoric of language separation has now been incorporated into Puja's own internal discourse and she shares the view that languages have spatial boundaries, like English at school and Punjabi at home. As stated by Heller (1995), "language practices can therefore reveal the microprocesses of symbolic domination—including the identification of interactional zones where individuals use language choices to exert, aggravate, or mitigate their power, to collude with or resist

that exercise...” (p. 374). Puja’s language choice seems to correspond with the covert ideology of the university, where English is the primary language.

6.2. The Labelling of Identity

The way participants labelled their identity was also of relevance to their complex processes of identity formation. When asked to label their identity, most participants identified their country of heritage, their nation state, or their first or strongest language. The following excerpts demonstrate how select participants choose to identify according to their country of origin. Mari and Saleem discuss their identity in relation to their familial heritage. Mari was born in Korea but lived in India from age fourteen to seventeen, and then came to Canada at age nineteen. Saleem was born and raised in Pakistan and moved to Canada over a year ago.

Narrative Excerpt 6.1:

Mari

When I came back home, I put all my efforts to improve my English...However, there was an invisible transparent wall between them and me. Maybe, it was because of the language barrier.

Excerpt 6.18

Mari

Arlene You talked a little bit about this in your ALL narrative assignment; the cultural differences. Can you talk a little bit about the differences that you found?

Mari: I think like every country has the wall. They have—how do I say—actually, I cannot describe it, but you can feel it. Like there is a wall between them and I think that is because of the language, because we cannot talk in depth.

Arlene So did you ever break through the wall, do you think?

Mari: Not yet.

Arlene Do you feel the same wall here at UWC?

Mari: Actually, when I first went to the west, like residence, I met a lot of friends, right. I have never had any white friends, but then I met them and like I hung around with them for like two weeks, but then like even we were talking and laughing, but it was not fun for me. I think that is because of the culture. I enjoyed like being with them, but at the same time like—how do I say—like if we have one joke that they think is funny—for me it was not. So it is like a difference—yeah. But then after that, I hung out with Hong Kongese and Japanese. Then it was like so fun. I think like I have a wall between the foreign countries like Europe or like Canada, but then I have less wall between Hong Kongese, Chinese, or Japanese I think because our culture is similar, but then like I have to explain everything to the white friends because they don't know what it is. But then if I talk to the same Asians, then they get it like right after I say it.

Arlene So how would you describe your identity?

Mari: I would say I am pure Korean. It's like I see my Korean friends who wants to get the citizenships here and live here for like forever long, but then for me actually like I don't feel like I ever be Canadian or something. I'm planning to go back to Korea, like even after 10 years. I want to die in Korea, actually. I think that is because I'm like totally Korean. I'm comfortable with the Korean environment and Korean friends. Yeah.

Arlene That's really interesting because earlier you talked about the wall, right?

Mari: Yeah, because of the wall, I think. No, like it is really complicated. I like here. I like my friends here and I [am] enjoying staying here but like at the same time I miss Korea. I

can't help it. Actually, there is a Korean flag on my wall in the residence, like there is a Korean flag.

Arlene That's really interesting. And how about when you write? Do you write with or feel different identities when you are writing?

Mari: No. I feel the same.

Arlene You feel Korean? Like, when you are writing your ALL 99 narrative, did you feel a different identity when you were writing?

Mari: No. I was totally Korean.

In this excerpt, Mari brings forward several important points: the idea of a linguistic and cultural barrier that separates her from "White friends" and the feeling of othering. Even though Mari is proficient in English, she compares her language skills to native-like speakers that she describes as "White friends" and that she does not feel the same linguistic and cultural wall when she is with her Asian friends. She also separates herself from people that are from Europe or Canada and refers to these countries as "foreign." It is an interesting statement, because she seems to be the one who is now "othering" the people from the countries that she felt marginalized by.

Mari describes her allegiance and identity to Korea, emphasized by stating that she has a Korean flag in her room. She describes the intensity of her national identity by saying she hopes to die in Korea. As discussed by Gee (2010) and Lee and Marshall (2012), plurilingual identities are not necessarily hybridized (May, 2001) but are a contingent upon the performance in society. In reference to Gee's (2000) work on identity, Mari seems to occupy a Nature (N-Identity) and Discursive identity (D-Identity) when describing herself. Although, she identifies herself as Korean, she describes not belonging with her White friends due to her culture and English language skills. The ideas of feeling marginalized and its impact on identity construction was discussed in Shin's (2012) study of Korean high school students in Toronto. Shin reports that many of the Korean visa students who participated in his research rejected the idea of a hybrid identity and instead focused on re-affirming their "cool" Korean national identities. In his research, he found the participants did not want to identify themselves as a blend of identities, because of the racism and marginalization they had faced when trying to learn

English and due to their belief that Korea was a more progressive country than “backwards” Canada. These participants created a new discourse that Shin describes as “heavily invest(ing) in styling themselves as modern, and others (long-term immigrants and white Canadians) as unmodern, as well as in the idea of a globally recognisable Korean cool (via ‘hallyu’) to represent their globality associated with cosmopolitanism in the local Toronto context” (p.190). Mari, like the participants in Shin’s study, also came from a middle- to upper-class background, where she completed high school in India in order to gain better English proficiency, and then came to Canada to further her English language skills. In her narrative assignment, Mari discussed issues of marginalization, racism, and exclusion due to her lack of her English proficiency. For Mari, being rejected due to her English skills and her race may have contributed to her not wanting to identify as a hybridized identity.

In her post-interview, Mari revisits her ideas about the “wall” and her ties to Korea.

Excerpt 6.19

Mari

Arlene So, in your first interview you said, “I’m going to go back to Korea”.

Mari: Oh, yeah, yeah.

Arlene Do you still feel that way or has it changed a little bit?

Mari: It’s like half/half. It’s like half/half. I think if I get the permanent residence here, maybe I will live here for like 10 years, but like I am definitely going back.

Arlene You talked a lot about walls. You said, “I feel a wall” in your narrative and interview, can you expand?

Mari: Oh, I made white friends now. I have like four white friends. I didn’t have any white friends [chuckles]. Yeah, I didn’t have any white friends before, but yeah, I have white friends who I’m really comfortable with.

Arlene So, do you feel like your wall has been broken?

Mari: Not completely, not with the girls, but I am really comfortable with white boys [chuckles]. I don't know why, but like girls are like picky, you know. You know, they gossip and like they smile fakely. I could tell, but then like guys are like really—

As the semester progressed, Mari describes a shift in what she felt initially about feeling othered. She now describes her barriers as partially breaking down. In Mari's situation, her feelings of being othered because of language and culture may have prevented her from opening her identity to a third space (Bhabha, 1994), where negotiation and reconstruction can take place and "where life in all its ambiguity is played out" (English, 2004, p. 100). Now that she feels more of a sense of belonging, perhaps because of her improved English proficiency over the semester and her ability to be comfortable with White friends has helped her feel less marginalized and less separated by the "wall."

Excerpt 6.21

Saleem

Arlene So the next questions are about your identity. How would you describe your identity?

Saleem: I'm a Pakistani. Yeah, that's it. I am Pakistani. I won't identify myself by the language I speak. I identify myself by from where I am, what culture I belong to, and what I am raised to be and what language I speak.

Arlene Do you feel that since coming to Canada—it has been a year—do you feel like part of your identity has changed?

Saleem: No, I'm still the same person I know I am. Yeah, I have grown, I have different views about stuff, but at the end of the day to the core I am still the same guy. I still want the same things in life—yeah.

Arlene So, some people when I ask them this question they will say, “Well, I’m 80% Chinese and 20% Canadian” or “I feel like I am mostly this, but I am also this”.

Saleem: No, I’m 100% Pakistani. I have like—because my thinking is like that. I might be a liberal Pakistani, but at the end of the day I completely identify myself with that.

Much like Mari, Saleem also expressed a strong allegiance to his national identity but refused to identify himself based on the languages he speaks, but instead includes his country of origin (Pakistan), his culture, and his linguistic repertoire. Saleem takes on pluralistic identity, that is shaped by multiple experiences. Saleem also demonstrated a counter-discourse toward the idea of hybridization. Saleem states that he identifies solely as a Pakistani, rejecting being seen as anything other than Pakistani (linguistically, and culturally), by contesting the idea of being hybridized as a Canadian (Gee, 2010), and that hybridity is an identity norm (May, 2001) Much like Mari, Saleem’s feelings of contestation toward the hybridization of his identity may have stemmed from his experiences with marginalization.

Other participants in the study, chose to identify themselves as a blend of their familial heritage and their Canadian culture. This identification seemed irrespective of the number of years they have been in Canada or whether they were born in Canada. Alka was born in India but came to Canada at the age of seven. In the following excerpt, she identifies herself as a blend of both cultures.

Excerpt 6.22

Alka

Arlene So, it says we are looking here at cultures and how you feel like you belong and how this affects literacy so how would you describe your identity?

