Abstract

Drawing on such concepts as globalization, transcultural and translingual mobility, (Blommaert, 2005), multilingualism, superdiversity (Vertovec, 2007) and individual hybridity (Appadurai, 1996), this research contributes to the growing body of knowledge on the impact of language teachers’ migratory experiences on language pedagogy (Menard-Warwick, 2008; Morgan, 2004; Varghese, Morgan, Johnson & Johnson, 2005). This qualitative study employs narrative inquiry as a research method to explore six language teachers’ narratives of migration and language learning to understand how individuals’ language ideologies, identity, and language pedagogy are shaped by transnational mobility. The results of the study indicate that migratory life experiences contribute to the formation of identity and the development of language ideologies. Narratives of participants suggest that they draw on their migratory experiences, identity, and language ideologies to inform their pedagogy in the language classroom. Moving forward, this research has implications on language-teaching practices and the professional development of language teachers.
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Chapter One
Introduction

1.1 Statement of Problem

The goal of this thesis is to explore whether and how language-learning experiences throughout the migratory process of language teachers shape their identity, determine their linguistic ideologies, and ultimately contribute to their pedagogy in the language classroom. My interest in this research began initially in 2013 as I entered the first semester of my Master of Education program and took my first graduate course with Professor Lotherington. I engaged in an autobiographical narrative project for the course, which provided me with the opportunity to reflect on my experiences of migration and language learning throughout my life. As a language teacher, through my autobiographical narrative project, I considered further how my life history could provide insight into how I perceive language and my identity and how these have epistemological significance for pedagogy in my language classroom.

Engaging in narrative self-reflection revealed to me the unseen and unexamined aspects of my own beliefs and sense of self that are constructive of my practices and internal experience as a language teacher. My experience of migration and language learning has led to emergent ideologies and identities that are particular to my migratory experience, but also representative of prevailing national and institutional ideologies I have encountered. My writing indicated to me that an unexamined participation in institutions allows for overarching national and global ideologies to take root and impact teaching and learning without addressing the benefit or detriment such ideologies have on teachers and learners. The following vignette excerpted from my initial project highlights how prevailing ideologies in institutions interact with individual
Three years ago, I applied to teach English for academic purposes at a Canadian university. While in the interview, my immigrant identity came to surface in the discussion as I naively listed my fluency in numerous languages on the application thinking that this would give me an advantage. During the second interview, I was offered the position; however, I was instructed that it would be contingent on my not disclosing to my students that English was not my first language since these international students were coming to Canada to attain authentic English ability. I accepted the position without really giving it much thought about what was being asked of me. I felt lucky as an immigrant to be getting the position. After working at the institution for a year, I had not discussed my own cultural background and my linguistic struggles or personal perspectives of language learning. I left my complex identity outside of the classroom space and portrayed a Canadian identity and played up the nativeness of my English skills by paying repeated attention to my pronunciation. I presented an institutionally reified legitimate Canadian identity to teach students from a specific cultural perspective, alienating the possibility of using my personal experiences as a pedagogical tool for language teaching (Cupial, 2014).

This fragment of my narrative, from my initial project, draws out the elements involved in the present narrative research project. Throughout my immigrant experience, I was exposed to language ideologies that diminished the value of my own linguistic knowledge, favouring the national language. This led me to often hide the aspects of myself that identified me as foreign in
the Canadian context, so when I was asked by my employer to hide aspects of myself and pretend to be a native born Canadian, I was familiar with such behaviour. The language ideology of the Canadian institution was established in a prevailing global framework of English language competency as providing maximal competitiveness for international language learners in the international job market (Canagarajah, 2008; Kachru, 1992, 2009; Melitz, 2014). I learned English in Canadian schools and experienced the primacy placed on English competence. This experience contributed to my own language ideology that implicitly accepted English as dominant and necessary for future success. I unquestioningly played up a native English speaker identity in my classrooms, reifying the language ideology of the institution, contributing to the overarching national and global ideology towards English primacy. I diminished my multilingual identity and chose to represent myself according to the monolingual ideology expected by the institution. A dissonance occurred between my identity and the multilingual identity I would have naturally expressed. This reveals how my own conceptualization of my sense of self (identity) was not aligned with my own linguistic ideology; rather I adopted a prevailing linguistic ideology of the broader social context.

1.2 Definitions of Terms

Identity: One’s ongoing assemblage of a sense of self as one interprets experiences, and performs subject positions in relation to others over time.

Translingual Identity: An identity, which is oriented primarily by the developmental experiences of language acquisition of two or more languages in two or more national contexts.

Migratory Experience: The experiences of living in two or more national contexts for the duration of a year. (Note: I am utilizing a year-long duration as my participants will be
recollecting memories from their childhood which will likely be framed according to their school years.)

Transnational Migration: A historical trajectory of lived experience, involving residing and moving through multiple nations and cultures, often involving learning new languages, where the subject is identified as a foreigner, tourist, immigrant, refugee, exile, or guest worker (Appadurai, 1996).

Ideology: A belief system that individuals draw upon, and contribute to, to determine practices and rationalizations, orienting a social position in relation to others.

Language Ideology: Ideology pertaining to ideas, values, beliefs about language. Within a broad social context language ideologies are constructed from language policies and national ideologies present within a social context. Personal language ideologies are constructed from an individual’s interaction with these broader linguistic ideologies and one’s emergent beliefs rationalized through an individual’s identity.

Naturalistic Language Acquisition Contexts: Migrants in a new sociocultural context need to acquire the dominant language to navigate social relations with speakers of the society. The process of language acquisition is associated with social integration into the sociocultural context, which leads to investment in the cultural milieu in which the language operates for societal discourse.

1.3 Research Overview

This research will focus on language teachers who have had multiple migratory experiences, having lived in at least three countries, and who have learned two or more languages in varying sociocultural contexts. This type of migratory experience will be defined by
the term *transnational migration* indicative of the lived experiences in various national locations. The study considers: What effect does transnational migration and the acquisition of two or more languages in different national and social contexts have on language teachers? And, can migration and language learning experiences impact the sense of self and consequently lead an individual to generate a translingual identity?

To explore the intersections between the experiences of migration, language learning, identity, and language ideology, for this thesis, I will engage in narrative inquiry to look into lived experiences of my own and those of other language teachers. *Transnational experiences* and *translingual identity* will be analyzed to understand whether and how language teachers utilize their personal experiences as a framework through which they enact their *linguistic ideologies* and identity in the language classroom.

The potential impact of language teachers’ migratory trajectory, identity, and language ideology on second language pedagogy is a rich yet underexplored area of study. This is an important area of study in the scope of the increasing presence of culturally and linguistically varied populations of students and language teachers in second-language classrooms. Translingual histories of language teachers “should be reconceptualized as solidly embedded within the context of their linguistic and social identities” (Motha, Jain, & Tecle, 2012, p. 14). As a result, research calls for the exploration of the implications of such embeddedness for language educators.

The research will pursue three questions:

**1. Do language teachers’ migratory experiences contribute to their beliefs and values about languages? How?**
2. Do language teachers’ migratory experiences contribute to a translingual sense of self? How?

3. Do language teachers’ migration and language-learning experiences affect their pedagogy in the second-language teaching classroom? How?

The thesis is divided into seven chapters. Chapter One provides the rationale and the motivation for engaging in this research. It provides an overview of the research questions, which guide this study. Chapter Two outlines the theoretical framing for the study in relation to the narrative inquiry approach, as well as the framework of globalization used to situate the research. Chapter Three outlines the review of literature. The literature review provides an overview of the pertinent literature relating to language teachers’ narratives and explains the role of language teachers’ identity and ideology in their pedagogy. Chapter Four consists of a discussion of the methods used in this research as well as an overview of my participants. Chapter Five provides a detailed presentation of the findings, which are presented according to the themes derived from my analysis according to each of my research questions. Chapter Six offers a detailed discussion of the themes presented according to each of the research questions. In the final chapter (Chapter Seven), I complete the investigation by providing conclusions as well as the implications of my research.
Chapter Two

Theoretical Framing

This chapter will present the theoretical orientation of my research according to the frameworks of globalization and narrative inquiry. The study considers the continuing trend of globalization as a fundamental factor in establishing the context in which transnational migrants’ experiences are embedded. The framework of globalization provides an analytic lens into the processes of language learning, and identity/ideology formation that occur in relation to the flows of people, languages, ideas, and cultures in transnational contexts. Considering the permeability of borders between nations, cultures, peoples, and languages in the context of transnational migration, the concept of native speaker as a model by which others’ linguistic competence and authority over language norms is evaluated becomes increasingly inadequate. This study considers the importance of the native speaker concept within the framework of globalization where individuals establish competencies in multiple languages. Narrative inquiry is utilized as an approach that can allow access to individuals’ life experiences. Looking at the storied life of an individual over time through a narrative process can reveal how identity and ideology develop over time and in relation to experiences of language learning. Narrative provides a holistic approach that accounts for the ongoing aggregate of experiences that lead to continual changes to a person over the course of his/her life.

2.1 Globalization: Transnational Mobility and Identity

The increasing migration of individuals as a process of globalization defines the demographics of nations, expanding interconnectedness between peoples, languages, and cultures throughout the world (Blommaert, 2010). Through the process of migration, individuals
are engaging in mobility across different contexts. This mobility allows for ideas, cultures, ideologies, and languages to come in contact at an unprecedented rate. The national landscapes influenced by globalization, individuals, and mobility have transformed into what Appadurai (1996) refers to as *ethnoscapes*. Appadurai (1996) explains an ethnoscape as the “landscape of persons who constitute the shifting world in which we live: tourists, immigrants, refugees, exiles, guest workers, and other moving groups and individuals who constitute an essential feature of the world” (p. 33). Vertovec (2003, 2007, 2010) articulates the newer, transient, less organized, legal or not legal individuals who are engaged in migratory movement, who ultimately transform social landscapes globally by contributing to *superdiversity*. The increasingly globally merging social landscapes provide a complex understanding of diversity of what was previously defined as multiculturalism.

The complex nature of diversity according to the migratory flows within the ethnoscapes can be described as *superdiversity* (Vertovec, 2010, p. 87). *Superdiversity* is reflected in the “important distinctions in ethnicity, religious affiliation and practice, regional and local identities in the migrants’ place of origin, kinship, clan or tribal affiliation, political parties and movements, and other criteria of collective belonging” (Vertovec, 2010, p. 87). The affiliations of individuals in superdiverse contexts are varied and cross boundaries of nation, culture, and religion, becoming reconstituted in new spaces forming complex intersections of culture and language.

*Transnational mobility* describes a historical trajectory of lived experience, involving residing and moving through multiple nations and cultures, and often including learning new languages. By encountering new cultures and languages individuals’ lives are increasingly situated within a transnational frame. The social encounters throughout a migratory trajectory
lead transnational migrants to continued language acquisition based in sociocultural dynamics of given contexts (Blommaert & Varis, 2011). Language usage is subject to the patterns of communication of community members in a given context (Duranti & Goodwin, 1992). The linguistic context is determined by the contributions of members in terms of their patterns of speech as well as the texts, which circulate in the given context (Bauman & Briggs, 1990; Hall, 1980; Kress, 1985). Each member in a context acts “not as an isolated individual, but as a social agent, located in a network of social relations, in specific places in a social structure” (Kress, 1985, p. 5). The nature and usage of language in contexts is relative to the ideological perceptions of the active social members in determining what they consider normative and as such accept as meaningful (Bauman & Briggs, 1990; Fairclough, 2007; Hall, 1980; Rampton, 2014). As globalization leads to increasingly diverse social contexts comprising multiple languages and ideologies, the usage of language within those contexts changes according to the agency of the speakers within the context, as each member adopts prevailing norms and contributes his/her own ideologies through patterns of discourse (Bhabha, 1994; Rampton, 1998, 2005, 2011; Wei, 2011). As migrants move between cultural communities they acquire linguistic resources from each context:

Repertoires are thus indexical biographies, and analyzing repertoires amounts to analyzing the social and cultural itineraries followed by people, how they manoeuvered and navigated them, and how they placed themselves into the various social arenas they inhabited or visited in their lives (Blommaert & Backus, 2011, p. 22).

The process of transnational migration through superdiverse contexts in the current contexts of globalization leads migrants to acquire diverse and complex linguistic repertories according to the contexts they inhabit. These linguistic resources are acquired as cultural capital, which
function as a medium of exchange with social members in a given linguistic community. The value of a language as cultural capital is relative to the degree to which dominant social members in a linguistic community accept the language as legitimate (Bourdieu, 1991). The acquisition of a linguistic repertoire in the context of transnationalism is based on the intentions of migrants to acquire languages that allow them to navigate social relations in multiple sociocultural contexts. The acquisition of languages as a process of social integration leads to identity investment according to the languages acquired (Norton, 1995). The dynamics of this process contribute to the formation of complex identities (Blommaert, 2013).

Understanding identity in the context of superdiversity requires a framework that focuses on the transnational experiences of individuals. Levitt and Schiller (2004) state, “our analytical lens must necessarily broaden and deepen because migrants are often embedded in multi-layered, multi-sited transnational social fields, encompassing those who move and those who stay behind” (p. 2). Identity becomes grounded in the transnational mobility of the individuals where they experience interactions with others as well as the discourses they occupy in various spaces.

For Blommaert (2013), understanding identity simply within the frame of multiplicity or plurality establishes the assumption of understanding culture and language as preexisting “separable units” (p. 613) that were then merged to produce “peculiar new units” (p. 613) such as multilingualism, hybridity, and mixed identities. Within the transnational frame of mobility and superdiversity, Blommaert (2013) states that the “contemporary semiotics of culture and identity need to be captured in terms of complexity rather than in terms of multiplicity or plurality” (p. 613). In the superdiverse globalized world of social relations, an identity is inherently a dynamic system that redefines and transforms in relation to the interactions of languages, cultures, and ideologies as mobile subjects that engage in different contexts.
2.2. *The Idealized Native Speaker and the Context of Transnational Mobility*

The concept of the *native speaker* was centralized in the field of applied linguistics through the Chomskyan paradigm of the *idealized native speaker* and *ideal speaker-listener*. Chomsky (1965) states that “linguistic theory is concerned with an ideal speaker-listener in a completely homogeneous speech community, who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance” (p. 3). For Chomsky (1965), the idealized native speaker is viewed as the authority, a speaker who has an intrinsic grammatical competence. In a similar manner, Stern (1983) indicates that a native speaker is someone who has intuitive knowledge about language rules, has creativity of language use, as well as has the ability to alter the language according to the needs of the social situation. The native speaker also represents the authority on determining whether a given linguistic form is accurate and therefore acceptable (Stern, 1983).

