

BRENNA SOBANSKI

Reflections on the Polyglot Self: Multilinguals Negotiating Identity

Abstract

In this paper I discuss how 10 multilingual residents of Halifax, Nova Scotia make sense of the meaning of their multilingualism for their identity. Contemporary work on multilingualism focuses on the ways in which globalization, diversity and the commodification of language affect multilinguals' language practices and identity. As the movement of people, information, and goods across borders increases in quantity and complexity, multilingualism becomes both more common and more highly valued. It is within this context of greater emphasis on the value of multilingualism, and perhaps greater acceptance of certain types of multilingualism in North America, that participants reflect on, and communicate, the meaning multilingualism holds for them. For participants in this research, multilingualism was the basis for a polyglot identity that focuses on increasing cross-cultural understanding and forming a sense of belonging to the world at large. While some felt that each language entailed its own specific way of being, all understood languages as connecting them to other cultures and ways of understanding the world around them. From this basis they developed a polyglot identity based on cross-cultural understanding and inclusivity.

Résumé

Cet article traite des façons dont dix habitants multilingues de la ville de Halifax, Nouvelle-Écosse entendent la relation entre leur multilinguisme et leur identité. Les études récentes du multilinguisme soulignent les effets de la mondialisation et de la commoditisation de la langue sur les pratiques et sur l'identité des personnes multilingues. Avec la croissance et la complexification des flux des gens, des biens et des informations à travers les frontières nationales, le multilinguisme devient à la fois plus commun et plus valorisé. C'est dans ce contexte de l'accentuation de la valeur du multilinguisme, et peut-être aussi de l'acceptation accrue de certains types de multilinguisme en Amérique du Nord, que les participants réfléchissent à la signification de leur multilinguisme et parlent de celle-ci. Pour les participants à cette recherche, le multilinguisme constitue la base d'une identité polyglotte axée sur la facilitation de la compréhension interculturelle et la formation d'un sentiment d'appartenance au monde entier. Tandis que certains d'entre eux croient que chaque langue apporte sa propre façon d'être dans le monde, tous pensent que les langues les relient avec d'autres cultures et d'autres manières de comprendre le monde autour d'eux. À partir de cette base, ils développent une identité axée sur la compréhension interculturelle et l'inclusivité.



INTRODUCTION: MULTILINGUAL IDENTITY IN HALIFAX

Recent research on multilingualism has been grounded in critical sociolinguistics, an approach that attends to how identity and power play into linguistic interactions (Lamarre 2013). Informed by this approach, and drawing on semi-structured interviews and language-use diaries, I analyze the way multilingualism shapes identity for ten multilingual Haligonians (the name for residents of Halifax, Nova Scotia).

Heller (2003) discusses the ways in which globalization leads to increases in the commonality and value of multilingualism, while Vertovec (2007) and Blommaert (2013) draw attention to the increasing complexity surrounding communication and identity in super-diverse cities. There is evidence of increased acceptance and even celebration of multilingualism amongst segments of the North American public (Pavlenko 2006; Lamarre 2013). A shift is taking place from focusing on languages as in tension and competition with each other, to a view of languages as able to coexist comfortably, perhaps even playfully, in the same space. This 'space' is both the physical places in cities (an integral part of Lamarre's (2013) research) and the space of the multilingual person. As Pavlenko (2006) lays out, in 20th century America there has been a development in the discourse surrounding multilingualism from seeing multilinguals as multiple monolinguals in one body who are necessarily in tension with each other, to a sense that the self can be comfortably hybrid. Otsuji and Pennycook (2010) push this development even further, proposing that we think of language use and the self not as a hybrid of various discrete languages, but rather as something that emerges from contexts of interaction. They propose the concept of the "metrolingual" to shift the focus from how many discrete languages a person uses, to how social interactions in time and space give rise to language.