Alka: Basically, like Indo-Canadian. I want to say that I’m just Indian because, yeah, my parents are from India, but I feel like I’m more part of here. But then I don’t want to call myself just a Canadian because I have my Indian heritage. Some of my

values are because, I think, the way I have I been brought up like in an Indian way, in a traditional way. I think values will change according to the way you are brought up, culture and tradition and everything so I always consider myself an Indo-Canadian, I won't just call myself a Canadian.

Arlene Do you feel like you kept your Indian identity?

Alka: Yes, for the most part, yes, compared to mostly all my friends, me and my sister are usually the only ones at most events as kids and I can actually speak the language and like my parents are so happy about that because—I don't know, especially with Indian parents, they get so happy when other parents think your kids are good because we can talk to like other adults in our language and we can talk to our grandparents and stuff. y parents one thing they always say is, "You are not going to go and teach your grandparents English, like you are going to talk to them in their language." Because I know some of my friends, their grandparents live with them but they barely talk because grandparents only speak Malayalam or like Punjabi and the kids only speak English.

In this excerpt, Alka describes herself as a blend of both Indian and Canadian cultures. She bases her identity on her heritage, her values, and the languages she speaks. She describes her identity from a pluralistic standpoint and contests considering herself solely Canadian or Indian. Blackledge and Creese's (2010) found similar patterns with some of the multilingual participants in their study when looking at the links between language and identity: "Language choice, use and attitudes are intrinsically linked to language ideologies, relations of power, political arrangements and speakers' identities" (p.36). Alka had described her linguistic performance as fluid and now describes her identity as a blend of Canadian and Indian cultures; therefore, Alka's language choice and attitude seem to be congruent with her identity.

Similar to Alka, Bartholomew discusses his blend of identities. Bartholomew was born in Korea but has lived in Canada since he was twelve.

Excerpt 6.23

Bartholomew

Arlene: Can you describe your identity?

Bartholomew: My family and I always discuss this. You know how some people say second-generation Canadian or they say banana...Korean but inside more Canadian. My brother and I discuss this, I'm Generation 1.5. I'm a Canadian citizen. I'm used to both cultures, but it's easier for me to get accustomed to Canadian culture. I am not fully Canadian, but I'm more Canadian than Korean. Have you heard of a banana?

Arlene: Are you considered a banana?

Bartholomew: I guess, I wouldn't say I'm full banana, but more banana than other students. Bananas tend to be Korean but born in Canada. They are Korean but fully accustomed to Canadian culture. I'm still accustomed to both but more on the Canadian side.

In this excerpt, Bartholomew describes himself as part of Generation 1.5. According to Marshall (2009), Generation 1.5 refers to an individual who was born in a foreign country but came to Canada at a young age and was educated here. Bartholomew describes this blend of cultures but includes the caveat that he is more Canadian than Korean. However, he then contradicts himself by calling himself "not fully a banana." He defined "banana" as someone who is born in Canada but of Korean heritage and fully integrated into Canadian culture. Bartholomew's excerpt demonstrates the challenges students may face when trying to describe their blend of identities. As emphasized by Bhabha (1994), the third space is a place where people can negotiate, recreate and play with their identity, with no fixity.

Other participants chose to identify themselves separate from their family's heritage background and chose a single Canadian identity. Puja identifies herself as Canadian. She was born in Canada and is of South Asian heritage.

Excerpt 6.24

Puja

Arlene Can you describe your identity...?

Puja: I don't know. I don't really think about it that much cause like Surrey, there's a lot of people, like East Indian people, so I don't really feel it's my identity cause it's like so many people are like me, I guess. I don't really think of it as identity like to be speaking these languages.

Arlene So what identity would you say you have...?

Puja: I probably would say Canadian.

Arlene That would be your primary identity.

Puja: [nods]

In this excerpt, Puja states that her linguistic repertoires do not define her identity. Puja seems to be contesting her Punjabi identity and instead is subscribing to more of what Gee (2010) describes as an Affinity Identity (A-Identity) by referring to herself as solely Canadian. Gee refers to the A-Identity as identifying oneself in relation to belonging to a group that shares similar interests and experiences. Therefore, the idea that pluricultural or plurilingual individuals would choose a hybrid identity can lead to the reification of identities based on appearance and language (Leung et al., 1997). As found in Lee and Marshall (2012), identity is not always fluid, but can be contentious and choppy. From a pedagogical perspective, the idea of reification based on culture and linguistic repertoires needs to be considered. Labelling students as ESL or assuming a lack of English proficiency or western cultural knowledge places students in a position that questions their legitimacy and their identity. In Ortmeier-Hooper's (2008) study of multilingual university students in a composition course, one of her participants contested being labelled as ESL and instead attempted to hide her cultural and linguistic background in order to "fit in." The participants in Ortmeier-Hooper's study demonstrated a range of identities; some related to their linguistic and cultural diversity, while others contested it. In this study, assuming that a student who looks South Asian would identify

herself as either South Asian or as a blend of identities can not reify, it can also impact legitimacy and feelings of belonging. As stated by Ortmeier-Hooper, “when students do share their identities as second language writers, we need to consider what that means to the particular student” (p.414).

The above excerpts demonstrate the difference in how the plurilingual participants in this study perceived their overarching identity. Some participants based their identity on their heritage language, nationality, or culture; other participants chose a blend of their heritage origin and Canadian culture; and some consciously chose to identify not with their heritage language/culture but instead as Canadian. From this spectrum, it is clear that identities are not necessarily based on heritage languages or cultures but are unique to the individual and their experiences. The data showed no correlation between the number of years living in Canada and participants perceiving a Canadian identity. In fact, some participants who had lived in Canada for one to two years still identified themselves as a hybrid Canadian. However, Puja, who described her first language as Punjabi, referred to herself solely as Canadian because for her, linguistic repertoires do not define her identity. The spectrum of how plurilingual students identify themselves is important to consider for a number of reasons. Teachers need to be aware that their judgements of students based on their first language or the number of years they have lived in Canada may be vastly different than the student’s own perceptions of their identity.

A second point of interest was the difference in the way some participants performed their linguistic identity and the ways they labelled their identity. In earlier excerpts, Puja describes using Punjabi with her family and English at school, but when asked to label her identity, she only includes her Canadian identity. Saleem uses Urdu, English, and Punjabi fluidly at home, in ALL 99, and on social media, but when asked to describe his identity he says, “I’m 100% Pakistani.” Alka and Bartholomew, though, described more congruency between how they blended their languages and labelled their identity.

6.3. Conclusion

The way identity is performed and labelled depends on many factors, including the discursive practices that legitimize certain language practices and the ways these discursive practices combine with one's internal belief system to create a new perspective on identity. From Bakhtin's (1981) dialogic perspective, the authoritative discourse combines with the internally persuasive discourse and creates a new view point. For some participants in this study, their perspectives on identity were not what I expected, given their linguistic performances. Therefore, it is important to stress that individuals will not always subscribe to the blending of a third space ideology but may in fact contest it and subscribe to the ideas of symbolic domination both as their authoritative discourse and internally persuasive discourse.

Chapter 7. Analysis, Part 3

This section of the data analysis discusses the idea that social and institutional discourses about plurilingualism impact the way people view and exercise their agency. The emergent subthemes highlighted include [i] the impact of institutional discourses (high school and university), [ii] familial/home discourses related to plurilingualism and how these impact identity, and [iii] the ways participants perceive their plurilingualism, and how their linguistic agency is exercised.

7.1. The Impact of Institutional Discourses

As previously mentioned, discourses carry political, historical, and social implications. Blackledge and Pavlenko (2001) note that language ideologies are about more than just language, “but are always socially situated and tied to questions of identity and power in societies” (p. 246). The data will be analyzed to identify how social and institutional discourses about multilingualism and plurilingual students impact how individuals perceive their plurilingualism.

7.1.1. Institutional Discourse

When looking at the reproduction of language ideologies within an institution, both overt and covert discourses must be taken into account. Many participants in this study described being part of an English as a Second Language (ESL) class in elementary school. As discussed by Blackledge and Creese (2010), and from my own experiences working in elementary schools, ESL classes were often places for bilingual and plurilingual students to strengthen their English skills, but also places where they were restricted from performing their range of linguistic repertoires. Some participants in this study described not understanding why they were placed in an ESL class when their first or stronger language was English and they were born in Canada. Rahul, Puja, Kate, and Anna describe their feelings about being placed in an ESL class in their elementary or high school years. Rahul, Puja, and Kate were born in Canada and described English as one of their stronger languages. Anna was born in China and came to Canada when she was seven years old.

Excerpt 7.11

Rahul

Arlene: Did you take any ESL classes in school?

Rahul: In elementary school they put me in there for one year, but then eventually I got out of there.

Arlene: How did going to ALL and doing the ESL class feel; did they feel similar?

Rahul: No. ESL was kind of more like dumbed down, like they really like—like I feel like I was in there for no reason, I don't really know why they put me in there. I don't know, ALL is kind of like they actually give you like more descriptions. ESL they kind of like basically just keep on spoon-feeding you.