Taking the notion of an idealized native speaker from linguistics (Chomsky, 1965; Stern, 1983) and conceiving of it in relation to sociolinguistic contexts is inherently problematic. For Medgyes (1992) and Phillipson (1992) any community of speakers will utilize multiple styles, registers, and dialects, of a specific language that can vary, making a determination of an idealized speaker difficult. Widdowson (1998) argues that what constitutes appropriate and acceptable language use is inherently relative to the pragmatics of a local speech community. The local reality of language use makes attributions of native speaker more problematic as acceptable language use is always context-dependent. Rampton (1990) challenges the association
of linguistic competency with the concept of a native speaker. He indicates that within a community of native speakers there can be variance in the proficiency of each individual where any given native speaker may be more or less proficient in different aspects of language use (e.g. oral or written).

A central premise of the concept of a native speaker and the associated linguistic competence is the aspect of intuition (Davies, 2003), where a native speaker is assumed to have an innate intuition about linguistic norms and is thus the standard for generating an “idealised model” (p. 7) and “an exemplar of such a model” (p. 7). Davies (2003) suggests that the concept native speaker implies a certain set of terms: “mother tongue, first language, dominant language, linguistic competence, communicative competence” (p. 24). Yet these terms are problematic in the scope of how languages are actually learned by individuals in globalized contexts. He argues “many people live in multilingual societies and we all live in multidialectal societies. The mother tongue and the first language may be different because, first, the mother tongue is, as we have seen, influenced by peers as well as by parents, it may be more than one language and then it is not always easy to decide which one is first” (p. 17). For Davies (2003) a second language and to a larger extent a foreign language do not suggest the same level of intuition about the norms of a language for a given multilingual. Yet given the complex learning trajectories of multilinguals in the context of globalization, an individual’s foreign language could become his/her dominant language for which they have the greatest intuition. However, within the framework of the concept of native speaker “a foreign language speaker cannot be appealed to for authoritative pronouncements about the language’s rules and its use” (p. 24).

The emerging reality of the transnational migration of individuals in the context of globalization presents multilingualism as an increasingly likely outcome for more people
(Blommaert, 2010; Duff, 2015; Vertovec, 2003, 2007, 2010). The aspect of multilingualism blurs the parameters around defining the native speaker. A given language and associated notions of norms and standards cannot correlate to a given speaker, or culture, or even defined boundaries of a singular language (Kramsch, 2009). In the context of globalization, languages are increasingly deterritorialized where varieties of a given language (i.e. English) are spoken throughout multiple national contexts leading to affiliation between speakers in ever greater numbers of speech communities spanning multiple geographic, cultural, economic, and personal contexts (Blommaert, 2005; Duff, 2015).

Natural contexts are often considered as valued contexts for subsequent language acquisition due to the opportunities to interact with native speakers (Pica, 1983). As the concept of native speaker is inadequate at defining individual speakers, natural contexts are not homogenized nor idealized communities of language speakers who utilize a standard linguistic form agreed upon by all constituent members (Duff, 2015). Through migration, individuals are exposed to naturalistic language acquisition contexts which present diverse ranges of speakers who exhibit varying registers, competencies, and vernaculars, all interacting within the same community (Blommaert & Backus, 2011; Blommaert & Rampton, 2011; Jørgensen, Karrebaek, Madsen & Møller, 2011; Rampton, 2014). In this way, a naturalistic language acquisition context is best considered to be a linguistic community where all constituent members engage in an ongoing negotiation of language norms to establish shared meaning in a dominant language (Blommaert, 2013; Jacoby & Ochs, 1995; Ochs, 1996). In this paradigm, notions of nativism, language authority, linguistic identity become increasingly diffused relating to a spectrum of subjects all with idiosyncratic linguistic usage and affiliations relative to local and global flows of language, culture, people, and ideas (Canagarajah, 2012; Pennycook, 2006).
2.3 Narrative as Inquiry

Stories and narratives are a human mechanism for constructing and understanding reality. Bruner (1991) suggests, “we organize our experience and our memory of human happenings mainly in the form of narrative” (Bruner, 1991, p. 4). Narrative is a process of meaning making, a way of interpreting our reality and providing a cohesive form to our “perceptual experience” (Bruner, 2004, p. 694), where “in the end, we become [original italics] the autobiographical narratives by which we ‘tell about’ our lives” (p. 694). Narrative allows individuals to apply a sense of temporality to the events of their lives, to understand the parts of life from a holistic perspective where life events occur in a chronology of experience (Ricoeur, 1983/1990).

The temporality of narrative provides the capacity to understand “the developmental dimension of human existence” (Polkinghorne, 1991, p. 135). Polkinghorne (1991) describes how the conceptualizing of personal experiences into narratives of life experience is “the basis of personal identity” (p. 136) through unifying the diverse events in one’s life into notions of self. Polkinghorne draws on Husserl (1928/1964) to define the human capacity for comprehending time through conceptualization of events in one’s life story. The understanding of time essentially requires unifying episodic moments in one’s life. Husserl (1913/1983) argues, “natural cognition begins with experience and remains within [original italics] experience” (p. 5). As such, subjective experience is the evidentiary pathway to understanding the world one inhabits.

This notion is further developed by Merleau-Ponty (1945/2003) who argues that subjective experience is the locus of human understanding of all universal reality. Narrative analysis offers a complete mechanism for ascertaining the subjective experience of an individual
and the chronological events in that person’s life that provides the transition and construction of that person’s interpretation of self in a temporal structure that explores the construction of identity. Polkinghorne (1991) emphasizes the constructivist nature of identity and how narrative elucidates the multiple events in one’s life that are interpreted by the subject to construct his/her understanding of self. Linde (1993) discusses the revisionary nature of narrative. She indicates that individuals revise their life stories to suit their current understanding of themselves (Linde, 1993). This process is inherent to the constructivist nature of identity formation, whereby an individual revises his/her interpretation of the narrative events in his/her life according to the current notions of self.

The study of narratives provides insights into the events in a person’s life that are emblematic of his/her beliefs and experiences (Bell, 2002). Narratives allow subjects to provide life histories of experience that delve into “hidden assumptions” (Bell, 2002, p. 209) and marginalized memories that are invaluable in forming an understanding of a subject’s language ideology and identity. The chronological capacity of narrative is essential to utilizing the subjectivity of a subject for contextualizing his/her development of identity and language ideology over time in response to life experiences. Bell (2002) describes how narrative draws out “important intervening stages” (p. 210) in a person’s life history that are essential for understanding the evolution of identity over time. Similarly, Kaplan (1994) articulates the possibilities of narrative analysis as inquiry by stating that analyzing in-depth narratives written from a first-person subject position provides insight into the experience of language learning and its impact on a person’s social relations and sense of self.

Narrative accounts of individuals’ experiences and patterns of language learning can provide insights into understanding of how languages are acquired from a subjective perspective.
Personal stories, diaries (Bailey, 1980, 1983; Norton Pierce 1994; Norton, 2000), life histories, case studies (Kinginger, 2004), language memoirs (Granger, 2004; Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000), and autobiographies of language learning (Bell, 2002; Hoffman, 1989; Pavlenko, 1998) can be a “unique and appealing foci of applied linguistics inquiry” (Pavlenko, 2007) which can provide insight into the subjective narrative perspectives of language learning and act as a “window into people’s beliefs and experiences” (Bell, 2002, p. 209). Narratives such as Eva Hoffman’s (1989) novel *Lost in translation: A life in a new language* for example describe the in-depth first-person subjective experience of learning languages in new cultural contexts and the impact of that experience on identity and language ideology. Hoffman’s (1989) account of her experience details the fragmentation that occurs when immigrating to a new cultural context. Her experience reveals how her ideology towards language focused on the way a language determines one’s ability to think and how to record memory. Language for Hoffman (1989) is implicit in identity formation, and as such language learning and language maintenance are invaluable in understanding one’s relation to the world and their particular social context. Pavlenko (1998) develops the field of autobiographical inquiry by analyzing literature by writers who had experienced subsequent language acquisition (SLA). This literature revealed to Pavlenko (1998) the “direct link between discourse and identity” (p. 17). Analyzing autobiographical narrative allows an individual to track the development of a person’s identity and the development of language ideology.

Pavlenko (2002) argues that individuals’ trajectories of language learning are embedded in *sociocultural* and *sociohistorical* factors that determine what individuals convey in their narratives and how those narratives are expressed (p. 217). Analyzing the narrative discourse of individuals can yield the power relations and ideological constructs that emerge from
individuals’ life experience over time (Pavlenko, 2002). Narrative analysis can draw out “the coordinates of time, space, and personhood into a unitary frame so that the sources ‘behind’ these representations can be made empirically visible” (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012, p. 159). Present in individual narratives is the way an individual positions him/herself in relation to social constructs of ideology, and the implicit power relations therein (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012). This narrative positioning reveals the aspects of discourse that index identity and ideology (De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012).

2.4 Summary

This chapter outlined the theoretical parameters that frame this study. The research pertaining to globalization and transnationalism indicates that individuals are navigating increasingly complex and mutable sociocultural contexts throughout their lives. The processes of language acquisition and identity formation are inherently correlated with this complexity and mutability for transnational migrants. The concept of native speaker for determining a speaker’s norm establishing authority in the scope of globalization is inadequate as language users negotiate language norms through socialization in linguistic exchanges on an ongoing basis. The research suggests that narrative inquiry is a powerful approach through which personal stories of migration can be accessed. The narrativization of migratory experiences provides a holistic lens to understand how varied sociocultural contexts influence the processes of language acquisition and identity formation over time.
Chapter Three

Review of the Literature

This study is intended to explore the impact of transnational migration on language teachers’ identities, language ideology, and language pedagogy. Sections one and two of this chapter will present the relevant literature pertaining to the influence of sociocultural interactions with others on the formation of identity and language ideologies. Section three of this chapter will present the relevant literature on the influence of language teachers’ migratory experiences on their language pedagogy, including the enactment of their identities and language ideologies in the language classroom.

3.1 Identity

The term identity is used in a variety of disciplines operating as a master trope for notions of selfhood from different perspectives. Tajfel (1974) articulates identity as a feature of group association where individuals define their notion of self according to a membership with a group and lack of membership with other groups. For Kroskrity (2000) this group affiliation is manifested through linguistic interactions between individuals. Kroskrity (2000) describes individuals as having a “repertoire of identities” (p. 112) that are strategically called upon in interactions with others to linguistically represent group affiliations. Barrett (1999) uses the term “polyphonous identity” (p. 318) to articulate how the use of linguistic structures for group affiliation is heteroglossic, indexing multiple social categories simultaneously. The linguistic representation of identity is bound to the culturally constructed associations of linguistic patterns, and the particular intentions of a given subject at the time of representing his/her identity. Ochs (1992) describes how linguistic features index identity constructs through the display of social
meanings representative of socially identifiable identity characteristics. Decoding identity through linguistic features is an inferential process whereby an individual’s interlocutor must infer the social meaning of one’s linguistic utterance and then make assumptions about how such an utterance indexes particular notions of identity (Ochs, 1993).

It is through language that we interpret the external world, and through language that we ourselves are interpreted. For Weedon (1997) it is through language that “our sense of ourselves, our subjectivity, is constructed [original italics]” (p. 21). As such, our linguistic uses do not construct a “unique individuality,” (p. 21); rather identities are defined through linguistic interactions with others. The act of participating in a given linguistic community leads individuals to learn the patterns of the community that allow for group membership (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Participation in a “community of practice” (p. 89) leads individuals to construct identities in relation to the communities they are motivated to belong to as members or communities they choose to not belong to. Norton (1995) argues similarly that individuals only invest in linguistic uses intentionally to gain access to social groups. Norton’s (1995) theory is grounded on Bourdieu’s (1977) notion of cultural capital where linguistic exchange represents a market exchange of symbolic power in a social context. An individual’s use of language is thus bound to the power structures within social groups. Identity in this sense is instrumental in one’s position in a social group, and as such individuals are “constantly organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world” (Norton, 1995, p. 18).

Establishing membership within social groups is a continuous process where the subject attempts to gain acceptance to multiple communities throughout the trajectory of a life (Wenger, 2010). Wenger (2010) suggests,

Multimembership is sequential as we travel through the landscape and carry our identity
across contexts. It is also simultaneous as we belong to multiple communities at any given time. The experience of multimembership is thus inherent in the very notion of identity in a landscape. And so is the work of experiencing all these forms of identification at once and in one body—whether they merely coexist or whether they complement, enhance, or conflict with each other. (p. 6)

The vastness of social experiences contributes to the construction of identity based on a multitude of group affiliations. The nature of these group affiliations is based on the subjective perceptions of individuals’ projection of membership in “imagined communities” (Norton, 2001, p. 159) through subjects’ investment in language use. For Norton (2001) identity is an investment in a perception of group membership with an imagined community, but identity is also relative to non-participation with imagined communities for which individuals do not perceive group membership. In this way identity is relative to perceptions of social relations that determine the identity affiliations of individuals.

For Bucholtz and Hall (2005), identity is inherently a relational process emergent from social interactions where “identities are intersubjectively constructed through several, often overlapping, complementary relations” (p. 598). Identity as a relational process is determined by the linguistic interactions between interlocutors in a social context (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). As identity is emergent from the outcome of social interactions between subjects, its determination can be intentional or habitual, but does require conscious awareness (p. 606). Identity is determined by the intentions, habits, and social positions of an individual when interacting linguistically with others in social contexts. An individual’s linguistic intentions and habits are constructed within a discursive environment over time. This environment is imbued with language ideology constructed through normalized social interactions within a social context
The structure in which individuals draw their interactional resources is based on the “ideological processes and structures” (p. 585) of society as “everyday conversations are impinged upon by ideological...constructs” (p. 607). The cultural ideologies of a community contribute to the perceptions of identity through linguistic interaction, as forms of linguistic expression “are ideologically associated with specific personas and groups” (p. 594). In this framework, identity is the processual ongoing aggregate of experiences that determine the individual how he/she will select interpretive constructs to engage in interaction with others according to perceptions of affiliation to imagined communities.

3.2 Language Ideology

Fairclough (1991) describes language ideology as being “in structures which constitute the outcome of past events and the conditions for current events, and in the events themselves” (p. 119). Language ideology is present throughout discursive practices in all aspects of society, in social institutions, group interactions, and individual interactions (Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994). Language ideology is not a homogenous notion but rather a construct “involving struggles among multiple conceptualizations and demanding the recognition of variation and contestation within a community as well as contradictions within individuals” (p. 71). According to Blackledge and Pavlenko (2002), language ideologies are mutable, changing according to their social and historical contexts.