The possible relations between language and the self are dynamic and complex. Language is a marker of identity, yet also a skill that can be learned and used at will. Multilinguals are able to switch languages, and thus their presentation of self and identity according to their desires or what the situation might demand of them (Versluis 2008; Lamarre 2002), and yet many also identify with numerous languages (Lamarre and Lamarre 2009). The historical idea that a language, a group of people, and a geographic place are all coterminous has become untenable (Appadurai 1996; Gupta and Ferguson 1992; Heller 2010). Critical sociolinguistics tries to account for and respond to this complex network of relationships between language, place, and identity.

Participants in my research spoke of their multilingualism as fundamentally shaping their identities. While they recognized their language skills as commodities (Bourdieu 1991; Heller 2010), and many spoke of ways in which they capitalized on their language skills, multilingualism mattered to participants primarily because of the ways in which they felt it shaped their identities and worldviews.

These findings are in line with the literature on language and socialization (Ochs and Schieffelin 1994) and work on multilingualism and identity from both psycholinguistic and anthropological perspectives (Pavlenko 2006). The question of the degree, and ways, in which language shapes one's understanding of the world is an important, and much-researched one, with relevance for psychologists, linguists, and anthropologists. My research, which draws from interviews and self-reports about language use, cannot contribute to this discussion in any etic way. Instead, I aim to describe the ways in which participants reflect on and understand their multilingualism and its connections to identity. As the literature on language ideology (Woolard 1992; Kroskrity 2004) demonstrates, the world not only contains many languages, but also many ways of thinking about language. These ideas are, of course, bound up with other social, cultural, and economic institutions and processes. In making sense of the meaning of their multilingualism, participants are also engaging with ideologies of language. Drawing on this literature, I discuss how participants understood multilingualism as a defining part of their identity, which shapes the way they interact with others, the way they view and value languages, and their place in the world.

METHODS: GAINING AN IN-DEPTH UNDERSTANDING OF MULTILINGUALISM

The research on which this paper is based was exploratory in nature and aimed to develop an in-depth and nuanced understanding of the meaning of multilingualism for participants in Halifax, Nova Scotia. The data was collected through 10 semi-structured interviews as they provide rich, in-depth data and allow for new themes to arise. Questions asked in the interviews covered language and identity, the participant's language use, how language relates to the city of Halifax, and practices of and reflections on multilingualism. Prior to the interviews, which lasted approximately one hour, seven participants kept language diaries detailing their language use over the course of two weekdays and one Saturday or Sunday. Language diaries, used by Clark (2009) and Lamarre and Lamarre (2009) in their studies of urban multilingualism, were a way to gain information on participants' actual language practices given that I could not observe their linguistic interactions as they moved throughout the city. The diaries also served as a springboard for some of the questions I asked during the interviews.

My study population was residents of Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM) who are competent in English (as I conducted interviews in English) and at least one other language. I defined competence as the ability to do daily life in the language (work, talk to people in social situations, read the newspaper, etc.). Given that I was not seeking to make comparisons or produce generalizable findings, representative-

ness of the population was not a concern in my sample. However, I did aim to ensure a mix of genders, ages, and languages amongst my interviewees.

I interviewed three men and seven women (see table 1 for participant profiles). Five of the interviewees were born outside of Canada and the other five were born in various Canadian provinces. All except one were Canadian citizens. Participants varied in the numbers of languages they spoke, from two (Oscar and Lucja) to six (Seumas). Some had grown up multilingual and others became multilingual later in life. Four participants had English as a first language, although of these four, three also had other first languages. Participants ranged in age/stage of life from undergraduate university students in their early twenties to retired adults likely in their sixties. Among them they spoke English, French, German, Spanish, Italian, Arabic, Farsi, Greek/Cypriot, Polish, Mandarin, Cantonese, and Gaelic fluently. The group also included previous fluency in Ukrainian and Hebrew. As tables 2 and 3 show, the only languages with more than 1000 speakers in Halifax not represented in my sample were Russian and Tagalog.