Excerpt 7.12

Puja

Arlene: Did you ever have to take ESL in school?

Puja: In elementary school, I think Grade 3 or 4, they just took me in it. But I was only in it for a few months.

Arlene: Do you feel like ALL is kind of like an ESL class, or not really?

Puja: I sometimes feel it is, because they sort of baby you in a way, because sometimes it's like way too slow. Like she gives us so much time to do a question. I'm like, it's not that difficult. Cause I guess everyone is different in the class.

Excerpt 7.13

Kate

Arlene: Do you feel that ALL is kind of like an ESL class or not really?

Kate: I wouldn't say ESL, because although it goes over punctuation and grammar and all that stuff, it's not really basic stuff, so it's kind of a bit more advanced.

Arlene: Did you ever take ESL in high school?

Kate: In high school no.

Arlene: In elementary school?

Kate: Yes.

Arlene: And how did you feel when you were in an ESL class in elementary school?

Kate: I think because you're usually around, because in that school I was around people who spoke more English. Um, more foundation people, so it felt kind of, most weird people, like you were kind of put in a different group almost, during one class or something.

These participants describe the ESL environment negatively. Rahul describes his dismay at being placed in an ESL class and Puja alludes to this as well, saying she vaguely remembers being placed in the ESL class but was quickly removed. Kate seems to justify why she was placed in the class, saying that there were many strong English-speaking students at her school with the implication that she was not one of the stronger English speakers, and that was why she was placed in an ESL class. Rahul and Kate did not view their ESL experience positively. Rahul describes feeling patronized in the classroom, and states "then eventually I got out of there" while Kate felt as though only the "weird" people went to ESL. For these participants, the covert institutional ideologies seem to be that ESL class was for students who are "dumb" or "weird," and they contested being considered a part of this group by stating or alluding to their dismay at being placed in the class.

Heller (1995) discusses the notion that "language norms are a key aspect of institutional norms, and reveal ideologies which legitimate (or contest) institutional relations of power" (p.373). When educational institutions reproduce the idea that ESL

classes are for people who are different and require remediation, they legitimize and empower these monolingual/monocultural ideologies and inadvertently devalue and “other” plurilingual and pluricultural knowledge. In his excerpt, Rahul questioned why he was placed in an ESL class. He was born in Canada and identified English as his strongest language. The idea that visible ethnicity and language are connected is discussed by Leung et. al (1997) as a form of mismatch. Where one’s ethnicity is tied to their linguistic competence, “Such then is the mismatch between the realities of urban multilingualism and the educational classification of students’ language identities and backgrounds” (p. 11).

This idea of labelling students according to societal assumptions is connected to Ortmeier-Hooper’s (2008) study. Her research involved the case study of three immigrant students taking a first-year university composition course and their discussions of an ESL identity. Much like Rahul and Kate, one of Ortmeier-Hooper’s participants described her high school ESL experiences as being isolating, reified, and being treated like she was less intelligent than the mainstream students. The monolingual and monocultural institutional discourses that are prevalent in many educational institutions can become so embedded that these ideologies become a part of the internal discourse and influence and shape their identity (Bhaktin, 1981). For Rahul and Kate, being a part of an ESL identity created feelings of confusion, contestation, and inadequacy.

Similar to ALL 99 at UWC, other universities and colleges have implemented academic writing courses, which are meant to help students improve their academic writing skills and thus improve their success at university. However, these types of academic literacy courses can sometimes be perceived as another type of ESL course. Marshall (2009) discussed the idea that in order for some students to feel like legitimate university students, they must first go through the hurdle of taking an academic literacy course, which can be perceived as “re-becoming ESL” (p. 42). In the next few excerpts, Adrian and Rahul discuss their views about ALL 99 and their beliefs about the course.

Adrian is a 19-year-old business student who was born in Canada and speaks English and Cantonese.

Excerpt 7.14

Adrian

Arlene: How does it feel to be in ALL?

Adrian: It's annoying. The requirement to not [have to] do ALL was 75% in English 12, and I got 74%. Because of the classes I skipped, I'm pretty sure I would have made it. On the LPI test you have to get 4/6 on the writing portion and I got 5/6, but then there is a part where you had to get at least 5/10 on the multiple choice and I got 4/10. It's kind of annoying. I'm hoping I can get an A or A+.

Arlene: So, do you find it helpful being in ALL?

Adrian: To be honest, not at all. Like, introductory writing, thesis statements, I learned that when I was at the age 15. So, it's kind of a nuisance, to be honest. I understand why UWC has the course, looking at my classmates and the trouble they're having, but I wish I didn't have to take it, to be honest.

Arlene: Does it feel like an ESL class?

Adrian: Definitely.

Excerpt 7.15

Rahul

Arlene: We talked about the transition from high school to SFU. Did you experience challenges, do you think, at high school because you were multilingual?

Rahul: No, not really because my English wasn't bad, like I didn't have like an accent or anything and like it was properly, so I don't think it really had an effect on me.

Arlene: Why did you feel like, "Ah, I have to take ALL?"

Rahul: I don't know, because it is like everyone says like everyone takes like first-year English, right, and then I guess ALL is kind of like a lower grade class I guess you can say.

Adrian and Rahul express displeasure in having to take ALL 99. Adrian discusses his frustration at having to take the course because of his poor grades in high school English. Adrian emphasizes that ALL 99 was very similar to ESL class and that he understood why his classmates needed to take it but feels that he does not belong in the ALL 99 group.

In these examples, Adrian and Rahul reproduce the discourse that ALL is not only similar to an ESL course but those who take ALL are somewhat different or “lower” than the “legitimate university students” (Marshall, 2009). In these excerpts, Adrian positions himself in what Preece (2014) refers to as the “native speaker identity” (p. 270). When Adrian states that he understood why his ALL classmates were needing to take the course (alluding to their poor English proficiency), he differentiates himself as the native speaker who was really not meant to take the courses but had no choice due to his poor study habits in high school. Adrian resists the prescribed identity of being considered part of the ALL-99 class and the ideologies that being part of that group carry (Preece, 2014), whereas Rahul describes himself as part of the “other” group and although he also refers to himself as a native English speaker, he takes on the identity of being in a lower-level class and being different from the other “legitimate” university students.

7.1.2. Familial and Home Discourses

Along with institutional discourses related to language use, familial discourse is also an influential discourse that can affect identity. In the next section of excerpts, Rahul, Mariyam and Kate discuss their writing abilities in other languages and how these may relate to the language practices of their families.

In the next excerpt, Rahul discusses how English and Hindi were used and perceived in his family.

Excerpt 7.16

Rahul

Arlene: What language do you prefer writing in?

Rahul: English 'cause when you do like in Hindi-English it is kind of like you have to think about it a little bit more. Whereas English is natural, right.

Arlene: What about reading? What do you read? What language—

Rahul: English and Spanish are the only languages I can read, but I am not that good at Spanish. I could say like I am at the begin level of reading Spanish, but that is all I know, like I don't know how to read in Hindi or Punjabi.

Arlene: No? How come you never learned how to read in Hindi?

Rahul: I don't know. It is just—I never had the time, I guess, because I was always busy with studies. And even like my parents would say like once you are done with school and once you are working, then you could take on learning, but right now it is just like it would be an extra on everything else that I already have to deal with, right.

Arlene: Do you wish that you had learned it?

Rahul: Not really.

Excerpt 7.17

Mariyam

Arlene: But do you do any other non-academic writing? Like do you write in a journal at home or do you write fiction or poetry?

Mariyam: Yeah, I used to do journals every day before I come to SFU 'cause now I am more busy but in summer like I write my own—I don't know, I have my own things like I just write journals.

Arlene: So, when you moved to Canada in Grade 9, were you journaling then?

Mariyam: Back then?

Arlene: Like here. Were you writing in your journal when you were let's say in high school?

Mariyam: Yes.

Arlene: Were you writing about your struggles?

Mariyam: Yeah.

Arlene: In what language?

Mariyam: I didn't keep them. English.

Arlene: You would write in English?

Mariyam: Yeah, 'cause since I was I think seven, I had like a private English teacher. She came to our house and she studies in US, so my mom was like "*You and your sister have to know how to speak English.*" But, you know, even though it used to be a lot in Iran, it is different than when you come here. 'Cause when you are in the environment, you hear different things, different pronunciations—like let's say—like for a word like "*water,*" right, I learn how to say "*wateh,*" but here the Canadian people say it differently. So even if you study a lot in Iran or anywhere, when you come here you still have to face some stuff. But, yeah, my mom tried to like teach English to us.