Blackledge and Pavlenko (2002) argue that an individual’s identity is engendered by the conflict or harmony between the language ideologies of the self and the “state, nation, or institution” (p. 122). They describe linguistic ideology being representative of Bourdieu’s (1991) concepts of habitus and field (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2002). Habitus is “a way of being which
has been inculcated through patterns of behaviour of the group in its history, culture, language and other norms” (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2002, p. 123). This patterned behaviour occurs in a field of social relations determined by the relative value and legitimacy of performative utterances. In multilingual societies, language ideologies can generate boundaries between social groups, and the negotiation of those boundaries is through the investment and usage of linguistic forms determined to have greater or lesser legitimacy in certain contexts (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2002).

For Bourdieu (1991), legitimacy is engendered through institutional reification of performative utterances:

It is the access to the legitimate instruments of expression, and therefore the participation in the authority of the institution, which makes all the difference - irreducible to discourse as such - between the straightforward imposture of masqueraders, who disguise a performative utterance as a descriptive or constative statement, and the authorized imposture of those who do the same thing with the authorization and the authority of an institution. (p. 109)

Language ideology can be seen as the representation of institutionally formed schemas for constructing and interpreting linguistic exchanges between individuals in a given field of social relations. Bourdieu (1991) argues that social fields “impose schemes of classification” (p. 127) through the “correspondence between objective divisions and classificatory schemes, between objective structures and mental structures” (p. 127). A language ideology is an interpretive schema individuals utilize and represent through habitus when engaging in performative utterances in a given field of social relations.
Irvine and Gal (2000) argue that ideologies are “conceptual schemes” (p. 402) that are fractally recursive involving “the projection of” (p.403) a schema “salient at some level of relationship, onto some other level” (p. 403). Language ideologies mediate social interactions in various fields of social relations, recursively iterated at various scales (Blommaert, 2007) of society. Blommaert (2007) introduces the vertical scaling metaphor to express the orders of indexicality that performative utterances reference in terms of fields of social relations. A given linguistic exchange is performative, indexing various scales of society through the specific schemes of interpretation and representation contained in an utterance. A scale is a field of social relations operating based on a historically engendered habitus (Blommaert, 2007). Utterances index scales by drawing upon field-legitimized discourse situated in the habitus of a field. The scale approach defines society within a “stratified social meaning system” (p. 7) where the legitimacy of discourse is determined by fields in relation to each other. Bourdieu (1991) argues that:

The symbolic efficacy of words is exercised only insofar as the person subjected to it recognizes the person who exercises it as authorized to do so… only in so far as he fails to realize that, in submitting to it, he himself has contributed, through his recognition, to its establishment. (p. 116)

In this way scaling operates in “two-directions of indexicality” (Blommaert, 2007, p. 4) as individuals act as mediums for habitus (Bourdieu, 1991) both legitimizing the habitus of a field and drawing upon that habitus. Language ideologies are scalable schemas that are recursively present in individual performative utterances within the habitus of fields. The legitimacy of language ideology is in its scalability, its ability to be iterated at various scales of societal fields. When a language ideology is iterable at multiple scales, particularly scales determined by
institutional fields, it provides an individual with greater authority to express and act upon that ideology. Language ideologies are mutable and instrumental, determined by their iterability throughout the stratification of societal fields.

Ideology operates as cognitive schemata in individuals, acting as the “interface between the cognitive representations and processes underlying discourse and action, on the one hand, and the societal position and interests of social groups, on the other” (van Dijk, 1995, p. 18). An ideology represents a social cognition whereby individuals are controlled in their actions and behaviours through societally formed schemas of belief and attitude (van Dijk, 1995, p. 21). Ideologies are both acquired and formed through an ongoing “process of socialization” (van Dijk, 1995, p. 18). As “shared mental representations” (van Dijk, 1998, p. 126) individuals influence the ideological schemata operating in a given social group. As ideologies are group constructs, individual cognition is a necessary component in understanding how an ideology is expressed in actual behavior (van Dijk, 1998; 2013). For van Dijk (1998) the expression of social cognition of ideologies is through discourse shared in “text and talk” (p. 6). Analysis of discourse is therefore a uniquely effective method of ascertaining the prevailing ideologies of individuals found in their discursive practices (van Dijk, 1998).

Woolard (1998) argues that the study of language ideology “allows us to relate the microculture of communicative action to political economic considerations of power and social inequality, to confront macrosocial constraints on language behaviour, and to connect discourse with lived experiences” (p. 27). As language ideologies permeate interactions in society between individuals themselves and institutions, narrative experience can reveal the ways in which language ideologies are formed and represented by an individual. The study of the *translingual/transnational socialization trajectories* (Menard-Warwick, 2014) of language
teachers is revelatory as a microcosm of processes of language/identity/ideology development emerging within the context of globalization defined by increasing diversity of languages, cultures, and identities.

### 3.3 Pedagogical Implications of Teachers’ Life History

According to Britzman (1991) “enacted in every pedagogy are the tensions between knowing and being, thought and action, theory and practice, knowledge and experience, the technical and the existential, the objective and the subjective” (p. 2). Britzman goes on to indicate that the distinctions drawn between these dichotomies are not as “neat or binary” (p. 2). For Britzman (1986) teacher practice is premised on the biographical life history of teachers. A teacher’s biography is formed of the cumulative experience of “interaction between time, places, peoples, ideas, and personal growth” (p. 443). A teacher’s pedagogy is an extension of that experience. Britzman (1986), drawing on Mills (1959), argues that “these social relationships contribute to the individual’s identity, values, and ideological perspectives” (p. 486). Using narrative inquiry as a research design, Clandinin and Connelly (1986, 1987, 1988, 2000) as well as Connelly and Clandinin (1990, 1994, 1999) focus on teachers’ experiences as formative of their teaching practice. They draw on Dewey (1938) to stipulate personal experience as a process that is inherently situated within social relations in a given context. Golombek (1998) utilizes the narrative inquiry approach proposed by Clandinin and Connelly (1986, 1987) to investigate language teachers’ language-learning experiences and the role of those experiences in their professional language teaching context. Golombek (1998) states that teachers’ “lived experience as teachers, students, and people, in which competing goals, emotions, and values, influenced the process of and the classroom strategies that resulted from the teachers’ knowing” (p. 459). For
Golombek (1998) teachers’ prior experiences function as an interpretive framework that informs their pedagogical practice, leading them to interpret the demands of a given teaching situation in relation to their practical knowledge.

3.3.1 The Role of Sociocultural Environment in Language Teacher Identity

Studies with English language teachers have found that teachers’ identities and language ideologies are formed in relation to the sociocultural circumstances throughout their life experiences of language learning, education, and teaching (Duff & Uchida, 1997). From the research conducted with four language teachers, Duff and Uchida (1997) concluded that the identities of teachers are shaped through the personal experiences of culture and language over time. This study highlighted the implications of teachers’ identities on their pedagogical approaches to understand how to navigate the cultural dynamics in language classrooms. Similarly, from a study with native and non-native EFL teachers in Japan, Simon-Maeda (2004) concluded that “a teacher’s personal set of values, an integral part of her or his identity forged from a lifetime of social interactions, shape educational beliefs and professional practices that in turn affect students’ learning contexts” (p. 428). Yoshihara (2012) extends Simon-Maeda’s (2004) investigation by establishing the relationship between non-native English language teachers’ pedagogical approaches to their biographical experiences. Teachers in her study indicated that they structured their language pedagogy according to their own experiences. The participants avoided error correction as well, because they found this approach ineffective during their own language-learning experiences. Ajayi (2011) indicated that teachers related their ethnic and social backgrounds to their pedagogical practice. Narratives of teachers indicated variant pedagogical approaches based on the “complex interplay of diverse variables” (p. 270) such as
life experiences, education, and ethnicity of teachers. Ajayi (2011) asserts that teachers’ practices are “multiple, diverse, and dynamic” (p. 270) as they are situated in the personal sociocultural experiences of individuals.

In similar studies with non-native English language teachers, Sun (2012) and Cheng (2016) found that teachers’ educational experiences based on specific cultural frameworks shape their identity formation, which can impact how their identity will influence their teaching practice. Sun (2012) indicated that a language teacher whose educational experiences were based in the Confucian tradition framed her teaching identity as the authority in the class who passes knowledge and expertise to students. Other studies with native-speaking English teachers have attempted to understand the identities of language teachers from a holistic perspective by analyzing their entire life histories (family life, career choice, schooling) (Bukor, 2013, 2015; Reeves, 2009). Bukor (2013, 2015) suggests, “teacher identity reflects not only the professional, educational, and pedagogical aspects of teaching but – more importantly – the imprints of the complex interconnectedness of one’s cumulative life experiences as a human being” (Bukor, 2013, p. 64). For example, Bukor (2013, 2015) found that language teachers’ personal experiences as children and their social dynamics within family impacted how they asserted empathy towards their students during their language-learning process. These studies suggest that the sociocultural experiences throughout a teacher’s life can have manifold implications on their pedagogical choices.

### 3.3.2 Transnationalism and Identity Formation

Studies with language teachers who have experienced migration across multiple national and cultural contexts investigate how this type of experience influences their identities and
pedagogy (Kooy & de Freitas, 2007). Kooy and de Freitas (2007) describe how their participants grappled with a sense of belonging culturally and linguistically across the cultural contexts they lived in, resulting in a complex identity formation process as they constructed identity “across national borders” (p. 877). Language teachers who have had multiple migratory experiences develop intercultural identities in relation to each cultural and linguistic context they inhabit (Menard-Warwick, 2008; Motha, Jain, & Tecle, 2012). Teachers draw on their experiences in diverse ways based on their individual migratory experiences and the identities and beliefs they develop throughout (Menard-Warwick, 2008; Motha, Jain, & Tecle, 2012). Additional studies which focus on the migratory experiences of language teachers who migrate to new contexts and then return back to their original national context suggest that even short-term international experiences have an impact on the language teachers’ identity (Trent, 2011; Widiyanto, 2005). Widiyanto (2005) indicated a positive identity transformation from his migratory experience. The transnational experience contributed to his view of himself as appreciative of other’s cultural positions and languages, a perspective he endeavoured to share with his students (Widiyanto, 2005). Other teachers spoke of their struggle to reconcile their past and present experiences into one teacher identity (Trent, 2011). In a study with language teachers in Mexico, who repatriated after living in the U.S.A, Mora, Trejo, and Roux (2016) found that the language teachers described having a fragmented identity resulting from lack of stability in their home context due to their transnational movement. The authors indicated, “just when they felt empowered as a result of their construction of an identity as US citizens, they returned to Mexico where they had to face the challenges of being part of a different culture, in which they felt they did not belong anymore” (p. 13). These teachers developed identity affiliations with both of the contexts in which they have inhabited and the languages they acquired (Mora, Trejo, & Roux, 2016).
3.3.3 Multilingualism and Language Teachers’ Multilingual Identity

Research on multilingual language teachers with migratory experiences suggests that acquiring a multilingual repertoire through migration contributes to a *plurilingual identity* (Ellis, 2004, 2006, 2013). Biographies of language teachers indicated that teachers’ language beliefs and knowledge were contingent on their multilingualism (Ellis, 2004). Ellis (2006) states that such teachers understand “their learners’ needs and difficulties in learning to function in English and negotiate L1/L2 use” (p. 13). Plurilingual teachers viewed L2 acquisition as an “achievable goal” (Ellis, 2013, p. 465) in contrast to monolingual teachers who perceived L2 acquisition as an overwhelming *obstacle* (Ellis, 2013). This dichotomy was found to be related to plurilingual teachers having successfully acquired a second language in contrast to monolingual teachers who had never engaged in the process of second-language acquisition (Ellis, 2013). In addition to the plurilingual teachers understanding of the process of language acquisition, Ellis (2006, 2013) suggests that these teachers are able to help students navigate the impact of language acquisition on their identities.

Menard-Warwick (2011) similarly found that bilingual language teachers in Chile understood that language acquisition required an identity investment in the target language and associated culture. These teachers appropriated English media popular cultural materials in their language teaching pedagogy, based on their own experiences of language learning, to help their students gain an understanding of the connection between language and culture in bilingual development. According to these teachers, this approach also had the potential to highlight to students the impact that investment in a new culture, through language acquisition, has on identity formation (Menard-Warwick, 2011). Studies with multilingual teachers who have had multiple migratory experiences describe the multiple identity affiliations these teachers develop.
in relation to each language and culture to which they have been exposed (Bujas-Grubar, 2014; Fichtner & Chapman, 2011). Fichtner and Chapman (2011) found that teachers developed multiple identity affiliations that were hierarchically related, where their native culture and language served as their primary identity and their multiple “target language cultures” (p. 133) were considered secondary. Bujas-Grubar (2014) identified that language teachers’ multilingual identity affiliations were relative to their experiences of using the languages in their repertoire in each of their migration contexts. The participants described investing in linguistic identities according to the cultural acceptance they experienced through their language use (Bujas-Grubar, 2014). This led the teachers to be more adept at understanding their students’ identity development throughout the process of becoming multilingual (Bujas-Grubar, 2014).

3.3.4 The Role of Language Ideology in Pedagogy

In addition to identity, research has shown that the language ideologies language teachers’ develop from their life experiences influence their pedagogical practices (Trujillo, 1996, 2005). For Trujillo (1996, 2005) language ideologies are not only a set of beliefs which are “essential features of teaching” (1996, p. 127) but are also the “practice through which individuals are produced, and in turn, produce their orientation to the social structure they inhabit” (1996, p. 127). Trujillo (2005) used narrative inquiry to determine how language teachers attempted to assert their ideologies in their classrooms to establish a language policy that included the L1s of their students. Razfar (2012) draws on Trujillo (2005) and uses narrative analysis of language teachers to glean the language ideologies present throughout their pedagogical practices. He argues, “narrative practices are also embedded with interests, values, and beliefs in the social and ideological sense” (p. 64). Razfar (2012) found that one participant
asserted her language ideology by establishing language activities in the classroom which supported multilingualism, rejecting the societal monolingualism and cultural assimilation among immigrant populations which were reflected in the school context. By invoking her own ideologies in the classroom, the teacher also attempted to have her students assert their ideologies of language and identity drawn from the analysis of their personal narratives and positions. Razfar (2012) concluded that language ideologies are negotiated between teachers and learners in practice: “ideologies in practice are less about categories of beliefs or cohesive partisan commitment and more about actors navigating and enacting difficult issues filled with tensions, contradictions, and multiple positionalities” (p. 78). Scarino (2014) further discusses the idiosyncratic approaches of language teachers based on “their own particular repertoires of languages, cultures, and histories of experiences that shape their frameworks of knowledge, understandings, values, and practices” (p. 386). Scarino (2014) argues that classroom diversity, as the result of globalization, requires an “interlinguistic and intercultural orientation” (p. 399). For Scarino (2014) this involves an interpretive dimension, where both teacher and learner are continually engaging in interpretation of the other based on frames of reference determined by prior experience and ideological perspectives.