TABLE 1. Participant Profiles

Participant (pseudonym)	Gender	Place of Birth	Mother Tongue(s)	Languages Spoken*	Immigrant /Refugee?	Canadian Citizen
Oscar	male	Alberta	English	English, Spanish	No	Yes
Trina	female	Ontario	Ukrainian, English	English, French, German, (Ukrainian), (Arabic)	No	Yes
Maria	female	Cyprus	Cypriot/ Greek	English, Cypriot, Greek	Yes	Yes
Seumas	male	New Brunswick	Gaelic, English, French	English, Gaelic, French, German, Italian, Spanish, (Hebrew), (Dutch)	No	Yes
Ghornass	male	Iran	Farsi	English, Farsi, (French), (Arabic)	Yes	Yes
Ingrid	female	Ontario	German, French	English, German, French	No	Yes
Amy	female	China	Cantonese	English, Cantonese, Mandarin	No	No
Georgia	female	Jordan	Arabic	English, Arabic, French, Spanish	Yes	Yes
Alexandra	female	Ontario	English, Polish	English, Polish, French, (Spanish)	No	Yes
Lucja	female	Poland	Polish	English, Polish	Yes	Yes

*Parentheses indicate the participant speaks the language, but does not consider her/himself fluent in it.

TABLE 2. Official Languages Spoken Most Often at Home, Halifax Regional Municipality

Total Population	386,205
Language	Number of Speakers
English	365,200
French	3,660

Source: Statistics Canada 2011 Census, Detailed Language Spoken Most Often at Home. Numbers are for single responses only.

TABLE 3. Non-Official Languages with more than 1000 speakers, Halifax Regional Municipality

Total Population	384,335
Total Population, Non-Official Languages Spoken*	32,025
Language	Number of Speakers
Arabic	6,945
Spanish	4,025
German	2,805
Chinese, not otherwise specified	1,955
Persian (Farsi)	1,295
Mandarin	1,180
Russian	1,160
Tagalog	1,125
Italian	1,035

*i.e., number of individuals who speak one or more non-official languages.
Source: Statistics Canada 2011 National Household Survey, Total Population in Private Households by Non-Official Language Spoken.
Data taken from two different surveys because while the NHS includes data on languages spoken, and will count all non-official languages a person speaks, it does not include data for official languages. The census includes official language data, but it does not give an idea of how many people living in a specific area can speak each language, and is therefore less useful for work on multilingualism.

FINDINGS

The Meaning of Multilingualism: Polyglot Identity

Throughout my interviews it became apparent that for participants multilingualism was about much more than simply speaking multiple languages. While Grosjean (1989) pointed out some decades ago that a multilingual is not simply multiple monolinguals in one body, for these participants multilingualism had effects that went

beyond language as such. They understood their linguistic skills as shaping their relationship to language in general, influencing their sense of comfort in various parts of the world, and giving them an ability to better understand the viewpoints of people from other cultures. I term this identity participants expressed, based on the overarching fact of multilingualism as opposed to its specifics, “polyglot identity”.

At the heart of this polyglot identity was a love of learning languages and an interest in language for its own sake. For some participants, learning additional languages had become a hobby. Georgia said, “People get really intrigued that I know a lot of languages and I’m like I can’t help it. I love it. It’s fun to learn how people communicate with each other.” Similarly Alexandra said she would not mind learning “another one or two” languages. She identified learning German as a priority, then added Mandarin, and then decided Arabic would also be interesting. What was noteworthy was that as she considered the idea, the list of languages to learn kept growing; each new language she thought of opened up another realm of interesting possibilities worth exploring. The fun of learning languages was sometimes experienced as a sort of compulsion to keep picking up new ones. Trina captured this well when she referred to her desire to learn foreign languages as an “addiction”. For these participants, being multilingual was not just about speaking multiple languages; it was also about wanting to learn new ones and to continue engaging the world, and new populations in the world, through these different languages.

Participants considered language itself fun and intriguing. Like the young multilingual Montréalers in Lamarre’s (2002) study, many delighted in code-switching. Oscar talked about switching back and forth between Spanish and English “just for fun.” During the interviews, some participants switched into French or German for short periods, simply because we could and it was enjoyable (for the interviewees and for me). Three participants talked about tracing the origins of words, and enjoying seeing how different languages relate to each other. While code-switching blurs the boundaries between languages, as it involves speaking multiple languages during one interaction, the interest in tracing the historical relations between languages also focuses on combining languages. The sense of delight in language seemed to bring with it a challenge to the idea of languages as inherently separate and distinct.