In the above excerpts Rahul and Mariyam discuss their familial belief that English is an important language for their future advancement as they answer questions about writing in other languages. Rahul seems to value certain languages within his linguistic repertoire by stating that he did not have time to learn how to read in Hindi, but interestingly was able to invest his time in learning how to speak and read in Spanish. This highlights Heller's discussion on legitimacy and the discursive and symbolic domination that emphasizes one language over another. Rahul emphasizes that even his parents did not prioritize learning Hindi and stressed that he should learn to read in

Hindi, only after he attains his goal of finishing school and finding a job. It seems as though Rahul and his family position reading and writing in Hindi as more of a hobby that he should pursue after he has achieved a certain level success. Darvin and Norton (2016) refer to this as the way in which individuals imagine the outcomes of their linguistic investments. Darvin and Norton states that “a learner’s imagined identity and hopes for the future will impact his or her investment in the language and literacy practices of a given classroom, and subsequent progress in language learning” (p. 477). Mariyam’s familial linguistic discourse emphasizes the importance of learning English. Mariyam highlights the fact that she grew up with a tutor, who she legitimizes by saying, “she studies in the US.” Much like Rahul, Mariyam’s family views English as an important tool for success. Gee (1996) refers to discourses as being a type of “identity kit, which comes complete with the appropriate costume and instructions on how to act, talk, and often write...” (p. 15). Rahul and Mariyam emphasize English as one of the keys to a successful future linking their responses to discourses that are reproduced within their family. Therefore, they are performing these identities in part, based on the discursive practices that surround them.

In the next excerpt, Kate shares knowledge about her family’s linguistic beliefs, but emphasizes Mandarin instead of English.

Excerpt 7.18

Kate

Arlene: So, if your home language was Cantonese, why do you think it was important for you to go to Chinese school to learn Mandarin?

Kate: Well, my mom actually speaks Mandarin, and she kind of guessed that Mandarin would be a very useful language to have in the future. And it has.

Arlene: It has?

Kate: Yah, because China is a lot larger country, but like it has a lot larger influence now. There’s a lot of new immigrants coming here and maybe asking questions, or you can use it as a way to meet new people.

In the above excerpt, Kate discusses her mother's belief that Mandarin is an influential language for her future. This highlights Norton's (1995) view of the imagined future, and how certain languages are imagined as assets toward success. This further coincides with Bourdieu's (1991) concept of linguistic capital. Kate's mother stresses the importance of learning Mandarin because she felt it will be a valuable asset for Kate's future. Certain languages carry symbolic value and this value is produced and re-produced according to the linguistic market economy. Kate and her mother value learning Mandarin because of the influx of Chinese immigrants and transnationals coming to Metro Vancouver and the imagined opportunities that will arise from this. In addition, in her study on Chinese migrants in Italy, Paciocco (2018) describes Mandarin as a lingua franca because of the increase in migration across the country, and the lack of linguistic understanding between Chinese dialects.

Familial and institutional discourses play a role in how individuals perceive and perform their plurilingual identities and how value is attached to language. In the next section, participants discuss their linguistic repertoires and how they perceive and value their plurilingualism.

7.1.3. Perceptions of Plurilingualism and Agency

In the following excerpts, Alka, Keon and Adrian discuss their linguistic repertoires in terms of agency and asset.

Excerpt 7.19

Alka

Arlene: How do you feel about being multilingual?

Alka: I think that knowing languages is a very good thing. I know a lot of people that just know one language and I feel like you can fit in a lot better when you know someone's language because you can relate to them and make them feel more comfortable. Like I was saying with Punjabi, if you understand it more and you study with them, they will be so much more comfortable—they get so happy when they know that you can understand it and then they can actually tell you something

especially in classes. But after school 'cause like some people don't know what to tell the bus driver or just something like, "Is this stop the right one?" And then they will just ask and like it feels nice that you can go up to them and actually help them with something. And I always think it is a great benefit to know languages, like I want to learn Mandarin 'cause I want to learn a little bit of Asian languages so I'll probably be taking that this summer.

In the next excerpt, Keon, who is of Kurdish heritage but has lived in Canada for eight years discusses his perspective on his linguistic repertoires.

Excerpt 7.21

Keon

Arlene: Do you think that your social and cultural and linguistic, like languages—do you think that helps or hinders your learning?

Keon: I think it just helps the fact that you speak more than one language comes in handy sometimes.

Arlene: How do you think it helps? Like how does it come in handy for you?

Keon: Like, for example, at my work like I'm a salesman, right, and when a Persian family comes and they don't speak that good of English I can speak Farsi with them and try to get them to buy whatever, whereas if I speak only English that is really harder for me to do that 'cause they don't speak as good English so it is harder to get my message across.

Alka appears to view her plurilingualism as a means to 'fit in' with different linguistic groups and to help others who do not speak English. Alka describes wanting to learn Mandarin (there is a large Chinese population at the UWC) because she views speaking and understanding multiple languages as valuable. Keon also describes his multilingualism as valuable tool for communication. By using linguistic agency to help others who are have difficulty communicating in English (strangers on a bus or struggling classmates, customers at a store), Alka and Keon are perhaps creating a new discourse,

and in turn placing themselves in an agentic position of more power. Norton (1995) refers to this as the way in which individuals use their agency to re-position themselves and their identity. Norton states “a person may be positioned in a particular way within a given discourse, the person might resist the subject position or even set up a counterdiscourse which positions the person in a powerful rather than marginalized subject position (p. 16). In Preece’s (2014) study among British students in a first-year academic writing course, she also discusses the idea of the re-positioning of identity into a position of power. Preece describes it as the “native speaker of English” identity. “The native speaker of English was an identity that British-born participants frequently inhabited...this identity enabled the British-born participants to differentiate themselves from students and staff that they identified as ‘foreign’ and present themselves as “naturally” knowing English by virtue of their birth and education in the UK” (p.267). Although Alka and Keon were both born outside Canada, they refer to themselves as being fluent English speakers. Alka and Keon both describe using their linguistic repertoires to explain things to their classmates, thereby positioning themselves in a more powerful way.

Excerpt 7.22

Adrian

Arlene: How do you feel about being multilingual here at SFU?

Adrian: It’s a good asset to have. I believe that the better you can get your point across in terms of networking, and just the overall communication is going to be better for you. Obviously English is a universal language, but it doesn’t hurt, especially when you do business. As a business student if you do business overseas or in another country and you know the language, even if you know only parts of it, it’s going to work wonders for you.

In the above excerpt, Adrian describes his multilingualism as an asset and postulates the imagined value his linguistic repertoire would carry when doing business. Adrian’s sentiments about attaching value to his linguistic repertoires coincides with Bourdieu and Passerson’s (1977) and Norton’s (1995) ideas of cultural capital and investment. Adrian attaches value to speaking English and Cantonese and views these languages as

having a higher capital in the business world. Norton (1995) posits that “if learners invest in a second language, they do so with the understanding they will acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources, which will in turn increase the value of their cultural capital” (p. 17). Unlike Alka and Keon, Adrian discusses conflicting institutional discourses. In excerpt 7.14, Adrian expresses his discontent about having to take the ALL 99 course and resists being identified as a member of the class, as it reminds him of an ESL class. When asked about how he viewed his linguistic repertoires, Adrian states that his multilingualism (English and Cantonese) is an “asset” because it will improve his success in business. Here he describes two conflicting discourses within the institution. As a business student, Adrian may be privy to a neoliberal discourse, which follows the idea that economic growth and global capitalism occur across national borders, thereby perpetuating the idea that multilingualism will improve one’s economic capital (Kubota, 2016). However, he is also privy to the monolingual discourse of the university. Therefore, for Adrian, there are multiple linguistic discourses at play and likely more that have not been discussed. As postulated by Gee (1989)

“The various Discourses which constitute each of us as persons are changing and often are not fully consistent with each other; there is often conflict and tension between the values, beliefs, attitudes, interactional styles, uses of language, and ways of being in the world which two or more Discourses represent” (p. 7).

The ways in which Adrian uses his agency to contest or negotiate his plurilingual identity is dependent on the interplay between these and other discourses.

Alka, Keon and Adrian use their linguistic agency as a means to not only exchange information but also create, negotiate and invest in their own social identity. As referenced in chapter three, Marshall and Moore (2018) discuss plurilingualism and plurilingual agency as more than “plurilingual speakers freely and creatively using different languages for social interaction and learning,” (p. 23) but instead viewing plurilingual individuals as social actors situated and interacting within specific contexts and situations.

7.2. Conclusion

In this chapter, analyses and discussions related to familial/home and institutional discourses were highlighted. For some of the participants, the familial and institutional discourses were not congruent, as some family beliefs emphasized heritage language learning whereas others stressed learning English. Participants described their plurilingual agency by discussing the contexts and situations where they would use their linguistic repertoires. As specified by Norton (2006), individuals may look for social and linguistic resources that allow them to resist an unwanted identity position, and instead negotiate and construct a new identity position. As discussed, some of the participants were able to use their linguistic resources and re-position themselves to a more powerful identity position. As stated by Blackledge (2002), "In multilingual, heterogeneous societies language ideologies are constantly constructed and reconstructed in discursive interactions at micro and macro levels" (p. 67). For participants like Adrian, the contradictory institutional discourses play an interesting role in the way he perceived and valued his plurilingualism. From a dialogic perspective (Bakhtin, 1981), these competing authoritative discourses (university and the business world) and one's internally persuasive discourses, work to reveal the "individuals' ideological consciousness" (p.342) and influence one's identity. Gee's (1989) description of discourses being analogous to an identity kit coincides with the discussion and analyses in this chapter in that the discourses influence how identities and language are perceived and performed. The themes surrounding familial and institutional discourses and the influence on perceptions of identity and language are relevant to research question three and the pedagogical implications of these findings will be discussed further in the conclusion.