3.3.5 Relationality and Language Teacher Identity

Morgan (2004) argues that language teacher identity is inherently implicated in language teaching practice through the social dynamics between teachers and students in language classrooms. He indicates, “identity negotiation takes place and is interwoven through every facet of L2 instruction” (Morgan, 2004, p. 183). For Morgan (2004), a teacher’s identity is a pedagogical resource through the performance of identity in interactions with students. The
intentions of how to perform a category of identity are determined by the beliefs of a teacher about expectations of students and the educational institution (Morgan, 2004). Hence, Morgan (2004) states that a “fully autonomous, self-aware subject is able to choose which aspects of his or her identity are of pedagogical value or to know how his or her identity matched up with a group of students” (p. 173). Morgan (2004) thus sees group practices as elemental in affecting identity formation and performance.

In a landmark study, which expands on Morgan (2004), Varghese, Morgan, Johnston, and Johnson (2005) found that “language teacher identity is seen to be constituted by the practices in relation to a group and the process of individual identification or non-identification with the group” (p. 39). This group relationality is context dependent, leading to identity formation through interactions “in communities, among others, in their teacher education programs, and beyond that, in their schools and classrooms” (Varghese, Morgan, Johnston, & Johnson, 2005, p. 39). Varghese (2001, 2006, 2008) argues that the socialization experiences of language teachers over time contribute to their identity formation, which is then enacted in relation to the social dynamics of the contexts in which they work. Drawing on Lave and Wenger (1991), Varghese (2006) suggests that language teachers’ identities are enacted according to the school institution as a community of practice where the degree of legitimate participation validates or marginalizes their professional identities leading to variant approaches to their language pedagogy. The level of support within the community of practice (school institution, stakeholders, faculty) determines the degree to which the teachers will establish teaching practices that reflect their personal histories, identities and ideologies (Varghese, 2006, 2008).

Research by Liu and Xu (2011) and Tsui (2007) use the community of practice framework to illustrate how language teachers negotiate their identities in relation to the teaching
institutions where they work. Both studies indicated that the teachers experienced their identities as being marginalized or valued according to their perceptions of the value placed on their language skills and the support and access provided to them by the institution (Liu & Xu, 2011; Tsui, 2007). Teachers’ identities shift as they are enacted in relation to their participation or non-participation within the community of practice, leading to “competing identities” (Liu & Xu, 2011, p. 191). As language teachers negotiate their competing identities through a “continuum of participation” (Varghese, 2006, p. 221) in a community of practice, they enact their pedagogical approaches along the fluctuating boundaries of who they perceive themselves to be and who they are expected to be within the educational community (Liu & Xu, 2011).

In a similar way, Kim (2013) argues that language teacher identities “are constructed within and between categories of identity as they are influenced by situated local socio-cultural factors” (p. 103). Kim (2013) found that language teachers have multiple identities that they negotiate in the “local micro-society of the classroom” (p. 92). For example, one teacher in the study emphasized her American identity over her Korean identity to establish herself as a native-speaking teacher of English to garner greater perception of expertise as an English teacher (Kim, 2013). Kim (2013) further illustrates that the identity of the language teacher enacted in the classroom acts as a model for their students who have similar background experiences. The students in the study developed a “critical intercultural identity” (p. 100) in accordance with the identity negotiation enacted by one of the teachers, who illustrated the sociocultural construction of her own identity to her students.

3.4 Summary
This chapter provided the literature review of studies relevant to the study of language teachers’ identity, ideology, and pedagogy. The literature on identity situates identity formation through sociocultural interactions in communities over time in a person’s life history. Identity in this way is mutable and multiple as it forms and changes in relation to the ongoing experiences an individual has within sociocultural contexts. Ideology is similarly drawn from interactions with others as one’s beliefs and values are formed according to how communities validate group membership through shared schemas of social value. The literature on language teachers illustrates that the identity and ideology of teachers developed throughout their life experiences has significant implications for their pedagogy.
Chapter Four

Methodology

This study looks at the language ideologies and identities of language teachers with migratory experiences. A qualitative approach of narrative inquiry was utilized in this study, which included an auto-ethnography as a pilot study, and semi-structured interviews with six language teachers to ascertain narrativized life accounts of their language-learning and migratory experiences.

4.1 Pilot Study: Auto-Ethnography

The research methodology was piloted in the form of an auto-ethnography (Sampson, 2004). An auto-ethnography is a qualitative methodology, which allows an individual to capture the subjective experiences as reflected through the lens of the cultural context where those life events were experienced (Ellis & Bochner, 1996; Reed-Danahay, 1997). Holt (2003) indicates, “authors use their own experiences in a culture reflexively to look more deeply at self-other interactions” (p. 2). The auto-ethnography was completed during the preliminary stages of my proposal-writing phase for this thesis. I considered this method to be the most effective way to access and capture my own deeply personal experiences associated with my migratory trajectory and language learning in various sociocultural contexts. As a foundation and guide for this pilot, I utilized the migration narrative I first wrote for a graduate course at York University with Professor Lotherington. I expanded the original narrative through a systematic process of reflection to capture all of the important details of my memories, stories, and experiences throughout the span of my life. In my writing, I also consulted with family and friends to contribute to recollections of the various experiences we shared together. In addition, I examined
my personal journals, letters I had received, and looked through artifacts such as family photographs and mementos collected over the span of my life. The use of multiple sources of analysis allowed my writing to contain thick descriptions that provide cultural context to my recollections (Geertz, 1973; Shenton, 2004).

For the analysis and interpretation of my auto-ethnography, I employed a form of thematic analysis (Guest, 2012). The process involved the identification of relevant themes and subthemes; it also involved the identification of salient narrative strands in my auto-ethnography. This identification process meant immersing myself in my own experiences conveyed through the stories, which I developed through my personal writing. This process allowed me to explore salient life events over the course of my migratory trajectory related to identity (Ellis, Adams, & Bochner, 2011) and capture my perceptions of the experience of being immersed in a specific sociocultural milieu while learning a language (Lotherington, 2007; Steinman, 2005).

During the process of writing my auto-ethnography, I engaged in an ongoing consultation with my thesis supervisor Professor Lotherington, where the various themes, which were emerging out of my auto-ethnography, were discussed. Through the dynamic process of personal writing and consultation with my supervisor during the pilot stage of my research, I was able to craft three guiding research questions for my study. These questions were developed from three primary orientations that emerged from my auto-ethnography: language ideology, identity, and language pedagogy. The following three research questions were utilized to guide my study:

**Language Ideology Orientation:** Do language teachers’ migratory experiences contribute to their beliefs and values about languages? How?

**Identity Orientation:** Do language teachers’ migratory experiences contribute to a translingual sense of self? How?
Pedagogy Orientation: Do language teachers’ migration and language-learning experiences affect their pedagogy in the second-language teaching classroom? How?

By conducting the pilot study before the investigation with my participants, I was able to develop interview questions, which were effective for the investigation of life stories of participants with multiple language-learning and migratory experiences (Sampson, 2004). This process assured me that my interview questions were appropriate, clear, and comprehensive and could elicit data, which would be significant to the main research questions in my study.

Following my pilot study, I conducted interviews with six participants who are language teachers with multiple migration and language-learning experiences. The interviews consisted of three semi-structured interview sessions with each of the participants during which I asked open-ended questions pertaining to their experiences of migration and language learning in various sociocultural contexts (Wells, 2011; Wengraf, 2001). The interviews were all conducted within a three-month time period. The setting and time of the interview sessions was determined by my participants to make the interview process convenient for them. From the interview sessions with my participants, I was able to gather rich personal narratives, comprising of the participants’ views, experiences, and motivations based on their entire migratory experience. Once the interview process was complete, I transcribed the recorded interviews and coded the transcripts to determine salient themes according to the research orientations of language ideology, identity, and pedagogy (Saldaña, 2009). The narratives functioned as data sets, which were coded for universally shared themes to answer the overarching research questions. The goal of the analysis of the data set of the participants’ narratives was to determine the impact of migration on the participants’ language ideology, identity, and pedagogy.
4.2 Data Collection and Interview Setting

Data collection involved multiple semi-structured interview sessions with each participant. The semi-structured interview approach was selected to allow participants to express comprehensive descriptions of their life history within a holistic narrative context (Wengraf, 2001). Pre-established open-ended interview questions were utilized during every semi-structured interview session to guide participants’ discussion (Wells, 2011). Although interview questions were applied consistently during every session with every participant, the open-ended nature of the interview questions allowed participants to have flexibility to individualize their flow of narrative.

All of the interview sessions were conducted over a period of approximately three months. With the permission of each participant, every interview session was audio-recorded. During each interview session with every participant, I also made notes of any reflections, which pertained to each participant’s narrative. Three interview sessions were conducted with each participant, with the exception of one participant who completed all of the interview sessions in one meeting given that she was in a different geographic location. Additionally, this participant was interviewed over Skype and not in person. Interview sessions varied in duration for each participant: sessions ranging in total from two to six hours. There was a set of three interview protocols designated for each interview session. Each interview protocol was followed in the same order with every participant during every interview session. Five questions were posed during the first session, ten questions were posed for each migration context during the second session, and five questions were asked during the third session. Participants were interviewed individually. The times and the settings for all of the interview sessions were set individually by each of the participants to ensure their convenience during the data-gathering process. I
conducted all of the interview sessions with every participant entirely in English. During each session, participants often digressed from the questions set for each session. This contributed to an overall conversational demeanor during the interviews. The conversational style of the interview process allowed for the development of holistic and deeper narratives of participants’ lives. As a result, despite the open-ended questions, which were utilized during the sessions, participants had the possibility to freely explore and inquire into their own memories and experiences without being led by the interviewer (Wengraf, 2001). After completing the interviews with the five other participants, I completed my own interview session. Given that in this study, I had a dual role that of a researcher and a participant, I enlisted the help from a third party to take on the role of interviewer for the duration of my interview sessions. This allowed me the same capacity to explore my own memories in response to the interview questions from an interviewer. The same interview questions were utilized for my interview sessions and the third party asked the interview questions in the same order.

4.3 Interview Protocol

4.3.1 First Interview Protocol

During the first interview session, I asked the participants a set of five questions (see Appendix A). These questions asked the participants to describe their life according to a timeline, which marked all of the locations they immigrated to in their lives. The participants then narrativized this timeline by discussing their language-learning and language-usage experiences for each marked migratory context. Additionally, I inquired into the participants’ experiences of attaining teaching positions as well as their perceptions of their teaching contexts throughout their migratory process.
4.3.2 Second Interview Protocol

During the second interview process, I asked the participants a set of ten questions (see Appendix B). The set of ten questions was asked for each migration context that each participant identified in his/her migratory trajectory. Through these questions, I intended to capture an elaborate narrativized account of my participants’ life experiences, impressions, and observations, related to culture, language learning, and education experiences for each migration context.

4.3.3 Third Interview Protocol

During the third interview session, I asked the participants a set of five questions (see Appendix C). The set of five questions attempted to establish a holistic understanding of the participants’ current language ideologies as well as the formation of their identity in relation to language learning across various contexts. In addition, the questions were an attempt to have the participants reflect on their migratory experiences and relate these experiences to their current language pedagogy.

4.4 Data Processing and Analysis

This study used a qualitative data analysis approach for the participants’ narratives. First the audio recordings of the interviews were transcribed into verbatim texts. All interview content was transcribed to ensure that meaningful data was not ignored. The transcripts were then compared to the audio recordings to confirm the accuracy of the transcripts. Next, I coded the transcripts using the software program Atlas.ti. This software was selected to manage the vast amount of textual data. I then engaged in three cycles of coding with Atlas.ti. The first cycle of
coding utilized descriptive coding to locate all references to identity, ideology, and pedagogy (Saldaña, 2009). The first cycle of coding also involved value coding to locate salient features of ideology, as well as narrative coding that located salient features of identity (Saldaña, 2009). Value coding was applied to identify ideology in the narrative through detection of “data that reflect a participant’s values, attitudes, and beliefs, representing his or her perspective or worldview” (p. 89). Narrative coding drew out the elements of narrative that relate to identity development, through the identification of features in the text that reveal the storied accumulation of a sense of self over time (p. 109). The narrative coding identified aspects of the transcribed narrative that indexed identity through social categorizations (e.g. native-speaker, immigrant, etc.) and subject positionality in relation to such indices (De Fina, 2006; De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2012). The coded transcription then underwent a second cycle coding that utilized pattern coding (Saldaña, 2009, p. 152) to discern emergent codes in the first cycle codes related to ideology, identity, pedagogy, and the relationship between them. Pattern coding allowed me to determine salient connections between ideological frameworks and the participant’s identity.

The initial two cycles of coding were completed on each individual transcript. Codes were generated throughout the process of coding each transcript as salient narrative content emerged from the analysis. While I coded each transcript, I continuously compiled a list of the generated codes into an Excel worksheet. Once each of the transcripts was coded with the initial two cycles, I engaged in a third cycle of coding where I referred to the compiled list of codes to synchronize the use of codes across all transcripts. This third cycle of coding aided in applying codes that were common to the participants and those which were individualized.
After all documents were coded, I utilized Atlas.ti to aggregate codes that were common to the participants. The codes that identified common features were determined to be themes within the data set and were then interpreted as to their relationship to the study’s guiding questions. The resulting themes were then compared to each participant’s narrative to draw out the individual permutations of the overall themes found in the data. Based on the individual narratives, correlations between the themes were developed by considering how each participant’s description of experiences suggested how the themes occurred and how they could be related.

4.5 Participants

Participants were chosen on the basis of three requirements. All participants were required to have a migratory trajectory, which spanned two or more national contexts. Also, participants were required to have language knowledge of two or more languages where the language acquisition took place during their migratory process. Finally, participants were required to be language teaching professionals.

All of the participants in this study were females between the ages of 20-45. All were born and raised outside of Canada. With the exception of one participant who lives in Germany, all of the participants were currently living and teaching in the Canadian context.

For this study, during the interview sessions, participants were asked to narrate their life experiences. Because gathering life stories and experiences from an entire lifespan can create extensive volumes of data, I chose to limit the study to six participants. With a limited set of participants, I was able to dedicate significant amount of time to my participants and capture the
vastness of their life stories, which were expected to arise from lived experiences during the course of a lifespan.

In addition to the participants I selected for this study, I participated in the study in two ways. First, I developed an auto-ethnography of my migratory experiences, which took on the role of a pilot study. Through the auto-ethnography, I was able to narrow my research study and establish appropriate research/interview questions for the interviews with my participants. Second, I took on the role of a participant by being interviewed according to the same interview protocol as the other participants. This allowed me to contribute my narrative to the study. A third party conducted my interview.