Related to the interconnectedness of languages, participants rarely saw foreign languages as inaccessible to them; instead, they would listen for familiar words and try to understand languages they did not speak through their knowledge of related languages they had mastered. This led to participants feeling comfortable in foreign places. Not understanding was simply an opportunity to learn more, instead of a threatening experience. Seumas summed this up well when he said, “I think the world is my home.” He complicated this notion, however, by adding “But at the same time, I’m always a stranger wandering in the world.” In general, participants com-

municated a sense of belonging to, and actively engaging with, the linguistic and cultural diversity of the world. Their language skills and interests fostered an identity that extended beyond any particular language and place and led them to feel a sense of connection to the world at large. In this sense, although they did not use the term, the participants can be understood to be ‘cosmopolitans’, citizens of the world who are interested in engaging with cultural diversity for its own sake, as Hannerz’s (1990) groundbreaking article sketches out.

In relation to this cosmopolitan identity, there was also a sort of ethic that came along with being multilingual for many participants. This ethic was based on trying to understand other cultures, being inclusive, and acting as a mediator or translator to increase cross-cultural understanding. Multilingualism was experienced not simply as a capacity one acquires, but also as something that changes one’s very way of being in the world. As Trina said “you pick up a book, and it’s just kind of like ‘I’m gonna learn grammar.’ But you don’t realize the profound effect that it can have on you.” She connected this profound effect to a desire to travel and learn about other cultures. For Trina learning a language inevitably entailed learning another culture, which involved understanding the world from a different viewpoint. Ingrid summed it up well when she said:

I do think that the multilingualism does allow you to afford a little more . . . understanding to step back a little more and say well, you know, there might be a reason for why they’re doing things the way they do. Because I mean we’re talking about languages, but it’s really about cultures, right, you know what we believe, how we come to action, so it’s cultures who are doing things.

Ingrid’s quote nicely captures part of the language ideology, or shared notions about language itself, inherent in participants’ discussions of the meaning of multilingualism (Woolard and Schieffelin, 1994). She switches from talking about languages, to cultures, revealing a view of language and culture as necessarily unified. Participants had an understanding of culture as a different way of making sense of the world, and saw language as a conveyer of that sense. Learning another language thus had the effect for them of de-centring their own worldview. Participants expressed that it allowed them to view other cultures as equally legitimate and sensible ways of being in the world, and inhibited them from judging others based on their own culture’s criteria. This did not mean that participants had to agree with all aspects of every culture, but rather that they recognized the importance of considering multiple viewpoints.

This understanding, however, was not just an intellectual exercise. Oscar noted that “being able to speak the language, plus being able to see why they do the things that they do, and kind of where they’re coming from, it helps you to be a much more compassionate person.” The ability to see situations from others’ points of view, par-

ticipants proposed, affected how they interact with other people. Multilinguals also talked about doing “cultural translation”, using their knowledge of other cultures to help different linguistic groups understand each other.

Beyond helping various groups to understand each other, there was also a strong focus on inclusivity in multilinguals’ discussions of their language use. They spoke about taking on the role of translator whenever there was a person excluded because they could not speak a language. Further, they all explained they tend to choose the most inclusive language when they are in mixed language groups. This principle of inclusivity was sometimes overridden, however, by the desire to speak an endangered native language, such as Gaelic. In general, participants advocated understanding others and being inclusive. Although this was accomplished through language, for many it was an important part of who they were as people. As Seumas said, “My whole approach to the world is that way.”

The polyglot identity which these multilinguals expressed relied on an understanding of culture and language as being intimately connected, and also revealed a sense of comfort and delight vis-à-vis language itself. Many participants recognized the political dimensions of language, and the tensions and conflicts that often accompany questions about language learning, use, and status. However, when reflecting on what being multilingual meant to them, there was a clear sense of delight in being able to speak multiple languages, and an appreciation for the approach to the world participants understood as resulting from their multilingualism.