Chapter 8. Conclusion and Implications

This study has evolved from questions about plurilingual identities and the connections between participants' language perceptions and use in today's globalized and transnational climate. This chapter will provide a summary of the study and present answers to the three research questions that were detailed in the introductory chapter by including the findings from the study. Following this, I will discuss my personal reflexivity regarding the research and will address what I consider to be the limitations of the study. Lastly, the pedagogical implications and future directions of this study will be highlighted.

8.1. Overview of the Study

This study focused on the ways in which plurilingual participants perceived and performed their linguistic repertoires and identities across space and time. In order to explore this topic, a qualitative methodology with an ethnographic approach was implemented. The participants in the study were 15 first year university students from the Academic Learning and Literacies course (ALL 99) at UWC. There were three stages of data collection, and participation was spread across these stages. Stages one and two were similar to pilot studies, involving interviews with nine participants. Stage three of the data collection process involved six participants, where pre and post interviews, narrative text, classroom observations and reflexive field notes were collected over the course of a semester. An open-coding data analysis method was used, where three emergent themes were highlighted and analyzed. These themes included the ways in which participants perceived and used languages, the way identities were performed and labelled across space and time, and the way familial and institutional discourses influence identity and perceptions of language and investment.

8.2. Research Questions and Findings

Since the 1970s and 1980s, there have been changes in the way identities have been theorized. As highlighted by Norton and Toohey (2011), in the past, identities were often seen as fixed categories, whereas in the last three decades more research has

focused on a “poststructural understanding of identities as fluid, context-dependent, and context-producing, in particular historical and cultural circumstances” (p. 419). This study has emerged from a post-structural standpoint, where identity and plurilingualism are seen as both seamless and fluid, as well as complicated and the result of constraint.

As discussed in the introductory chapter, the influx of immigrants and transnationals in the Metro Vancouver area has changed the demographic of educational institutions, such as at UWC. The aim of this study was to explore the perceptions and usage of languages among plurilingual students and gain a better understanding of how these impact their sense of identity. As posited by Block (2007), identities are always changing and therefore “...it is well-nigh impossible to arrive at a definition or list of perspectives that will hold up for very long” (p. 187).

The research questions I analyzed in this study were the following:

- Research question 1: How do plurilingual students in a first-year academic literacy course perceive and perform their identities in a university setting?
- Research question 2: How do plurilingual students form and re-form their identities in the academic setting using verbal and written modalities?
- Research question 3: What role do social and institutional discourses about plurilingual students play in their perceptions and performances around language and identity?

8.2.1. Findings Related to Research Question 1

How do plurilingual students in a first-year academic literacy course perceive and perform their identities in a university setting?

In looking for answers to research question 1, I examined how participants perceived and performed their mult/plurilingualism across space and time. The interlinking conceptual threads include notions of linguistic competency, legitimacy and value.

When looking at the concepts of legitimacy and competency, it was found that some of the participants had difficulty defining themselves as multilingual due to the juxtaposition between competency and legitimacy. In other words, in order to feel like they were legitimate speakers of a certain language, they felt that they had to have achieved a certain level of competency. This idea perpetuates the belief that in order to be considered bilingual, individuals have to have equal competencies in both languages (Weinreich, 1964). Some participants discussed the idea of legitimacy and competency as interconnected. For example, when discussing her linguistic repertoires, Alka neglects to include Hindi and Punjabi because of her lack of a 'native-speaker like' accent. The discussion presented by Alka coincides with Lipi-Green's (2012) notions of accent and legitimacy and Bourdieu's (1991) and Heller's (2006) concepts of what it means to be a "proper" or legitimate language user. For some of the participants to consider themselves as a "proper" bilingual/plurilingual, certain components were necessary, including having a 'native-like speaker' accent and/or equal competency levels. Notions of legitimacy were brought forward in the way participants performed and perceived their identity based on the pervasive monolingual discursive practices of UWC.

The other common thread that was discussed related to the way multilingualism was perceived at the university and in the ALL 99 class. Many participants viewed a contrast between how their multilingualism was perceived at the university versus within the ALL 99 classroom. Participants perceived the university as being ambivalent toward their multilingualism. In contrast, in the ALL 99 class, participants discussed feeling a sense of belonging and the belief that their pluriculturalism and plurilingualism were seen as valuable assets for learning (Lin, 2013). For many of the participants, the ALL 99 classroom was seen as a space where they were able to perform a type of flexible plurilingualism and where they were able to communicate fluidly, using their multilayers of identity (Blackledge & Creese, 2010).

In response to research question one, the findings illustrate perceptions and performances of identity as a multilayered negotiation process that is dependent on space and time, as well as discourses of legitimacy and competencies that are internalized and performed based on context and situations

8.2.2. Findings Related to Research Question 2

Research question 2: How do plurilingual students form and re-form their identities in the academic setting using verbal and written modalities?

The findings that relate to research question 2 highlight the ways identities are performed according to space and time, and how individuals perceive and label their identities. The findings were based on narrative and interview data and revealed three main threads; the connections between plurilingual agency in accordance with space and time, symbolic power and legitimacy, and the blending (hybridized) and non-blending (non-hybridized) views of identity.

The first connection I found between these threads relates to the ways participants expressed their linguistic agency in different spaces and times. Many of the participants described using a monolingual identity in the general spaces at UWC, and expressed their belief that within the space of the university, English should be the primary language of communication. Once again, this brings the threads of legitimacy and symbolic domination to the forefront, as the hegemony and legitimization of English within educational institutions has the ability to impact the way identities are performed. In regard to space and agency, Marshall et al (2012) and Marshall and Moore (2013) found in their studies that participants chose to bring light and shade to their plurilingual agency depending on the spaces and freedom they felt as well as the restrictions they perceived according to the university's hegemonic norms. In this sense, some participants described the spaces where they were able to use their flexible plurilingual identities across overlapping spaces while others opted for separated, discrete plurilingual identities where languages were compartmentalized and boundaries of linguistic usage were followed. Therefore, the choice to perform their plurilingual identity seemed to be based on multiple factors, including the discursive institutional discourses they have internalized, contested or appropriated. As stated by Blackledge and Creese (2010), "Language choice, use and attitudes are intrinsically linked to language ideologies, relations of power, political arrangements and speakers' identities" (p.37)

The next finding pertained to how participants labelled their identity and the connection to their ideas of multi/plurilingualism. It was revealed that there were two main categories in which participants labelled their identity. The categories included a

blend of nationalities (i.e. Chinese-Canadian), similar to a hybridized identity, and a non-blended, more essentialist identity. The labelling of one's identity did not necessarily depend on the number of years the individual had lived in the country or where they were born. For example, Alka was born in India, but identified herself as an Indo-Canadian. However, other participants chose to identify themselves not based on their plurilingual and pluricultural repertoires, but instead labelled themselves according to a non-blended or hybridized identity. For some of the participants, the way they labelled their identity was contradictory to their linguistic repertoires and performances. The overarching idea from the findings is that the links between linguistic repertoires and how individuals perceive their identity are not necessarily connected. Thereby, identities are based not only on the discursive practices that circulate, but also on how individuals act upon these discourses through appropriation and contestation (Gee, 2010).

In response to research question two, the findings reveal that plurilingual students in this study incorporate multiple means to construct and negotiate their identities. These include the appropriation and internalization of institutional discourses, their beliefs about their linguistic usage according to space and time, and the ways in which they incorporate different discourses in order to perform an identity, which does not necessarily correlate with their linguistic repertoires ethnicity or heritage background.

8.2.3. Findings Related to Research Question 3

- *Research question 3: What role do social and institutional discourses about plurilingual students play in their perceptions and performances around language and identity?*

The findings that relate to research question three centre on the ways in which familial and institutional discourses influence the perceptions and performances of language and identity. The main threads of these findings relate to notions of legitimization, negotiation and contestation of discourses, and the ways in which participants viewed their linguistic investments and value.

The notion of legitimacy was evident in the findings in multiple ways. When discussing familial/social and institutional discourses, participants shared feelings of marginalization, dismay and negativity toward being placed in an ESL class at school,

and for some participants being placed in the ALL 99 class at university. These feelings coincide with institutional discourses that ESL classes are for students that were “dumber” or “weird,” and that at the university level, the ALL 99 course was for students that were not quite legitimate university students. Accordingly, being positioned as ESL or a member of ALL 99 made participants feel inferior to their peers. These pervasive language norms that are reproduced and internalized become part of the discourse that orbits around these students. Similarly, Marshall (2012) found that due to the institutional positioning and discursive practices “students who feel that they have been accepted as a member of the university community find in their first semester that they have to overcome the hurdle of re-becoming ESL before they are accepted as a *legitimate* university student” (p. 54).