Protecting the participants’ confidentiality was an important component in this study. Hence, each participant is identified by a pseudonym to ensure anonymity. Direct quotes in the findings chapter refer to verbatim statements participants made during their interview sessions. The quotes are identified by the participants’ pseudonyms and quote numbers, which refer back to their transcribed interviews in Atlas.ti. The following chart provides an overview of participants’ background information, including their migration trajectory and their language knowledge.

**Table 1**

**Overview of Participants’ Biographical Background**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bina</th>
<th>Sandra</th>
<th>Rose</th>
<th>Estella</th>
<th>Helene</th>
<th>Lisa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approximate Age</strong></td>
<td>30’s</td>
<td>40’s</td>
<td>40’s</td>
<td>40’s</td>
<td>20’s</td>
<td>30’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Language(s)</td>
<td>Polish/ Yiddish</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Bengali/ Tamil</td>
<td>Brazilian Portuguese</td>
<td>Trinidadian English</td>
<td>Bengali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Repertoire</td>
<td>German, French, English, Greek, Hindi, Sanskrit, Malay, Kannada, Arabic</td>
<td>French, English, Hindi, German, Hindi, French, Greek, Hindi, Malay, Kannada, Arabic</td>
<td>English, Hindi, German, Spanish, French, Latin, Hindi, Mandarin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond the First Language</td>
<td>Korean, Japanese</td>
<td>Lebanon, Greece, UAE, Oman, UAE, USA, Canada</td>
<td>India, Singapore, India, Oman, UAE, Canada</td>
<td>Brazil, England, Germany</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago, Canada, France, Canada, Ecuador, Canada</td>
<td>Bangladesh, Germany, Bangladesh, India, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migratory Trajectory</td>
<td>Germany, Canada, South, Korea, Canada</td>
<td>Germany, Canada, UAE, Oman, UAE, USA, Canada</td>
<td>India, Singapore, India, Oman, UAE, Canada</td>
<td>Brazil, England, Germany</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago, Canada, France, Canada, Ecuador, Canada</td>
<td>Bangladesh, Germany, Bangladesh, India, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Occupation</td>
<td>ESL Instructor - Secondary School</td>
<td>Academic English, Instructor - University</td>
<td>Academic English, Instructor - University</td>
<td>ESL Methodology, Instructor/ Researcher - University</td>
<td>French as a Second Official Language, Instructor - Elementary School</td>
<td>Academic English, Instructor - Independent Language Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 Participants’ Individual Biographies

This section provides a brief biographical description of each participant who participated in this study. The biographical description outlines the participants’ migratory trajectory, it includes their language-learning process as well as their vocational experiences as language teachers.

**Bina**

Bina is a woman originally from Poland whose first language is Polish. At an early age, she learned Yiddish from her maternal Jewish grandmother. As a young child, she and her parents escaped communist Poland by immigrating to Germany. She lived numerous years in Germany where she learned German and English as a child. Ultimately, she and her parents immigrated to Canada where she continued to learn English and German as a heritage language. In elementary and secondary school context in Canada, she also developed reading and writing ability in French. As a university student in Canada and in Germany, she pursued German language/literature and philosophy of language studies. Her continued interests in language learning led her to expand her knowledge by completing graduate degrees in applied linguistics.
as well as language education. As an English language teacher, she has taught in Canada, Germany, Poland, and South Korea. Her passion for learning Korean and Japanese resulted from multiple years teaching English in South Korea. As a result of her own migratory experiences, through her research pursuits she seeks to understand the experiences of other individuals with similar migratory trajectories and complex language-learning paths. In the Canadian context, she is currently completing her Master’s degree and teaching English as a second language at the secondary school level where she works primarily with students of immigrant backgrounds with the goal of preparing them for university studies.

Sandra

Sandra was born in Lebanon where the dominant languages she learned were Lebanese Arabic and French. At an early age, she left Lebanon with her family to immigrate to Greece. In Greece, she attended English international schools where she acquired English. In the social context, she was also exposed to Greek, as this was the dominant social language. In her elementary school years, Sandra and her family immigrated to the UAE where she attended British international schools and continued to develop her English skills. Despite Arabic being her first language, Sandra stressed that English took on the role of a mother tongue which she utilized predominantly even in the context of her home. As a teenager, she and her family immigrated to Oman for a brief period. In Oman, she continued her education in English and began to focus on learning French. She completed her secondary school education by returning back to the UAE. As an adult, she completed her university studies in the UAE and in the United States where she was an international student. In the UAE, she has worked as an English as a second-language instructor, teaching English for professional purposes. Teaching English to students of Arabic background led her to regain interest in her first language and develop fluency
in Arabic. While continuing to pursue professional teaching positions, she completed her Master’s degree in the field of applied linguistics. She currently lives and teaches in the Canadian context. She is a teacher of English as a second language in a university context where she primarily teaches English for academic purposes and university research writing skills to international students.

Rose

Rose is a woman born in India whose first language is Tamil. Her migratory trajectory started within her own native context where at an early age she moved to multiple states in India leading her to acquire Bengali in addition to Tamil at a young age. She described India as a linguistically and culturally diverse country where she learned multiple languages by the process of moving around with her family. As a child, she also spent time living in Singapore where she acquired Malay. She attended English international schools in India, where English was the language of instruction. As a young adult, she developed an interest in studying English language and English literature at the university level. This consequently led her to complete a Master’s degree in English literature. Once her degree was completed she remained in India and taught English literature courses in the university setting. To expand her teaching experience, as an adult, she first migrated to Oman and then to the UAE where she worked as an English language instructor at the university level in both contexts. In the UAE, she also took on administrative roles in the education context, where she was developing language curriculum for schools. By teaching in Oman and the UAE for years, she developed linguistic knowledge of Arabic. She currently lives in Canada, where she is an instructor of English as a second language. She teaches English for academic purposes courses to international students.
Estella

Estella is a woman born in Brazil whose first language is Brazilian Portuguese. Already in the context of Brazil, when she was a young student, she became interested in learning languages, starting with German and then English. During her secondary-school education, she indicated that she participated in an exchange program in Germany, which contributed to her development of German language skills. As a university student, she continued developing a linguistic orientation academically and focused her studies on Portuguese and English. In Brazil, her intentions were initially to become a teacher of English as a second language. With the intention of becoming a language teacher, she completed her first Master’s degree in Brazil and then immigrated to England to expand her knowledge of the field as well as to continue her linguistic development of English. In England she completed her second Master’s degree in the field of linguistics. By gaining a scholarship for additional graduate studies, she remained in England and completed her PhD. Her research goals ultimately contributed to her migration to Germany where she is currently a professor at a university, where she conducts research on multilingualism. At the university level, she also dedicates her time to training novice ESL instructors by teaching methodologies for the second-language classroom.

Helene

Helene is originally from the island of Trinidad. The language she used predominantly in this context was Trinidadian English. In the school context of Trinidad, her studies focused on the development of multiple languages. She indicated that she acquired English, Hindi, and Spanish in the elementary school system. During her secondary school years, her family immigrated to Canada. In the bilingual Canadian context, where English and French are the official languages, Helene became interested in learning French. This led her to focus on French
academically and pursue a French studies degree. Her interest in the French language inspired her to migrate to France. In France, she was an international student pursuing studies in the French language. After completing her language teaching diploma in France, she returned to Canada. She then migrated to Ecuador where she taught English as a second language. Upon returning to Canada, she completed a teaching degree as well as a Master’s degree in education with a focus on French and Spanish. She is currently teaching French at the elementary school level in Canada where she is a French immersion teacher.

Lisa

Lisa was born in Bangladesh where her first language was Bengali. As a young child, she migrated with her family to Germany. In Germany, she acquired German and English in the school context. She and her family then returned to Bangladesh. Although Bengali was her first language, she indicated that upon returning to Bangladesh she had to relearn Bengali as German had become her dominant language while living in Germany. During her university studies, she migrated to India where she acquired Hindi. After completing her degree in India, she returned to Bangladesh where she worked as an English teacher and an English language-curriculum developer. After working professionally in the second-language education field, she immigrated to Canada to pursue a Master’s degree in educational studies. In the Canadian context, she worked extensively with international students from China in the university setting to support them culturally and linguistically in their new context. Her work with international students inspired her to study Mandarin.

4.7 Ethical Considerations
Before contacting potential participants for my study, I submitted a detailed protocol of my research intentions to the Ethics Review Committee at York University. Upon receiving the approval from the Ethics Review Committee at York University, I contacted the potential participants in writing who I thought would be suitable for interviews. The participants who agreed to participate in my study were then provided with a Consent form. The Consent form outlined the goals of my research and provided the participants the information about how their participation in my study could potentially be beneficial to their practice by understanding of how identity and ideologies may be enacted through the pedagogy in the second-language classroom. Additionally, participants were familiarized with the interview procedures involved in this study. It was explained that the participation in this study required three semi-structured interview sessions to draw out their personal narratives of language learning, migration, and teaching experiences. Participants were notified that their participation was voluntary and that they had the right to terminate their participation in this study at any stage during the interview process. If such a situation was to arise, I assured the participants that any data they provided would be destroyed. During the interview process, participants were told that they had the right to ask questions and choose not to answer any questions, which they personally deemed as problematic or sensitive. The Consent form also informed the participants that once the findings would be finalized, they had the right to obtain a copy of the results. I notified the participants that the final results of this study could be shared during conference forums and could be published independently in addition to this thesis. Importance of privacy was stressed to the participants during all of the interview sessions during which the data collection process took place. I recognized the participants’ right to anonymity and therefore for all components of my research, I assigned pseudonyms to my participants. Once I completed the analysis of the
participants’ narratives and attained conclusions from this analysis, I notified the participants in writing that the study has been completed. By notifying the participants about the conclusions of this study, I ensured that there remained collaboration throughout the research process of this study between the researcher and the participants.

4.8 Access to Data

The data files from the interview sessions as well as the Atlas.ti hermeneutic unit files remained stored on my personal computer, which is secured with a password. As the principal researcher in the study, I am the only person who has access to the data.

4.9 Summary

A pilot study in the form of an auto-ethnography was utilized in this study, which served as a foundation for determining the research questions for the main study. In the main study, six participants (including myself) who are language teachers with migratory experiences were interviewed. Interviews were semi-structured in nature and consisted of a set of three interview sessions during which open-ended questions were asked so that participants could narrativize their migratory experiences over the span of their life. Coding of the narratives was completed with the program Atlas.ti where the narratives were coded through three cycles. This involved descriptive, value, narrative, and pattern coding. The codes were then compared between narratives to derive common themes present in the data set.
Chapter Five

Empirical Findings

The purpose of the study is to understand how language learning during multiple migratory experiences influence participants’ language ideologies, their identity, and how these experiences shape their pedagogy in the language classroom. This chapter presents the research findings from interview sessions with six participants. The data from the interviews was qualitatively coded for themes. This chapter presents the salient themes, which emerged from the participants’ narratives relative to their migration and language-learning experiences. The themes are organized in this chapter according to how they inform each of the primary research questions. Table 1, provided below, presents an overview of the specific themes for each research question, as they will be presented in this chapter.

Table 2

Overview of Research Questions and Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Ideologies</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ1:</strong> Do language teachers’ migratory experiences contribute to their beliefs and values about languages? How?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 1:</strong> Who Owns the Language?</td>
<td><strong>Theme 2:</strong> Multilingual Repertoire as a Social Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**RQ2:** Do language teachers’ migratory experiences contribute to a translingual sense of self? How?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1: Multilingualism and Hybrid Identity</th>
<th>Theme 2: Language Influencing Cultural Mentality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Pedagogical Approaches**

**RQ3:** Do language teachers’ migration and language-learning experiences affect their pedagogy in the second-language teaching classroom? How?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1: Use of Technical Language Knowledge in the Language Classroom</th>
<th>Theme 2: Identity in the Language Classroom</th>
<th>Theme 3: From Language Learning to Languaging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 5.1 Who Owns the Language?

From the migratory experiences, four of the six participants formed the belief that others perceived language as owned by specific social groups. In community and professional interactions, participants indicated that they experienced cultural groups acting as owners of language by rejecting them socially based on their contrasting language abilities. These experiences led the participants to formulate the idea that they must perpetually negotiate others’ perceptions of language ownership.

#### 5.1.1 Community Interactions
All of the participants indicated that throughout their migratory experiences they were identified as inauthentic community members. Participants attributed this experience to not being familiar with the dominant in-group speech patterns of the local community in the new national contexts. Proficiency, accent, and pragmatic use (speech acts/speech genres) were described as the speech patterns, which contributed to the identification of the participants as out-group members. Proficiency is utilized to refer to a speaker’s ability to utilize speech that is complex (elaborate and varied), accurate (without errors), and fluent (rapid production of speech with few pauses, hesitations, reformulation) (Ellis, 2003). Accent refers to the manner of pronunciation relative to a specific cultural, national, or local community of speakers. Pragmatics is utilized to refer to the capacity of a speaker to produce appropriate speech according to the local conventions in a given community of speakers (e.g. humor) (Wierzbicka, 2003).

Bina spoke about how her lack of proficiency in the dominant in-group language in the new national context resulted in her social rejection:

Whenever I was in class, many of the Canadians, the individuals who were born and raised here would laugh at my linguistic skills because I did not know the language very well, and they would tell me to go back to my country. (Bina, Quote 159)

What emerges from this excerpt is how the linguistic in-group acted as owners of the language by suggesting to Bina that she should return to her place of origin, thus revealing that from their perspective that she did not belong in their country. Being marked as an outsider was associated with inauthenticity. Several other participants expanded the discussion of inauthenticity by indicating how their accent and pragmatic use of the language led to being identified as outsiders in the new migration context. In the statement made by Helene, accent is indicated as a marker of inauthenticity:
I think, where it became difficult is when I was trying and some people don’t make comments. They listen to you, but some people, when people say you have an accent, every time I would hear you have an accent: in my head, but I’m trying to speak Canadian. That’s when it would become conscious to me that it’s difficult, oh my God I can’t hide this even if I want to. So it’s like you always perceive an accent. (Helene, Quote 169)

Despite her best efforts to speak like a Canadian, Helene’s accent remained a significant factor in the persistent identification of difference and contributed to the lack of in-group acceptance. Another participant shared how her pragmatic use of Arabic played a role in her being identified as an inauthentic member of the linguistic in-group. Sandra described her experience of returning to Lebanon after living many years abroad:

At the American University of Beirut, the professor, he actually made a joke and I didn’t laugh. So that’s why he said you didn’t like my joke, and I said I didn’t realize it was a joke. So I think that’s culturally something, I do not understand their cultural jokes.