Views of the ‘Other’: Multilinguals’ Comments on Unilinguals

Multilinguals defined their identity not only by talking about what they are, but also by contrasting themselves with what they are not. Reviewing their comments on unilingualism, it becomes clear just how important their multilingualism is to these participants. Nearly all of them spoke about their multilingualism as giving them freedom. They seemed to pity unilingual people for lacking the independence that comes with multilingualism. Sometimes participants were very direct in their criticism of unilingualism. Seumas explained “I think, ya, there is a multilingual identity . . . that really tries to understand the worldview of different others. And really gets disgusted at a . . . myopic view of existence that is sometimes so prevalent in unilingual cultures.” Similarly, Ghornass suggests “most of the ignoramus attitudes . . . most of the ignoramus[es] are monolingualistic.” He makes a conscious choice to avoid identifying with a single language because he associates unilingualism with ignorance. Not only did participants understand their multilingualism as making them more accepting and understanding, but some also ascribed the opposite characteristics of ignorance and lack of inclusivity to unilinguals.

For participants, multilingualism was a natural thing. It just made sense that

someone would want, and be able, to speak multiple languages. One participant exclaimed, “I have a hard time understanding how *anybody* can be unilingual.” The idea that speaking multiple languages is a natural and easy thing to do, combined with the fact that participants see their multilingualism as so central to being accepting, inclusive, educated people, may have informed their negative views of unilinguals. Unilinguals were seen, in a sense, as wilfully ignorant. This attitude came across very clearly in cases where participants were defending their right to speak an unshared language. As Amy said “they might think I’m rude; I feel like it’s not my fault you don’t speak Cantonese.” Seumas, referring to his wife, said “She’s had 20 years to learn; she should have it [Gaelic] down pat by now.” When I asked if she was uninterested in learning Gaelic he replied “She has no real facility for languages.” Despite the fact that he recognized her lack of facility for learning languages, he still felt it was more or less her problem if she did not speak the language, and therefore he did not need to accommodate her. On the one hand, participants prided themselves on being inclusive and going out of their way to use languages that work best for others and to translate for those who are excluded. Yet they also viewed unilinguals as somewhat deliberately uninformed and therefore inferior and undeserving of accommodation. It seemed accommodation was often conditional upon the language necessary for accommodation coinciding with the political statement the multilingual person wanted to make.

Participants expressed their views of monolingualism as something negative and multilingualism as something undoubtedly positive as if they were self-evident. In early 20th century North America, however, bilingualism was often considered to be negative, and to have a detrimental effect on the bilingual person’s cognitive and social capabilities (Lamarre 2013). The ease and delight with which participants discussed their multilingualism is evidence of a change in attitudes towards multilingualism. Instead of being considered a deficiency, and viewing languages as competing with each other, these participants, like Lamarre’s (2013) young Montréalers, saw having multiple languages as fun, and valuable both economically and personally. This shift in attitudes toward multilingualism also accompanies increases in the value placed on multilingualism in the global economy (Heller 2010). Participants’ personal positive experiences with multilingualism are occurring in a context where language diversity itself may be increasingly valued.

The Meaning of Multilingualism: Language as Skill, Language as Being

Participants in my research spoke of language as both something they were, and a skill they had. Some of them mentioned having obtained work as a result of speaking multiple languages. Others noted they always included their language skills in prominent places on their resumes. Many were very aware of the economic value of

their language skills and were happy to capitalize on them. It was clear in all cases, however, that what participants loved about languages, what they appreciated about being multilingual, was not the economic benefit but rather the freedom and cultural understanding they asserted came from being multilingual. In this sense participants' understanding of their multilingualism, and of themselves, is closely wrapped up in an ideology of language as essentially connected to culture and ethnicity. Language was meaningful to them because it enabled them to learn other cultures. Here we see the interplay of fixity and fluidity identified by Otsuji and Pennycook (2010). The delight in learning multiple languages and using them as one desires is evidence of the fluidity of language, and yet there is a continued understanding by speakers of a fixed connection between language and culture.