Along with the broader institutional discourses, familial discourses were also discussed. These findings also centred around ideas of legitimacy and imagined capital. For some families, the symbolic power of English was seen as valuable and the imaginary ticket to a successful future. The participants seemed to internalize these discourses in two ways: by legitimizing and appropriating the linguistic discourses and/or contesting them to create a new identity position. I found that some of the participants chose to legitimize and appropriate their familial discourses about language. They reproduced the language beliefs of their families by valuing and subscribing to the imagined capital that their specific language would achieve. In terms of the intuitional discourse, participants described aspects of appropriation and contestation. Some participants expressed views that contested institutional discourses by questioning the reasons why they were placed in certain classes, or by using their linguistic agency to reposition themselves in different context. Other participants, like Adrian, described competing discourses (monolingual beliefs and the asset of being multilingual) and appropriated these discourses in accordance with ideologies of imagined linguistic capital. As stressed by Norton (2013), when learners make an investment in a certain language, they do so “because it will help them acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources” (as cited in Darvin & Norton, 2015, p.37). Therefore, Adrian had to negotiate between these discourses in order to acquire his symbolic capital in the business world.

In response to research question three, the findings reveal that familial/social and institutional discourses impact how participants perceive perform their identities in

different ways. Some participants were able to exercise their plurilingual agency to contest or reposition their identity from a marginalized position to a more powerful one whereas others chose to appropriate and perform their plurilingual identities within the parameters of more constraining discourses.

8.3. Summary of Findings

A significant finding in this study relates to the way in which many of the participants described themselves as not being a “proper” or legitimate language user. Many of the students discussed feeling this deficit when describing their second or third languages. This idea of deficit coincides with the way many students perceived their plurilingualism; either through ambivalence or asset. A second significant finding related to the way participants identified themselves. Even though some participants described themselves as being plurilingual with strong connections to their heritage language, they did not necessarily describe their identity with the same fluidity. These participants emphasized that their linguistic repertoires did not influence the way they identified themselves, but instead their ethnic origin played a more significant role. A third significant finding involved the way participants changed their identity position from a non-native of speaker of English to a native speaker of English identity (Preece, 2014). These participants were able to reposition themselves from a marginalized place to a power position, whether it be in the contexts of a classroom (helping another student who did not understand the assignment) or at work (helping a customer who does not speak English).

My findings coincided with aspects of different theoretical frameworks. I believe it is difficult to attribute the ways in which plurilingual students negotiate their identities to just one theoretical approach. Some participants discussed their identities as being more fluid and hybrid. For example, in excerpts 6.22 and 6.23, Alka and Bartholomew discussed how their identities were a blend of their heritage cultures and their Canadian identity. They both described a sense of hybridity and seamlessness that corresponds with Bhabha’s (1994) concepts of the third space. This may relate to the idea that identity negotiation occurs in the in between space that is created from the reconstructed institutional discourse and from our own interpretations. Hall’s (1996) and Leung et.al.’s (1997) views on identity as being in constant motion also correspond with some of the

participants' views on identity. The idea that identities are points of attachment and that new ethnicities are being created corresponds with the notions of hybridity. In contrast, some participants chose to view their identity from a more static and compartmentalized position. For example, in excerpts 6.18 and 6.21, Mari and Saleem affirm that they are not a blend of two cultures, but base their identity on their heritage culture/origin. These beliefs correspond with May (2001) and Lee and Marshall, (2013), where identities should not necessarily be considered hybrid, depending on the individual and the discourses and assumptions that they have internalized. Block (2006) discusses the idea of hybridity by bringing forth May's (2001) argument that hybridity can be considered an overstatement and that "social constructs such as ethnic affiliation, while not fixed for life, do nevertheless provide grounding for much of an individual's day to day activity" (p. 27). Therefore, for some participants in this study, these social constructs (ethnic affiliation) play a significant role in how they perceive their own identities. Interestingly, just as identities involve complexities and contradictions, so does the theoretical framework used to investigate and analyze the findings.

Denzin (1997) states the following with regard to writer's reflexivity and positionality: "All texts, however, are shaped by the writer's standpoint, by one's location within culture, history, and by the structures of race, class, gender, sexuality, age, family, and nation" (p. 220). As such, even though I have attempted to produce a research study that depicts the ways in which plurilingual students perform and perceive identities, I understand that my own assumptions and subjectivities are involved. In chapter 4, I discussed my personal story as a plurilingual student and adult. Throughout this study, I have been able to reflect on the negotiation of my own linguistic identity and the assumptions I carry. The process of carrying out this research project has opened my mind to new ways of looking at plurilingualism and identity. When I started this study, I was a research assistant in the ALL 99 course and spent time with the lecturers and students. I was under the assumption that I could relate to some of the students because of our common cultural and/or linguistic backgrounds. I came to my project with my own internally persuasive discourses, assumptions, truths and history and I leave this research project with some new discourses, assumptions and truths. The research process has taught me that the concept of identity is embedded with hidden and overt discourses, linguistic beliefs, and assumptions that we have been carrying like backpacks over the course of our lives. Even though we may share cultural and linguistic

similarities, our backpacks will always be different because our life story is different. When reflecting on my own identity, I am revisiting parts of my life and unpacking/repacking this limitless backpack. In the process of unpacking, I can see the cultural and linguistic discourses that shaped my younger years, and the new discourses about linguistic assets and value that shape who I am today. When I stop to reflect on my plurilingual identity now, I approach it with excitement. I see my own identity and that of my students/participants, as being seamless, fluid and agentic. I also recognize that fluid, agentic identities are less of an option where social, cultural, economic, and linguistic constraints hold individuals back and push them to conformity and reproduction of discourses.

8.4. Research Limitations

As with all research methods, there are limitations. In this section, I will discuss the limitations related to the data collection as follows: firstly, by mainly using interview data, I was unable to account for the ways in which participants performed their identity across different spaces; secondly, as a plurilingual researcher, my experiences and assumptions about language use and identity need to be considered as being viewed through my own subjective lenses that influence my analyses and interpretations.

As stated, the data I analyzed was comprised mainly of interview excerpts. Even though I included narrative texts as part of the data collection, many participants chose not to submit narrative data, doing only interviews instead. Hammersley (2006) emphasizes the importance of interview data by concurring that interview data is central to ethnography because it is part of the “ethnographic commitment to understanding people’s perspectives” (p. 10), as we cannot make assumptions solely on observing people’s behaviours. With that said, there can be differences between the way people perceive themselves and the way they perform an identity. It would have been beneficial to have more participant observations in other settings across the university or even social situations off campus in order to provide richer data on both the perceptions and performance of identities.

Another limitation has to do with my own subjectivity. As referenced by Ilieva (2014), researchers who are familiar or share similar experiences to their participants need to be aware that their lived experiences although similar, are not the same, and

that a researcher's own reflexivity is an important tool to include in the analysis. Prior to interviewing the participants, I discussed my own plurilingualism as being the root of my interest in this research project. In chapter 4, I discuss my reflexivity and position as researcher and as a plurilingual student.

A final limitation in this research project relates to power asymmetry during the interviews. Initially, during the interviews, I did not perceive myself in a position of power over the participants. After some of the interviews, I had taken reflexive field notes, and in reviewing these notes, it became clear to me that although I saw myself as an insider who shared the commonality of being plurilingual, the participants did not necessarily see me as such. Instead, they saw me as an outsider, associated with ALL 99 class. This type of outsider positioning can create an asymmetry of power (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015), where participants may be hesitant to disclose their true feelings and instead withhold information. This may have been demonstrated by some of the participants who chose not to provide a narrative text sample even though during the interview they had agreed to it. In attempts to lessen the asymmetry of power, I gave participants the opportunity to participate in a post-interview session, where I could relay my findings and where they would have an opportunity to provide feedback. Only four participants took part in the post-interviews.

8.5. Pedagogical Implications and Future Directions

Having done the study in a Faculty of Education, and being an educator myself, I am faced with the challenge of finding pedagogical implications that can inform practice and praxis in university settings. The first implication relates to how languages are perceived at the University. Many of the participants described feelings of ambivalence about their plurilingualism within the broader spaces of the university, and instead described feelings of belonging and improved learning practices within the narrower contexts of their ALL 99 class. The instructor in the ALL 99 class created a space within the classroom where plurilingualism and pluriculturalism were seen as an asset and a tool to improve their learning skills. By implementing changes in the pedagogy of university classes to make them more pluricultural and language aware, we can create spaces where linguistic repertoires are seen as assets. This can be implemented by offering teacher workshops and mentoring in classes where plurilingual teaching

methods are in use. As stated by Marshall et al., (2012) when instructors value “intercultural and interlinguistic understanding and tolerance among students” then discourses about “remediation and lack of legitimacy” can be challenged (p. 136)

The second pedagogical implication involves a shift in the discursive practices of educational systems. As discussed by Cummins (1997), “individual educators are by no means powerless; they have many opportunities within the school to challenge the operation of the societal power structure” (p. 109). These pedagogical changes can occur by helping students view their linguistic repertoires as assets and talents, instead of as deficit. Not only should we expect a discursive shift in the classroom, but in the overall institution. Cummins (1997) refers to affirming the identities of subordinate groups in K-12 contexts by “communicating to pupils that their bilingualism is a valuable asset for them and for society” (p. 111). Implementing these perspectives and approaches in higher education classrooms and across institutional spaces would serve to challenge the monolingual and deficit discourses that have so powerfully been embedded.