(Sandra, Quote 522)

What stands out as interesting in Sandra’s account is that even in her nation of origin, she was perceived as inauthentic due to her lack of knowledge of the speech genre (humour) specific to the local pragmatic use of Arabic. Even though Sandra was born in Lebanon and spoke Arabic she was treated as an out-group member. Sandra was unable to acquire the pragmatic components of the local speech patterns because she lived in multiple international contexts, which disconnected her from Lebanon. From Sandra’s experiences we can see how migration can lead to being perceived as inauthentic even after returning to one’s nation of origin.
The experiences described by the participants suggested that the cultural groups they interacted with were predominantly linguistically homogenous comprising individuals who utilized the same speech pattern (proficiency, accent, pragmatic use of language) for oral communication. In such a context, linguistic deviation from the norm that was easily identified as different was associated with inauthenticity. One participant described a social context that was linguistically heterogeneous comprising multiple expatriates all of whom utilized diverse speech patterns for communication. This dichotomy was described eloquently by Sandra:

I would have felt more self-conscious in the US because in the US the majority are the Americans and southern and you kind of really stand out because you are completely different: You are Arabic with strange English accent. You know, I got a different accent and I look different, but in Dubai I kind of don’t look different from everyone else. Everyone is different in Dubai, everyone is an expat, and everyone had a different accent, so I don’t stand out much. I don’t fit in but I don’t stand out. I don’t stick out as much and I don’t attract attention as much in Dubai. (Sandra, Quote 212)

The tendency of others to identify difference in speech patterns appeared to be relative to the consistency of similar speech patterns among individuals in a given context. The expression of ownership of a language seemed to be dependent on having multiple individuals share a similar perception of what constitutes linguistic difference. This led the participants to perceive social groups that expressed a similar perception of linguistic difference as a linguistic in-group that purported to have linguistic ownership.

In contrast to the multiple participants who had out-group experiences based on their contrasting speech patterns, Bina described being accepted as an authentic in-group member
based on her speech patterns in German related to accent, proficiency, and pragmatic use of German. She indicated:

I was very comfortable with German, because at one point I said in class that I was an international student from Canada and the professors did not believe me. I think they thought I was joking with them because they could not detect that I was using the language in an inferior manner or that I was still learning it. They just thought that my manner of speaking was as if I was a German from the north and I mean I grew up there, so I probably spoke like a northerner. (Bina, Quote 148)

Bina’s account suggests that when others cannot identify contrast in speech patterns, one will be perceived as an authentic in-group member in community interactions.

The narrative data conveys how all of the participants recognized the assertion of language ownership of others in new national contexts. Based on this experience, the participants formulated a belief that when social groups share the same speech pattern, that group will act as owners of the language and treat others whose speech patterns contrast with their own as inauthentic linguistic outsiders.

### 5.1.2 Professional Interactions

Given that the participants are all language teachers, the aspect of language ownership was also discussed in the participants’ experiences of professional interactions. In contrast to community interactions, in the professional context authenticity was associated for Bina, Lisa, Rose, and Sandra with being a *native-speaker* (in-group) of the language according to country of birth rather than according to linguistic proficiencies. Rose articulated the importance of country
of birth to being perceived as authentic or as a native speaker in the context of language teaching. This is what Rose indicated about authenticity in the professional context:

I never had that concept in India that there were owners and you could not be part of the club owner of the language. Because the way I have learned Bengali, if I could speak it, I would own it. There was no, but when I came out of India, it dawned upon me that there was this fact: A non-native speaker of English. It was really surprising because I never came across this term in India. And I never thought that there was a non-native speaker. I just found that there was so much English writing, I mean, we have studied so much in English writing and English writers that I thought that we owned the languages as well…I suddenly realized there was a pecking order in the hiring process and therefore people who are native speakers. Certain countries were considered to be those who had the privilege to disseminate the rules of that language and also the rules of that culture and somehow, and somehow I could not have that kind of authority that they had. (Rose, Quote 876)

What emerges from Rose’s statement is that despite learning English fluently during her childhood in India, her awareness of lack of authenticity was only first acknowledged when she migrated to Oman to teach English. Additionally from this excerpt, it was indicated by Rose that by not having authenticity one would not have the authority to determine legitimate usage of English in the English teaching context. This belief was shared by Sandra, Lisa, and Bina who described experiences where they tried to incorporate their varieties of English into their teaching practice, only to have their professional superiors question their usage and refer to native speaker norms as the only legitimate usage of English in the English teaching context.
From the interviews, it appeared that the parents of students, the students themselves, and school management drove this concept that only native speakers were authentic speakers who had the authority to determine legitimate usage of English. It was indicated that the participants believed that these stakeholders derived their preference for native-speaking teachers from the perception that their language knowledge was representative of English usage in countries where the dominant language is English. As non-native teachers, participants had to utilize the speech patterns according to the norms in English speaking countries to establish legitimacy. As a result they indicated that parents, students, and management perceived their linguistic expertise as derivative, referring to non-native teachers as simply an “intermediary” (Bina). The participants described being treated as having a lower status than native-teachers in terms of pay scale, opportunities for advancement, and in having their linguistic expertise called upon in curriculum development. To illustrate the participants’ experience of being treated according to a lower status, Sandra spoke of her interaction with a native English speaking colleague:

I think that there is always the superiority that they are native speakers and have better English and she thinks she is just the best teacher. You can hear it from the ways she talks, you know she keeps, she argues, she puts people down, she answers questions with stuff she thinks is very sophisticated, so you kind of know she thinks she is kind of better than everyone else. The question of course, who is not Irish or originally speaks English you know is native, is not good enough. You can tell that from her attitude, you can tell straight away. I think she thinks you can’t even teach. (Sandra, Quote 381)

This quote suggests a sense of ownership of the language by a native speaker that was expressed through her pejorative behaviour of asserting her professional superiority as an English teacher.
based solely on her status as a native speaker of English. The participant associated her co-
teacher’s expression of superiority with her being a native speaker of English.

These four participants, throughout our discussion, questioned the validity of the
native/non-native paradigm. Particularly, participants rejected the notion of language ownership
with native speakers and their perceived authority to legitimize linguistic patterns. Rose voiced
this perspective:

I don’t think that that is true, that the native speaker has a better command of the
language. And all of that depends on what you are talking about, the medium of
instruction. Yes, you probably have a better command if you are using expressions; you
are using a higher form of the language. What is that form of language that actually
differentiates the native and non-native? It is very complex and sometimes the way we try
to define that command is completely wrong, and it needs to be completely rethought,
and it has become pejorative. (Rose, Quote 550)

In this excerpt, Rose emphasized her linguistic values that there is no clear distinction between
native and non-native speakers in terms of linguistic expertise. Rose indicates that knowledge of
expressions is commonly associated with being a native speaker; however, she states that
expressions alone are not sufficient for signifying having greater command of the language. The
notion that one group can act as owners of the language and be considered as inherently
linguistically authentic based on birth nation was stressed as problematic and indicated by the
participants as an outdated notion.

Unlike the other three participants, only Bina described an experience where she was
hired to teach English as a native-speaker of English despite management being aware that she
was born in Poland. Management perceived that her linguistic skills were indistinguishable from
native-born Canadian speakers of English. Bina’s legitimate language usage was perceived as sufficient to garner the authenticity associated with native-speakers. Bina described her experience:

I remember even one time, this Chinese student, I don’t know how he knew this or how he found out, it was one of my students. When I was teaching at the University and he kind of called me out on it, he said something like: you know, I know you’re or you were Polish or, something like, English is not your first language, because I can hear your accent. And I don’t know to this day if someone actually told him or if he, you know, he actually found out, but that made me feel scared and very strange. It was a very uncomfortable feeling, because, I mean, this was something that I was trying to cover up but the student somehow knew. He knew my secret, my language secret, and so you know, I was, I was frightened that he would say this to someone else and then you know it would trickle down into management. And I wasn’t supposed to talk about it in class; they would think I was talking about it. (Bina, Quote 17)

Despite the recognition by the management of Bina’s school that a country of origin is not pertinent to one’s capacity to teach English, the perceptions of the exclusive language authority of native-speakers by the students and their parents, presented a constraint that only native-speakers should be employed at the school. Additionally, we can see how Bina’s recognition as an authentic speaker of English in the professional context required imposture where she had to actively hide herself to pass as someone else. Although the other participants did not pose as native-speakers in their teaching practices, each participant described the challenging negotiation of the stakeholders’ perception of ownership of language.
Reflecting back on their migratory experience, Bina, Lisa, Rose, and Sandra indicated that as non-native teachers of English language, they formulated the belief that in professional interactions they needed to actively negotiate the language ownership perception of others. As non-native language teachers, the participants had to determine how much legitimacy they could acquire from stakeholders to establish their authority as English teachers.

5.2 Multilingual Repertoire as a Social Tool

From migratory experiences, participants developed the belief that their languages are social tools for achieving intended effects with interlocutors in conversations (communicative goal) like garnering social acceptance with a linguistic in-group member in a sociocultural context. The participants recognized that various aspects of speech patterns (proficiency, accent, pragmatic use) are interpreted by others as having social value. Achieving communicative goals in conversations with others required the acquisition and use of speech patterns strategically in moment-to-moment interactions in a given social context.

Four participants in the study described being ostracized in their new migration contexts because their speech patterns contrasted with those of the dominant linguistic community. Participants described the process of intentionally acquiring the speech patterns (proficiency, accent, pragmatic use) of the dominant speakers so that they could communicate without being marked as different and effectively integrate into the linguistic community. For example, Helene described how she strategically acquired an accent, which allowed her to integrate into the linguistic in-group at school. She explains:

I remember changing because they fully didn’t understand who I was. And also, yeah, because they looked at me like I was Trinidadian and they looked up at that but at the
same time you didn’t want to feel singled out. You always wanted to feel like you’re blended, not so very different, some alien, so that is why I decided to make conscious decisions. Ok, I need to learn how to speak like a Canadian, yeah I didn’t want to feel different. (Helene, Quote 96)

In this example, the participant identified the differences between her Trinidadian accent and a Canadian accent. She then strategically acquired a Canadian accent to avoid being perceived as different when interacting with Canadians. In conversations with her school peers, Helene was mindful of the distinct English accents and would strategically put into practice her Canadian accent, using it as a social tool to present herself as an in-group member who shared the same speech patterns as her peers. This allowed her to achieve her communicative goal of fitting in socially.

Additional participants described intentionally acquiring other speech patterns (proficiency, pragmatic use) for the purpose of social integration in new migration contexts. During the interview, Rose spoke about her migration to Toronto and how she discerned that the local variety of English was different from that in her previous context. In an excerpt, Rose illustrated how she analyzed speech patterns of the Torontonians she interacted with and intentionally acquired the pragmatic use of English according to the local variety used in Toronto:

Of course it changed hugely because I learned to speak the Torontonian way… Here it was Torontonian downtown language. Should I say, brevity, saying two instead of five words and basically not saying anything more than necessary, so brevity was paramount here. I found that if you spoke more, people just didn’t understand what you were saying. (Rose, Quote 688)
This case demonstrates how Rose was able to purposely pick up the speech patterns of the people around her so that when she spoke to them she would be understood just as easily as other members of the local community. We can see how the participant was able to tailor her pragmatic use of English to the social context and use it as a social tool for developing social connections, which allowed her to achieve her communicative goal of integration into the local community.

In addition, the findings showed that once the participants developed a varied linguistic repertoire comprising speech patterns in multiple languages, in moment-to-moment social interactions they would strategically draw upon this repertoire as a set of social tools to achieve their communicative goals. Rose, Bina, Estella, and Sandra indicated that in specific situations they would deliberate on which speech pattern in which language would be the most effective for achieving their communicative goals in conversations. In a job interview setting, Rose recalled how she decided to speak in her British accent rather than her Indian accent recognizing that the British accent would increase her chances of getting the job. She explained:

We were all sharing experiences of getting jobs at that time. I said that I had to put on an accent in order to get a job in Dubai, to get through the interview. So that put on an accent seems to be something like akin of falsehood or lying, but actually I don’t think it is that. I think it’s the way. It’s the way the English language keeps evolving and it is not a stationary thing and accents keep changing and even the Canadian accent by the way is changing as well. And so its accents are never constant so if one experiments with accents, it’s not something that is negative, but it, it’s some people might perceive it as negative because they might want to connect to your culture and nationality and they say: hey! And were you not educated in India? And, you belong to this culture! And, you are
talking Canadian and American. How many years have you lived in Canada or America?

Just one year, and you are just putting on an accent?! (Rose, Quote 170)

Rose’s colleagues perceived her decision to “put on an accent” as dishonest as for them language usage should be reflective of a person’s background. For Rose however, this was not an instance of dishonesty, as she believes that language is simply a social tool for a speaker to utilize to accomplish communicative goals. Unlike, Rose, Bina, Estella and Sandra who described active pre-thought when drawing on their linguistic repertoire in specific situations, Helene’s excerpts pointed to a spontaneity involved in her strategic selection. In this excerpt, Helene describes a social encounter where she spontaneously drew on her repertoire in reaction to a person who was acting aggressively towards her:

I remember in Scarborough, there was a girl on the bus, a girl wanted to fight with me, she would get shocked if I spoke Trinidadian, so I did that, and she backed off, but I knew that would happen before I did it. So that’s why I did it so. I said something in a way, like I was, like tough. This was being younger. I was being younger and adolescent, so I put emphasis on a particular vernacular of language according to what I wanted to achieve. (Helene, Quote 364)

What can be derived from her discussion is that the participant was able to immediately select which element of her linguistic repertoire (Trinidadian) was best suited as a social tool to negotiate the power struggle with her interlocutor.

From the evidence of the participants’ narratives, it is apparent that their multiple migratory experiences had the effect of developing the belief that speech patterns could be developed and utilized as social tools to achieve personal goals in communication. The participants dissolved their personal attachments to any given language. They demonstrated the
belief that language is fundamentally a mechanism for negotiating social exchanges through the strategic selection of speech patterns according to the practical needs of the given situation.

5.3 The Perceived Value of English as a Lingua Franca

All of the participants indicated a belief that English is considered the most internationally valued medium for communication. Five of the participants acquired English as a subsequent language. These participants were brought up to think that English language skills were essential for success in their future. Bina described how her parents propagated their belief in the benefits of English:

So in school, you would think they would be teaching you English more worldly or usable languages, but they did not. It was strictly Russian and Polish. And to this day, my parents complain that if they had learned English that would serve them better and they would have more opportunities, but instead, they learned Russian fluently. And to this day, they think that it is such a useless thing, and I guess they are right. I mean, I speak western modern languages and look at all of the opportunities I have because I have this powerful language in my linguistic repertoire, and they work in factories, where you don’t need English (Bina, Quote 83)

In this excerpt, the participant indicates how her parents discussed the social shift towards an acceptance and valuing of English. Her parents suggested that the languages they were taught at school are no longer valued in the current social climate. Bina expresses her agreement with this perception indicating that she perceives English to be a “powerful language” that provides her with greater opportunities. Sandra and Lisa picked up the same concept and indicated how their
family members encouraged them to specifically acquire English as part of their linguistic repertoire since they believed that English could ensure future opportunities.