While participants appreciated being able to speak multiple languages because it enriched their lives socially and culturally, they did not relate to all of their languages in the same way. For most, one language was more central to their identity than others. For seven participants the language that played the largest role in their identity was the one most closely connected to their family heritage – which often was not the language the participant used most frequently. Seumas and Ingrid, both of whom grew up speaking multiple languages at home, each picked one language that was most important. Only three participants did not identify most closely with a language related to their heritage. Alexandra, despite her Polish heritage, chose English because she felt she adhered to more Canadian cultural norms than Polish ones. The other two participants did not identify any one language as being more important than the others. Lucja, who emigrated to Canada from Poland, identified both Polish and English as equally important; she explained that she feels Canadian, but the Polish language will always be easier for her. Identifying with both languages reflected that both living in Canada and being from Poland influenced her daily life and sense of self. While Lucja identified with multiple languages because her experiences led her to feel equally connected to both, Ghornass identified with multiple languages as an intentional choice. He purposefully cultivated a multilingual identity because he felt it helped him to be more open-minded.

While for many participants one language was more central to their identity than others, four participants said that each language they speak gives them a distinct identity and way of being in the world. They suggested that although one language might be more important to their identity in terms of how they think about themselves, in terms of their lived experience, they have multiple discrete identities. Alexandra explained, “when I’m with my family and speaking Polish, I, it literally feels I’m a completely like, almost different person, like it’s a different part of my identity, whereas when I’m speaking in English, you know, it’s a different side again.” Seumas explained that “when you speak different languages you become

immersed in that understanding of the world.” In his description, taking on this different understanding creates the identity he inhabits while speaking a certain language. He elaborated: “So when I speak Gaelic I have very much a Gaelic cosmic outlook on existence. When I speak English I speak it from the language of, uh, well, everybody speaks English, of world dominance almost. If you speak French you speak with a sense of struggle, how to go about maintaining the language.” Seumas’ comments highlight the importance of the socio-political context of language. One can imagine that speaking French in France as opposed to the Maritimes would give him a different feeling and sense of identity. Maria agreed that languages form one’s way of being in the world. Her comments were notable because she focused not simply on how her worldview changed, but also on how her physical presence changed. She explained that when one speaks English, one does not express words “with your face and your hands and everything.” Because of this, “when I speak English I feel more um, how do I say, not rough. Very gentle. And when I speak Greek, it’s sort of strong, you know.” Maria explained that teaching Greek to her sons was important so that they would “grow up with this feeling that I have. You know, I didn’t want them to grow up, with, feeling as an English person.” In Maria’s experience, language constitutes one’s very way of being in the world. The language you speak changes how you feel and how you, quite literally, embody your thoughts, ideas, and emotions when expressing yourself. Regardless of how they use language in practice, when these participants reflected on language use, they operated within an ideology of separate and distinct languages inherently connected to cultural identities.

Participants’ descriptions of the ways in which speaking a language meant also taking on a discrete identity related to that language are very much reminiscent of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. Whether or not language actually causes one to see the world differently, when asked to reflect on language and identity these participants used language as a point around which to construct a different sense of being in the world. Pavlenko (2006) reports the same finding from a majority of her multilingual survey respondents. She connects the ability to embrace a sense that each language brings with it a distinct identity and outlook on the world to the more recent focus on ethnic consciousness in North America and the introduction of postmodernist thought, with its celebration of hybridity and challenges to essentialist notions of the self. For the participants in my research who expressed that each language brought with it a unique worldview and sense of self, this was a cause for celebration, not a problem. Indeed, it was this sense that each language opened one to the experiences of other groups of people in the world, and to a different experience of oneself in the world, that seemed to be at the root of their positive feelings surrounding their multilingualism.

CONCLUSION

This paper has addressed multilingual Haligonians' reflections on their linguistic identity based on language-use diaries and semi-structured interviews. Participants tended to be proud of their multilingual identity and to associate it with an increased ability to understand other cultures and others' viewpoints. For many, being multilingual meant not just having certain language skills, but also being inclusive and trying to increase cross-cultural understanding and acceptance of diversity. Multilingualism was, for these participants, an ethical as well as a linguistic practice. Despite this, some participants did exhibit occasional intolerance of unilingualism. As much as participants ascribed to a polyglot identity, many also spoke about the distinct identities that came with each language they spoke.