In terms of future research directions, plurilingualism in a tertiary institution can be further explored by investigating the ways in which teachers can apply plurilingual pedagogy, with further focus on how one’s main or dominant language can be incorporated into the classroom. Taylor and Cutler (2016) discuss this gap by stating “Despite growing recognition of plurilingual realities among applied linguists, many researchers, educators, SL/FL learners, and others continue to view bilinguals as two (inadequate) monolinguals without recognizing the dynamic interactions that go on between the languages in their linguistic repertoires...” (p. 391). Therefore, future studies could investigate the ways in which teachers are able to incorporate a student’s other language(s) within their praxis, while still maintaining the academic English model of the university and seeing how this impacts student learning outcomes and perceptions.

8.6. Concluding Remarks

This research study has given me the opportunity to explore plurilingual perceptions, performance and agency among first year university students in an

academic literacy course. The ideas of legitimacy, competency, agency and negotiations/contestations of identity across space and time were of particular relevance in understanding how students use and perceive their languages and themselves. With globalization and transnationalism on the rise, it is my hope that this research study will add depth to the pre-existing understanding of plurilingual identities.

References

- Angrosino, M., & Mays de Perez, K. A. (2000). Rethinking observation: From method to context. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 673–702). London: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Auer, P. (1999). *Code-switching in conversation: language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). Discourse in the novel. In M. M. Bakhtin (Ed.), *The dialogic imagination: four essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Barton, D.; Hamilton, M.; Ivanič, R. (Eds.) (2000). *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context*. London: Routledge.
- BC Ministry of Citizens Services. (2017). Issue 17-135 2016 Census: Highlights from the Immigration and Ethnocultural Diversity in Canada Release. Retrieved March 20, 2018.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge
- Blackledge, A. (2002). The discursive construction of national identity in multilingual Britain. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 1(1), 67–87.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London: Continuum.
- Blackledge, A., & Pavlenko, A. (2001). Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5(3), 243–257
- Blaikie, N. (2000). *Designing social research: Logic of anticipation*. Cambridge: Polty Press.
- Blaxter, L., Hughes, C., & Tight, M. (2001). *How to research* (2nd ed.). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

- Block, D. (2006). *Multilingual identities in a global city. London stories*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bloomfield, L (1933). *Language*. New York: Henry Hold and Company,
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. (J. Thompson, Ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, W. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture, language*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
- Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2015). *InterViews, Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Burgess, A. & Ivanič, R. (2010). Writing and being written: Issues of identity across timescales. *Written Communication*, 27(2), 228–255.
- Byrd Clark, J (2009). *Multilingualism, citizenship and identity: Voices of youth and symbolic investments in an urban, globalized world*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 401–417.
- Cooley, A. (2013). Qualitative research in education: The origins, debates, and politics of creating knowledge. *Educational Studies*, 49(3), 247–262.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2009). Multiliteracies: New literacies, new learning. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 4(3), 164–195.
- Coste, D., & Simon, D. (2009). The plurilingual social actor. Language, citizenship and education. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 6(2), 168–185.

- Coste, D., Moore, D., & Zarate, G. (2009). Plurilingual and pluricultural competence. Strasbourg, France: Council.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989, 139–167
- Cummins, J. (1997). Cultural and linguistic diversity in education: A mainstream issue? *Educational Review*, 49(2), 105–114.
- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2015). Identity and investment in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 36–56
- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2016). Investment and language learning in the 21st century. *Langage et société*, 3(157), 19–38.
- De Fina, A. (2008). Who tells which story and why? Micro and macro contexts in narrative. *Text & Talk*, 28(3), 421–442.
- De Munck, V. (2009). *Research design and methods for studying cultures*. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.
- Denzin, N. (1997). *Interpretive ethnography: Ethnographic practices for the 21st century*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2000). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1–30). London: SAGE
- Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 733–768). London: SAGE Publications.
- English, L. (2004). Feminist identities: negotiations in the third space. *Feminist Theology*, 13(1), 97–125.

- Farnsworth, V. (2010). Conceptualizing identity, learning and social justice in community-based learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 1481–1489.
- Freedman, S. W., & Ball, A. F. (2004). *Bakhtinian perspectives on language, literacy, and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- García, O., & Li Wei, (2014). *Translanguaging language, bilingualism and education*. London: Palgrave.
- Gee, J. P. (2000). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 25, 99–125.
- Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. (2nd ed.). New York and London: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2010). A situated-sociocultural approach to literacy and technology. In E. Baker (Ed.), *The New Literacies. Multiple Perspectives on Research and Practice* (pp. 165–194). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Gee, J. P. (2011). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. Milton, Park, NY: Routledge.
- Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In C. Geertz (Ed.), *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays by Clifford Geertz* (pp.3–30). New York: Basic Books.
- Giampapa, F. (2004). The politics of identity, representation, and the discourses of self identification: In A. Blackledge & A. Pavlenko (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*, (pp.192–218). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters
- Glaser, E. (2005). Plurilingualism in Europe: More than a means for communication. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 5(3-4), 195–208.
- Hale, A., Snow-Geron, J., & Morales, F. (2007). Transformative education for culturally diverse learners through narrative and ethnography. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 1413–1425.

- Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs identity. In S. Hall & P. Du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp.1–17). London: SAGE Publications.
- Hammersley, M. (1992). *What's wrong with ethnography?* New York: Routledge.
- Hammersley, M. (2010) Reproducing or constructing? Some questions about transcription in social research. *Qualitative Research*, 10(5), 553–569.
- Hammersley, M. (2018) What is ethnography? Can it survive? Should it? *Ethnography and Education*, 13(1), 1–17.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Haugen, E. (1956). *Bilingualism in the Americas: A bibliography and research guide*. University of Alabama: American Dialect Society.
- Heath, S., & Street, B. (2008). *On ethnography: Approaches to language and literacy research*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Heller, M. (1988). *Code-switching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heller, M. (1995). Language choice, social institutions, and symbolic domination. *Language in Society*, 24(3), 373-405.
- Heller, M. (1996). Legitimate language in a multilingual school. *Linguistics and Education*, 8(2), 139-157.
- Heller, M. (2006). *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Continuum.
- Heller, M. (2007). *Bilingualism: a social approach*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Hinton, K. (2015). Should we use a capital framework to understand culture? Applying cultural capital to communities of color. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 48(2), 299-319.

- Ilieva, R. (2014). The story of a researcher's positioning within an ethnographic study. In S. Marshall, A. Clemente, & M. Higgins (Eds.), *Shaping ethnography in multilingual and multicultural contexts* (pp. 59-85). London, ON: The Althouse Press.
- Jeoffrion, C., Marcouyeux, A., Starkey-Perret, R., Narcy-Combes, M., & Birkan, I. (2014). From multilingualism to plurilingualism: University students' beliefs about language learning in a monolingual context. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 27(1), 8-26.
- Kubota, R. (2016a). Neoliberal paradoxes of language learning: Xenophobia and international communication. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 37(5), 467-480.
- Kubota, R. (2016b). The multi/plural turn, postcolonial theory and neoliberal multiculturalism: complicities and implications. *Applied Linguistics*, 37(4), 474-494.
- Lee, E., & Marshall, S. (2012). Multilingualism and English language usage in "weird" and "funny" times: A case study of transnational youth in Vancouver. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 9(1), 65-82.
- Lee, J. S., & Anderson, K. T. (2009). Negotiating Linguistic and Cultural Identities: Theorizing and Constructing Opportunities and Risks in Education. *Review of Research in Education*, 33(1), 181-211.
- Leung, C., Harris, R., & Rampton, B. (1997). The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 543-560.
- Lewis, G.; Jones, B. & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 655-670.
- Li, Wei, (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1222-1235.