In addition to English being propagated as the most valued language, two participants indicated that they were educated to believe there was a greater value to the British form of English. Rose described how in the school context her variety of English was deemed inferior to the British form of English:

Mrs. Saunders, and I will never forget her, who used to teach us pronunciation. And she used to teach us pronunciation. That was very foreign to the way we spoke English in India, so it was like teaching us to speak in an accent that we cannot use with people around us. So why speak with an Oxbridge accent that you cannot use with people? But she used to insist that we pronounce words in a particular way, and was very difficult for us. It was kind of audio-lingual, I say this, so she would say something and then all of us had to repeat us and look into our mirrors and make sure we make the motions so she was very strict. But I do thank her because she did to some extent manage to make an impact on the way we spoke. She had, she did create impact, she did make us see that there was an English, she did make us see that there was a formal spoken English that was different from our variety of English and that was aspirational” (Rose, Quote 221)

Rose was taught to perceive the “Oxbridge” accent as more valued, a belief she internalized as a goal to achieve. Both Rose and Sandra acquired British English during their educational experiences leading them to perceive this form of English as more internationally valued.

The hierarchy of English varieties was further engrained as part of the participants’ perceptions throughout their careers as English teachers. Rose, Bina, Lisa, and Sandra described how in the International English teaching industry there is an established pay scale, which is
based on country of origin and the associated accent. Rose spoke about how non-native teachers were not provided the same pay as native teachers: “they got us cheap the non-native teachers were always cheap because we did not require all of the benefits” (Rose, Quote 118). These participants indicated that a British accent yields the highest potential salary.

For Rose, Bina, Lisa, and Sandra, the belief they were taught that English acquisition was essential for future success was confirmed when they became employed as English teachers. Lisa spoke about how English has provided her with multiple job opportunities and financial security. She said:

Yes, I was more in control because of English. It was a very important aspect. It gave me economic and financial security and more confidence level, for sure. And, I realized that especially being a woman in Bangladesh, it is very important to have skills, proper skills, to be able to get jobs, because it is very very hard to get jobs. So it did help me in so many different ways (Lisa, Quote 246).

For Lisa, her English-language skills afforded her multiple professional opportunities, which allowed her to determine her life choices and have a reliable income. For these four participants, working as English-language teachers has entrenched their belief that English is the most internationally valued medium of communication.

In addition to the participants’ descriptions of English being valued in education and in their professions, Estella, Helene, and Lisa described how English is valued in community interactions all over the world. Estella expresses the importance of her English-language skills for community interactions in Germany:

In terms of status, I think I really had an advantage in Germany because I speak English and many people value English…And so, and especially in Heidelberg, many people
speak English or speak a little bit of English, so Germans sometimes have a problem with foreigners but not with English speakers. So if you are American and you speak English, if you are British, or if you are international and you speak good English, then you are immediately valued. If you speak another language like Arabic or Turkish, then you might have a problem because nobody cares about your language. But if you speak English, then you are valued. It was always like my salvation to wherever place I went to, so not to be disrespected or looked down, I used English (Estella, Quote 59).

From this excerpt, it is clear that different languages appear to have contrasting value in community interactions. As Estella observed, English has been assigned higher value than other languages such as Arabic or Turkish in the German-speaking community. For that reason, Estella’s English-language skills were indispensable, as she was able to communicate with community members in a shared language even though English was not the dominant social language. Estella believed that English was her “salvation” as she was able to achieve respect in social interactions from the value placed on English.

From the findings, it is evident that despite having a multilingual repertoire, the participants asserted the belief that English is the most valued language for communication internationally. The participants further indicated that English-language skills are the most marketable for career opportunities in the field of language teaching.

5.4 Multilingualism and Hybrid Identity

All six participants in the study described how immigrating multiple times and learning multiple languages led them to identify with multiple identity categories. The participants’ narratives illustrated how they disassociated themselves from essentialist identification with a
single identity category related to one language and cultural context. All of the participants indicated that in their various migration contexts, others took notice of the contrasting language markers in their speech. This prompted others to routinely ask the participants the question: *Where are you from?* This question drew out the participants’ multi-identification, as they could not define themselves according to a single cultural context to answer the question. Sandra recalled an encounter where she was questioned about her background based on her accent:

I was asking the salesperson, one of the customers approached. Are you from England? And I said: no. I just said no. I just stop there because he is only interested whether I am from England and they are not really interested to know where I am from. Did you say what part of England? What part of England are you from? Birmingham or London? And I said neither one. So he just looked at me. Ok, I am from Lebanon and then goes, so do they have an English accent in Lebanon? This kind of accent is in Lebanon? So you know, then you have to explain. No, I actually went to English schools in Dubai so that is why my accent is not typically Lebanese, so it seems, so if I just say I am from Lebanon lots of expectations come with that… I think he said: Do they have the accent in Dubai or Lebanon? I said: No, I just went to English school and then I just said that is my life history. I said that because that is, obviously have repeated it so many times. That was like the last straw, so I said so that is my life story for you with a smile and he said: sorry I did not mean. I just wanted to know if you have met Kate Middleton, so I just laughed.

(Sandra, Quote 173)

Sandra’s complex history of migration made it difficult for her to label herself according to a single context or language. Even when she said, “I am from Lebanon” she was challenged because her language use contrasted with the other customer’s assumptions about people from
Lebanon. For these participants describing who they are requires reference to their entire life history of language learning and migration. The participants indicated that they could not express who they were according to a singular identity category.

Because the participants could not refer to one context and language to describe their identities they all described their sense of self in relation to being mixed and/or hybridized. Associating their identity with a sense of hybridity was the result of the participants’ identification with various aspects from their multiple migration contexts. Bina described her experience of immigrating multiple times and how she came to identify with each context where she lived:

When I first came to Canada, I was new in my school and everyone was trying to find out where I was from. This guy from the Polish kids asked me. I just came from Germany, and so I said I am from Germany, I am German. He laughed at me and said that I’m Polish. But for me, for me it was more complicated. I lived in Germany after Poland, before coming to Canada. I learned the language fluently and when I lived in Germany I was fully integrated into that culture. And so by living in Germany, for so long, I have adopted the language and the culture as part of my identity. My identity formation happened for the most part in Germany. I guess that kid did not understand that that language and place became a part of my identity. I was developing a hybrid identity based on where I have lived and where I was living now. It was difficult to call myself a Canadian at that time, but now I do in some ways... These places and languages have molded me into the hybrid that I am. (Bina, Quote 118)

This excerpt speaks of the way in which Bina’s migration from Poland, to Germany, and then to Canada allowed her to associate with various cultural contexts/communities and
languages. For this participant the cultural and linguistic components were additive in the sense that each aspect contributed to her sense of self. The transitions across cultures and languages and the identification she developed in each context led her to develop a hybrid sense of self. As the participants were continually in a process of losing connection to their previous context and forming connections to their new context, their identity was always in a state of flux, compiling itself in relation to their self-concept at the time. This was a significant process as each participant made reference to her hybridized identities and how the migration and the language-learning process has transformed the way she understands and describes her sense of self.

Although all of the participants described their identity as hybridized, four of the six participants also indicated that they had a singular identity related to their ethnicity. In one of the accounts, Estella described herself ethnically as strictly Brazilian:

I am a professor from Germany, and everybody expects a German person to come in and present, and then I come and it is obvious that I don’t look German. So I always have to explain, I am a German citizen but I am not German, explain when I talk to people and so they: I don’t want to be identified as German. So I always somehow find a way to say that I am Brazilian, and so for me it is very clear, very clear identity as Brazilian. (Estella, Quote 9)

In this excerpt Estella correlated her Brazilian identity with her culture and appearance without making reference to a linguistic correlation. However, in another experience described by the participant, when fellow Brazilian academics expected her to publish in Portuguese, relating her linguistic and ethnic identity as Brazilian, she countered this ascription by indicating she only publishes in English. She described this encounter as follows:
Brazilian colleagues ask me to publish a book chapter. They gave me a topic. I said sorry, I am not going to write it in Portuguese I prefer to write it in English and if you want you can translate it into Portuguese, and they were very surprised, and you know English is my work language… So they were a bit disappointed you know. You are Brazilian, but you only write in English. This is weird, so this is, this has been an issue for me. (Estella, Quote 123)

This description indicates how the participant appears to disassociate her identity affiliation with her language preference from her ethnic identity. The two variant perspectives indicated by Estella’s descriptions seem to indicate how despite ascription to a singular Brazilian identity she identifies with multiple categories according to the languages she speaks and her cultural experiences: “I have all these three aspects, you know. All the three languages, three cultures mixed in myself, you know” (Estella, Quote 167). Similarly to Estella, the other three participants, Bina, Lisa, and Sandra indicated having a single ethnic identity; however, they framed their identity as hybridized when speaking about their multicultural and multilingual experiences.

From the interviews, it was evident that the participants embraced the hybridization of their identities as a natural result of the state of globalization where increasingly more people migrate across multiple national contexts. The participants indicate that fixing their identity according to a singular concept was more valued by others rather than by themselves. The tendency of others was to perpetually attempt to index their identities according to singular categories of language and national origin. For the participants, defining oneself according to a singular category was irrelevant in scope of their complex migratory trajectories and the impact on identity. As Rose indicated:
I know I can slot my identity in many places, and according to many languages, but I mean, to determine a precise reading of myself seems more important for others rather than me. I am, there is no determination or solution to a self like that, and ultimately there doesn’t need to be. (Rose, Quote 457)

The participants all express the sentiment that “there doesn’t need to be” a singular “determination” of the self. For them, a hybrid identity is the emerging norm in the world.

Four of the participants see themselves as “global citizen[s]” (Rose, Quote 329) where their migratory experiences contribute to an emerging notion of identity, as internationalism becomes the dominant framework for shaping and understanding identity. The accounts indicated that reference to being a global person was based in generating a conceptualization of a space for belonging. Estella expresses her association with the global concept:

People know me as this person from the world and who has lived around the world and many places so in a way I am Brazilian but I also but also a world citizen: an international person or international citizen. (Estella, Quote 153)

Through this the concepts of global and international, the participants were able to situate their multi-identification according to a perception of membership (i.e. citizenship) and belonging.

5.5 Language Influencing Cultural Mentality

All of the participants in the study learned languages in new migration contexts through social interactions with community members in the new contexts. The acquisition of language through interactions with community members in each cultural context led the participants to take on cultural beliefs, values, attitudes, and perceptions, as a cultural mentality which they perceived to be associated with the cultural milieu and language. Five of the six participants
indicated that learning languages through social interactions impacted their sense of self by generating an association between their cultural mentality and the language they utilize. Helene described how her sense of self changes according to the cultural mentality she associates with a given language from her repertoire:

   Your thinking is with the language. Behind every language there’s a thinking, there’s a way of thinking. The way how I think when I speak Trinidadian is very different when I start to speak French. Automatically, my thinking changes; I all of a sudden see myself differently too. My concept of myself, to change the way how I say things, have a different meaning. (Helene, Quote 248)

From this excerpt, we can see how when Helene transitions between languages she also transitions between cultural mentalities. For Helene her thinking is based on the cultural mentality of a given cultural group associated with a national context, and so when she switches between languages she switches between cultural mentalities.

   Helene described how her process of learning new languages occurred at the same time as she was attempting to integrate into a new cultural context. This integration involved adopting culturally specific perceptions and behaviors. The simultaneous acquisition of a cultural mentality and the associated language led the participants to think according to the cultural mentality while using the specific language. Helene described the correlation between a context, language, and her cultural mentality:

   From the language of learning French in France, this I find is so interesting, that I adapted to the mentality of how people think from learning the language of French. So even here, when I start to speak French, I feel a little bit different. It’s almost as though, I feel, I
transpose myself, like I went into another realm of what it felt like to be there, how I felt when I was there. (Helene, Quote 48)

This excerpt illustrates how for Helene, the French language is always connected to the national context in which she learned the language. While in France, Helene indicated that she was trying to behave and take on the attitudes of French people around her. By taking on a French cultural mentality during her language acquisition, the French language was imprinted with the cultural mentality Helene developed in France.

Participants Lisa, Estella, and Bina associated cultural mentalities with the function of language according to the culture of given social domains (i.e. family, professional) in which their languages were used during their migratory process. Lisa described the correlation between language, cultural mentality, and social domain:

I think in all of the four languages. That is also something, like I can think in all of them. Like, for example, thinking of let’s say whenever I am thinking of a professional matter, I am thinking in English, but then when I think of my childhood, when I get nostalgic, I start thinking in German, especially when I think of Germany, or I consciously can see myself. And then when it comes to, like when it comes to relaxing, I like to listen to Hindi songs that relaxes me the most, even more than Bengali. So the time that I was with friends in India for example, that is how we would hang out, you know, like we would speak in Hindi and it was for many years when I was going to university and stuff. And it was very emotional attachment to Hindi songs and it relaxes me a lot. So, I would.

When it comes to relaxation and entertainment, I tend to think in Hindi. (Lisa, Quote 43)

For this participant, English was associated with the cultural mentality of the professional domain as she learned English primarily in academic contexts. Hindi took on the association
with the cultural mentality of the emotional/friendship domain as it was learned mainly through social interactions with friends in India. For Lisa, every language she acquired became associated with a cultural mentality according to the domain in which that language was learned in her life.

For one of the participants, her cultural mentality was correlated with cultures from given national contexts as well as specific social domains. For Rose, some of the languages in her repertoire seem to be correlated with the culture of a social domain, whereas others seem to be correlated with the culture specific to a national context. This dichotomy is illustrated in this excerpt:

I react to it from the perception of a person who knows the Tamil language and the Tamil culture that comes with the language that brings in its stereotypes and prejudices. Then, when I want to objectify it, then I will use the English language, like when I write about it, immediately connect to the famous theorists with the system that it requires to have, that perception, that it requires it. So when I write, I like to objectify everything because of the language, so I just use English, but my first reaction, my emotional reaction, probably from the languages that I have learned, so it is the culture that comes with the language, the emotional, very strong emotional quality to Bengali culture that makes me react. And then, the very strong critical character of the Tamil language, that makes me very critical of whatever, how I react to something. And then, the objective nature of the English language, which comes with that kind of Western empiricism, that talks about this. When you want to write about something, attach or, you know, what to have, a value judgment on something, so immediately, that distance, that objectivism comes into play.
So I think, that that is what I would say, I react to something that is how language influences the way that I perceive everything. (Rose, Quote 742)

In this excerpt, Rose describes a Tamil cultural mentality according to her perceptions of Tamil attitudes and values in the Tamil Nadu region of the national context of India where she acquired the Tamil language. The acquisition of language in that cultural context correlated her experience of the cultural mentality with the Tamil language. This drew out the idea that speaking in Tamil generated a Tamil cultural mentality. Rose acquired English predominantly in academic domains leading her to associate the function of English with the cultural mentality (objectivism, Western empiricism) she took on in the academic domains. Rose associated English with a cultural mentality of Western empiricism, which was her perception of the academic culture present in the universities she attended where she developed and utilized English.