REFERENCES

- Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Blommaert, Jan. 2013. Citizenship, Language, and Superdiversity: Towards Complexity. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 12.3: 193-196. DOI 10.1080/15348458.2013.797276
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. The Production and Reproduction of Legitimate Language. In *Language and Symbolic Power*, ed. John B. Thompson, 43-65. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Clark, Julie Byrd. 2009. *Multilingualism, Citizenship, and Identity*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Grosjean, François. 1989. Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language* 36.1: 3-15. DOI:10.1016/0093-934X(89)90048-5
- Gupta, Akhil, and James Ferguson. 1992. Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference. *Cultural Anthropology* 7.1: 6-23. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/656518>.
- Hannerz, Ulf. 1990. Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture. *Theory, Culture, and Society* 7.2: 237-251. DOI: 10.1177/026327690007002014
- Heller, Monica. 2003. Globalization, the New Economy, and the Commodification of Language and Identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7.4: 473-492. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9841.2003.00238.x
- . 2010. The Commodification of Language. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39: 101-114. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.anthro.012809.104951
- Kroskrity, Paul. 2004. Language Ideologies. In *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, ed. Alessandro Duranti, 496-517. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Lamarre, Patricia. 2002. Multilingual Montreal: Listening in on the Language Practices of Young Montrealers. *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 34.3: 47-75. <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/docview/215638684?accountid=10406>.
- . 2013. Catching "Montréal on the Move" and Challenging the Discourse of Unilingualism in Québec. *Anthropologica* 55.1: 41-56. <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/docview/1412580910?accountid=10406>.
- Lamarre, Patricia, and Stéphanie Lamarre. 2009. Montréal «on the move»: Pour une approche ethnographique non-statique des pratiques langagières des jeunes multilingues. Dans *Formes & normes sociolinguistiques : ségrégations et discriminations urbaines*, dir. T. Bulot, 105-135. Paris, France : L'Harmattan.
- Ochs, Elinor, and Bambi Schieffelin. 1994. Language Acquisition and Socialization: Three Developmental Stories and Their Implications. In *Language, Culture, and Society: A Book of Readings*, 2nd ed., ed. Ben

- G. Blount, 470-512. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Otsuji, Emi, and Alastair Pennycook. 2010. Metrolingualism: fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 7.3: 240-245. DOI: 10.1080/14790710903414331
- Pavlenko, Aneta. 2006. Bilingual Selves. In *Bilingual Minds: Emotional Experience, Expression, and Representation*, ed. Aneta Pavlenko, 1-33. Bristol: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Versluys, E. 2008. Multilingualism and the City: The Construction of Urban Identities in Dakar (Senegal). *City & Society* 20.2: 282-300. DOI: 10.1111/j.1548-744X.2008.00022.x
- Vertovec, Steven. 2007. Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30.6: 1024-1054. DOI: 10.1080/01419870701599465
- Woolard, Kathryn. 1992. Language Ideology: Issues and Approaches. *Pragmatics* 2.3: 235-249.
- Woolard, Kathryn, and Bambi Schieffelin. 1994. Language Ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23: 55-82.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere gratitude and thanks to Martha Radice for her encouragement, guidance, and translation help. She supported me through every step of this research, and fostered my academic interest in multilingualism. Thanks also to the two anonymous reviewers; their comments helped me develop my thinking and research and led to significant improvements in this paper.

BRENNA SOBANSKI graduated from the University of King's College and Dalhousie University with first class honours in Social Anthropology and History of Science and Technology. Her anthropological research focuses on multilingualism and identity. Building on her interest in language learning and cultural exchange, she spent a year in Germany doing work through the PAD (pedagogical exchange service) and now lives and works with refugees as a neighbour and settlement worker at Romero House in Toronto.

Copyright of Canadian Ethnic Studies is the property of Canadian Ethnic Studies and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.