- Li Wei, & Hua, Z. (2013). Translanguaging Identities and Ideologies: Creating transnational space through flexible multilingual practices amongst Chinese university students in the UK. *Applied Linguistics*, 34(5), 516–535.
- Liang, X. (2012). Language as investment, capital, and economics: Spanish-speaking English learners' language use and attitudes. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(6), 1-16.
- Lin, A. (2013). Toward paradigmatic change in TESOL methodologies: Building plurilingual pedagogies from the ground up. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 521-545
- Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology and discrimination in the United States* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge
- Marshall, S. (2009). Re-becoming ESL: multilingual university students and a deficit identity. *Language and Education*, 24(1), 41-56.
- Marshall, S., & Moore, D. (2013). 2B or not 2B Plurilingual? Navigating languages literacies and plurilingual competence in postsecondary education in Canada. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 472–498.
- Marshall, S. & Moore, D. (2018). Plurilingualism amid the panoply of lingualisms: Addressing critiques and misconceptions in education. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1–16.
- Marshall, S., Clemente, A., & Higgins, M. (2014). Introduction. In S. Marshall, A. Clemente, & M. Higgins (Eds.), *Shaping ethnography in multilingual and multicultural contexts* (pp. 1–29). London, ON: The Althouse Press.
- Marshall, S., Clemente, A., & Higgins, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Shaping ethnography in multilingual and multicultural contexts* (pp. 59–85). London, ON: The Althouse Press.
- Marshall, S., Hayashi, H., & Yeung, P. (2012). Negotiating the multi in multilingualism and multiliteracies: Undergraduate students in Vancouver, Canada. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 68(1), 28–53.

- Marshall, S., Moore, D., & Spracklin, A (2016). *Plurilingualism amid the panoply of lingualisms: addressing critiques and misconceptions*. Paper presented at Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics (ACLA/CAAL) Conference, Calgary, AB.
- Marshall, S., Zhou, M., Gervan, T., & Weibe, S. (2012). Sense of belonging and first-year academic literacy. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 42*(3), 116–142.
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative Researching* (2nd ed.). London, UK: SAGE Publications.
- May, S. (2013). *Language and Minority Rights Ethnicity, Nationalism and the Politics of Language*. Florence: Taylor and Francis.
- Michael-Luna, S. & Canagarajah, S. (2015). Multilingual academic literacies: Pedagogical foundations for code meshing in primary and higher education. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice, 4*(1), 55–77.
- Mills, K. (2009). Multiliteracies: interrogating competing discourses. *Language and Education, 23*(2), 103–116.
- Moore, D. (2006). Plurilingualism and strategic competence in context. *International Journal of Multilingualism and Multiculturalism, 3*(2), 125–138.
- Moore, D., & Gajo, L. (2009). Introduction – French voices on plurilingualism and pluriculturalism: Theory, significance and perspectives. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 6*(2), 137–153.
- Moyer M.G., Rojo L.M. (2007) Language, Migration and Citizenship: New Challenges in the Regulation of Bilingualism. In: Heller M. (eds) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. Palgrave Advances in Linguistics. Palgrave Macmillan, London
- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social features. *Harvard Education Review, 66*(1), 60–92.
- Norton, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(1), 9–31.

- Norton, B. (1997). Language, Identity, and the Ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 409–429.
- Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (2008). English May Be My Second Language, but I'm Not "ESL", *College Composition and Communication*, 59(3), 389–419.
- Paciocco, A. (2018). Performing Chinese diasporic identity through Mandarin, The case of Italian-schooled Chinese migrant youth in Prato (Italy). *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 04/04/2018, 1–15.
- Pindi, G. N. (2017). Hybridity and identity performance in diasporic context: An autoethnographic journey of the self across cultures. *Cultural Studies-Critical Methodologies*, 18(1), 23–31.
- Pittaway, D. (2004). Investment and second language acquisition. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 1(4), 203–218.
- Pompper, D. (2014). *Practical and theoretical implications of successfully doing difference in organizations*. Bingley: Emerald Group.
- Poplack, S. (2010). Code-switching. In L. Wei (Ed.), *Bilingualism and multilingualism* (pp.12–20). London: Routledge.
- Preece, S. & Martin, P. (2009). Imagining higher education as a multilingual space. *Language and Education*, 24(1), 3–8.
- Preece, S. (2009). Multilingual identities in higher education: negotiating the 'mother tongue', 'posh' and 'slang', *Language and Education*, 24(1), 21-39.
- Preece, S. (2014). *Posh Talk: Language and Identity in Higher Education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Preece, S. (2015). They aint using slang: Working class students from linguistic minority communities in higher education. *Linguistic and Education*, 31 (2015), 260-275.
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

- Segal, M. T. & Chow, E. N. (2011). Analyzing gender, intersectionality, and multiple inequalities in global, transnational and local contexts. In Chow, E. N., Segal, M. T., & Lin, T. (Eds.), *Analyzing gender, intersectionality, and multiple inequalities: global, transnational and local contexts* (1-14). Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Shin, H. (2012). From FOB to cool: Transnational migrant student in Toronto and the styling of global linguistic capital. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 16(2), 184–200.
- Sorsoli, L. (2007). Like pieces in a puzzle: Working with layered methods of reading personal narratives. In M. Bamberg, A. De Fina, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *In Selves and Identities in Narrative Discourse* (pp. 303–325). Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing.
- Spolsky, B. (1998). *Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Statistics Canada. (2011.) Language Highlight Tables 2011 Census. Retrieved October 20, 2017, from <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/as-sa/98-314-x/98-314-x2011001-eng.cfm>
- Statistics Canada. (2016). Focus on Geography Series, 2011 Census. Retrieved March 20, 2018, from <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/as-sa/fogs-spg/Facts-cma-eng.cfm?LANG=Eng&GK=CMA&GC=933>
- Statistics Canada. (2017). Canada at a Glance 2017: Population. Retrieved March 20, 2018, from <https://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/12-581-x/2017000/pop-eng.htm>
- Stille, S., & Cummins, J. (2013). Foundation for learning: Engaging plurilingual students linguistic repertoires in the elementary classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 630-638.
- Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

- Taylor, S. K., & Cutler, C. (2016). Introduction: Showcasing the Translingual SL/FL Classroom: Strategies, Practices, and Beliefs. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 72(4), 389-404.
- Velasco, P. & García, O. (2014). Translanguaging and the writing of bilingual learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37(1), 6–23.
- Walford, G. (2008). Selecting sites and gaining ethical and practical access. In G. Walford (Ed.), *How to do educational ethnography* (pp.16–38). London: Tufnell Press.
- Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist practice and post structural theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Weedon, C. (2004). *Identity and culture: narratives of difference and belonging*. New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Weinreich, U. (1964). *Languages in Contact*. London: Mouton & Co.
- Williams, M. (2000). Interpretivism and generalisation. *Sociology*, 34(2), 209–224.

Appendix A.

Sample of Interview Questions

1. Can you tell me about the languages you speak?
 - Prompts: Which is first
 - Stronger language today versus the past
2. Can you tell me about how you use languages at UWC?
3. How are/were languages used in your home?
 - Cultural role of language
 - Written language
4. How would you define the term “multilingual”? Do you consider yourself to be multilingual?
5. How do you feel about being in a multilingual environment like UWC?
6. How do you feel your peers view your multilingualism?
 - In the classroom or at UWC
7. Can you tell me about the different kinds of writing you do?
 - Formal/less formal literacies, social networking etc.
8. What language do you prefer writing in?
 - Is it context dependent?
9. How do you use your different languages in different kinds of writing?
10. What language do you prefer reading in?
11. How would you describe your identity?
 - Socially, culturally

12. When you write, do you write with, or feel, different identities?
13. How does your cultural/linguistic background influence your learning at UWC?
14. Tell me about the transition from high school to UWC?
15. How has your writing changed from high school to university?
16. Would you be interested in providing written samples of your work?
17. Would you be willing to provide me some information about yourself, like your age, how long you have lived in Canada, how long have you been at UWC?
18. Are you willing to do another interview toward the end of the semester or sometime in the future?
19. Applicable to some participants- Thank you for being willing to share your ALL 99-narrative assignment. Can you tell me about what you wrote?
20. Do you have any questions or comments?

Appendix B.

Sample 1 of Reflexive Field Notes

Notes- Saleem

During the interview, I positioned myself as a plurilingual speaker who understands Punjabi and some Urdu. I explained to him that I understood what he and Rahul were speaking about in class. After the interview, I asked him about an observation I had made in class that day, when he was speaking Urdu to Rahul. Saleem said that Rahul could not understand him or speak to him in Urdu because he just knew the basics, but to be funny he continued to probe him in Urdu (smiling as he is telling me this).

During the interview, when talking about his family and his culture and language, he was welling up with tears. I felt empathetic to Saleem when he was talking about his mother, her food and his close connections to his family. We share cultural similarities.

Appendix C.

Sample 2 of Reflexive Field Notes

Notes-Mariyam

When we were walking toward the interview location, Mariyam talked about how nervous she was about passing ALL 99 (they have an in-class essay next week). I asked if she needed help, and offered to answer any of her questions. I talked to her about my personal life, including my Indian heritage, my daughter and my role at the university. She asked me where I was from and if I spoke other languages. She also asked if my daughter spoke Punjabi. I explained to her that she could understand some words in Punjabi, as my mother often took care of her. However, Mariyam seemed most interested in my schooling. She talked about wanting to be a dentist but was worried about her English skills and passing ALL.