The narratives suggest that the participants developed cultural beliefs, perceptions, and values while interacting with members of given cultural communities. This development of a cultural mentality seems to have occurred through the acquisition of a given language in interactions with community members. The cultural mentality the participants developed seem to be relative to their perceptions of the expanse of a cultural context, be it limited to specific domains like academia or family, or correlated with an entire nation, or people.

The participants described having an awareness of their variance in cultural mentalities of different cultural groups and how languages correlate to cultural mentalities. In one of the interviews, one of the participants illustrated her perception of two distinct cultural mentalities associated with two of the languages in her repertoire:

I think that languages carry a culture and I feel aware of two different cultures that are completely different as well because it’s not like European and another European culture
it’s actually Arabic and European so it’s kind of very different cultures, I think that makes you more understanding. (Sandra, Quote 406)

Sandra stressed that Arab and European cultures differ significantly. She suggests that her perception of the dichotomy between these two cultures gives her greater understanding of the spectrum of variance of the cultural mentalities associated with each of her languages. This participant associated her understanding of differences in cultural beliefs and attitudes with her own propensity to be more open and receptive as a person towards cultural differences of others. Other participants indicated a similar openness towards cultural differences based on their multiple languages and associated cultural mentalities:

I feel I have a little advantage in terms of understanding different cultural backgrounds and the fact that it’s different. I have a little bit more openness and tolerance for different mindsets because every language behind a language is a different mind set so I believe that this ability to speak different languages makes me tolerant to different cultures like different perceptions perspectives mind-sets, yeah. (Helene, Quote 239)

Helene suggested that understanding how language and culture are correlated to different cultural mentalities allowed her to be perceptive of cultural relativity and accepting of differences. These participants perceived language and cultural mentalities as interrelated, as Rose pointed out: “to come to terms with a complete system with not only just language but consciousness a new system of thinking and a new system of expression” (Rose, Quote 569). The narratives by Bina, Helene, Lisa, Rose, and Sandra have suggested that they have internalized the perception of cultural relativity leading them to respond to all languages, cultures, and mindsets with a readiness to accept diversity.
5.6 Use of Technical Language Knowledge in the Language Classroom

Through the process of migration, the participants of this study have acquired multiple languages. Experiences of personally acquiring multiple languages have allowed them to develop vast technical knowledge in relation to the language-learning process. Four participants indicated that they drew on their technical language knowledge to assist their students in the language-learning process. Two of the participants indicated that through their personal experiences of learning multiple languages, they have been able to generate an acute awareness of their students’ language-proficiency levels. Lisa discussed the correlation between her personal language-learning experiences and her understanding of the needs of her students according to their proficiency levels. She stated:

"Especially since I have different level of proficiencies of language at different times. So I understand different level of learners and how to approach different learners. So that is something that really helped me. Because I know if someone is at is at this level, I know how to approach this kind of person and it will not help if someone is at a different level. So I have been able to use effective strategies and ways to teach or deal with learners of different levels. (Lisa, Quote 494)"

It can be ascertained from Lisa’s excerpt that her understanding of students’ proficiencies allowed her to tailor her teaching practices to support each student according to their individual progress in their language acquisition.

Four other participants indicated that their multiple language-learning experiences generated linguistic knowledge specific to grammar knowledge that improved their language teaching capacity. Bina’s statement indicates how her personal experience of learning grammar in a subsequent language has expanded her grammar teaching ability. She explained:
You know, it is so important that I have learned other grammars, for me as a teacher. I have never overtly learned Polish grammar and so if I only had one language, I could probably not be effective in explaining grammatical structures to learners. Having multiple grammar knowledge, I am able to use those in class and explain to my students such concepts as the passive voice or the past participle. Learning English later in life, I had to acquire all of the grammatical structures. This way I am able to focus on grammar easily in classes, and I am always eager to teach grammar. I know it. I feel confident with it. It is not difficult for me. The grammatical structures are not taught enough in the first language, but that is because you will just get it naturally since you are young. (Bina, Quote 280)

It is clear from this excerpt that because acquisition of the first language does not overtly entail learning grammatical concepts, it is through the acquisition of a subsequent language that the participant was able to gain a direct understanding of the rules of grammar. For this participant, learning grammar in a subsequent language allowed her to gain confidence in her grammatical knowledge, which improved her capacity to teach grammar in her first language.

Additionally two participants described using their multilingual repertoires to explain vocabulary to students from the target language by identifying vocabulary from their own repertoire that correlated to the students’ repertoire. Drawing on her French vocabulary, Sandra demonstrated how she was able to help her Spanish-speaking students comprehend unknown vocabulary in the target language of English:

Many of the things that the Spanish students say, or the Brazilians, especially is very similar to French, so I can help them you know. What I realize, well ok, it’s similar, it’s a French word they are trying to say something that I know exists in French, and I can just
tell them in English... If he said something in Spanish and it was similar to French, I knew what he was saying or if I was trying to say something in English, and there was no way that he could understand it. So I could try French and it would be similar or maybe they could guess if I said it in French, because they have some similar words. (Sandra, Quote 426)

Identifying cognate vocabulary (words in different languages that have shared origins and meanings) and loanwords (words that are adopted into one language from another language) between her linguistic repertoire and those of her students assisted her in explaining the target language vocabulary by drawing on her students’ prior knowledge. Activating students’ prior vocabulary knowledge helped the students gain understanding of new vocabulary rapidly and thus expedite the comprehension process.

The findings revealed that participants drew on the technical language-learning knowledge they acquired during the process of migration. This technical knowledge allowed the participants to explain linguistic concepts to students more effectively. Furthermore, as these participants were language students themselves, they indicated that they were better able to discern the needs of their students and adjust their pedagogy accordingly to ensure their students’ successful acquisition of the target language.

5.7 Identity in the Language Classroom

All of the participants learned multiple languages throughout their migratory process. These participants indicated that learning languages in new social contexts influenced their identity formation as they personally identified with these multiple languages and these cultural contexts. Four of the participants indicated that they drew on these experiences as part of their
pedagogical approach by cultivating discussions in the classroom about their own identity as well as their students’ identities. For these participants the discussion of identity was designed to illustrate to their students that learning a subsequent language is an investment in a changing identity as well as an investment in a language.

Three of the participants, Helene, Estella, and Bina focused on sharing their own identity in the classroom to encourage their students to consider their identities in the language-learning process. Bina describes her rationale for this pedagogical approach:

I like to tell my students about my identity and how it is so connected to places, people, cultures, and languages. I think that that helps students see who I am and not be afraid to open up about their own identity. Once students know that the classroom is open to such components as culture, and that they have the freedom to talk about their identity, this allows for a kind of openness in the classroom and personal relationships to grow. Ultimately, I think that this openness can help students in their language learning. Language learning is essentially not just about learning a language, but it is about figuring out how that language impacts your previous identity, and how this new language learning shapes you into a new identity. Discussion of my own identity helps students to think through their own identity progression and language learning. (Bina, Quote 255)

In her approach, the participant discussed how language learning is not limited to the acquisition of linguistic skills but includes the formation of a new identity. For these three participants, by openly revealing their own identities to their students in the classroom context, they were able to encourage their students to correlate their language-learning process with their concept of self. Estella indicated that the expression of her own identity in the classroom can also encourage
students to retroactively consider their identity formation that occurred in the past from prior language acquisition. She described a specific case of this process from her teaching experiences:

> In my lectures, I say very clearly that I am Brazilian, and that I have lived in England, and I tell them very clearly about my identity. I think that this also helps them to not assume, to talk about their identity as well. Because many times, with our students, not only pupils in schools, but with our students at university, they want to hide their identity. So if they have a grandmother or parents of a different culture, they sometimes want to hide it. If they can, and I think, why should you hide it? Why should you hide who you are? And, why should this be something that you are ashamed of? So, I think, the fact, so I openly talk to them about those things and I think that it helps them open up, and I have experienced this many times in my teaching. So, I had one student at the end of the school year. She came to me and claimed to me: you know, after your lectures, I continued to start speaking Russian with my grandmother again. Because at some point, she has stopped and focused on German, and so the mother tongue is kind of forgotten and she came to me and said she realized how important it is for a child to keep on learning Russian. So I think, so I think that it has an impact in that sense, you know.

(Estella, Quote 192)

The participant found that by presenting her own identity in the classroom, one of her students was propelled to consider changes in her linguistic repertoire. Estella’s student was able to understand how the learning of one language contributed to the submergence of her other language and its associated sense of self.

Unlike these three participants, Rose describes how in her pedagogical approach she avoided referring to her own identity to shift all of the focus onto the validation of the students’
identities in the language-learning process. Rose spoke of her pedagogical approach to identity in the following excerpt:

I don’t like to talk about my own, about my, I feel very uncomfortable, but I love talking about other people. I love getting them to talk about culture because I want them to feel proud of their culture. I think this is the only way they, to manage learning a language, yeah, I think so. I think that came from my childhood and my schooling, where I was made to feel embarrassed about my culture and made to think of English culture, and English music, and English whatever, and English, English as aspirational, and how that has changed my thinking. And so, I don’t want to do that to them, I want them to feel extremely happy with themselves first of all. (Rose, Quote 715)

In this account, Rose reveals that her experiences of language learning made her cautious not to express her own identity while teaching, out of concern that she may make her students feel that their own identity is less valued. Rose indicated that her goal was to encourage students to value their identities and to consider the changes that might take place in regards to their identity as they are acquiring a new language.

From the findings, it is clear that the participants Bina, Estella, Helene, and Rose shared the same pedagogical goal in the language classroom, leading their students to consider language learning to be an investment in the process of identity formation. Different migratory experiences however have led the participants to different pedagogical approaches to achieving the same identity formation objective in the language classroom. Helene, Estella, and Bina stressed their personal experiences of language learning and identity formation, intending to encourage their students to do the same. Rose’s negative experiences associated with her language-learning
process led her to believe that it is preferable to focus entirely on students’ identities in their language-learning process.

5.8 From Language Learning to **Languaging**

All of the participants in the study indicated that developing students’ conversational fluency in the target language was their primary objective as language teachers. The participants’ preference for improving their students’ fluency in the target language seemed to be based on their own migratory experiences where the demands of social interactions required conversational fluency rather than academic knowledge (i.e. grammar). Helene recalled how learning a language in a new context required her to produce output immediately to negotiate the demands of conversations with local community members. She stated: “you know that that’s true, because if you’re put into a context where nobody else speaks the language, that’s how you learn it, you learn a different way to say what you’re going to say” (Helene, Quote 251). Having experienced this type of conversational negotiation in new migration contexts, all of the participants conveyed their belief that the fluent speech requirements present outside of the classroom should be transposed into the classroom.

Despite the participants’ active pursuit of developing conversational fluency in the target language classroom, all of the participants indicated that curriculum expectations often were a barrier to their goals. Participants suggested that the general focus in curriculum was on the development of grammar and writing skills rather than conversation skills in the target language. Bina described the perceived shortcomings of the standard curriculum expectations:

Many programs focus so intently on grammar development or writing in the foreign-language classroom but conversation development is often neglected. It is not considered
as an academic aspect of the language that gets credence. And as a result, students often complete language programs but end up not being capable of speaking the language, and I mean what is the point of learning the language this way? Can you go to cultural contexts where they use the language day to day? And can you immerse yourself into the community and bond linguistically with speakers of the language? No. That kind of teaching creates a situation, which is unlikely to support that. (Bina, Quote 233)

The participants’ focus on re-creating more realistic conversational conditions in their classrooms led them to draw on pedagogical strategies that increased the natural flow of conversation similar to their own experiences and conditions of language learning throughout their migration. Three participants indicated that encouraging their students’ communication in the target language even at low proficiency levels was beneficial at improving the students’ conversational fluency. Rose’s excerpt illustrates how she encouraged conversation in the language classroom at any stage of students’ linguistic proficiency:

I want them to create. For me, that is the most important thing about the language learning, that they should get to the creating process immediately. It is not, that should learn perfect communication first and then start creating. They should be creating from day one, not just learning that they should be creating. (Rose, Quote 746)

From this excerpt it is shown how Rose values speech output over accuracy in the target language. Her pedagogical approach is to ensure that students are continually creating output in the target language by engaging in conversation regardless of their language proficiency.

Three participants described how maximizing the conversational fluency of students at any proficiency level required teachers to be mindful of the effects of error correction on their students’ flow of conversation. Bina indicates that, “error correction ultimately doesn’t do any
good for building communication skills. It puts students on the spot and shy about using their communicative abilities” (Bina, Quote 268). Being conservative with error correction would encourage students to continue to produce language without feeling afraid of being identified for errors.

To develop conversational fluency, four participants indicated the important role of group work in the language classroom. These participants indicated that group work created more opportunities for students to utilize the target language in social interactions and facilitate a natural flow of conversation. Bina described how this natural flow of conversation allows her students to negotiate the dynamic linguistic demands of social interactions:

It’s collaborative, and it’s communicative, and it’s in flux, and not stagnant and it is connected, and as much as it is intellectual work it’s also a thing. So when they establish new connections with new people or with the same people but with different groups, connect with them in a new class, and through talking it’s a new kind of language that emerges. They don’t speak the same way with one group, the way they are with another group. Something that I have done they don’t understand consciously, probably not, but I can see that happening, and I find it exciting because they speak. The same person speaks differently in different groups and in different situations. He has learned to negotiate meaning in a particular way. So that is incredible for me that is what is important, not the standard learning of grammar exercises where I am saying something. (Bina, Quote 298)

As indicated by Bina, group work allows the students to explore unfamiliar utterances in the target language to negotiate linguistic meanings that were not intentionally determined by the teacher.
Some participants described grouping students with different linguistic backgrounds to encourage more effective negotiation of language use. One participant suggested that the mixing of students ensured their usage of the target language rather than resorting to a shared first language. Estella described a multilingual project she carried out where she connected her German-speaking class with a French-speaking class through teleconferencing to ensure they utilized their target language English:

I have a project, where German students interact with French-speaking students, through English as a lingua franca, and they do a lot of activities online, like they go shopping, and they use English, because this is the only language that they understand, so I think that it has an impact. (Estella, Quote 178)

Three other participants focused on mixing students from disparate backgrounds; however, they avoided a monolingual environment by encouraging the students to utilize multiple languages in communication to ensure that there would be no breakdown in the natural flow of conversation. Rose provided her rationale for encouraging her students to engage in multilingual communication:

I get students’ feelings. I’m not here trying to convert them into English speakers. I just want them to know it’s important to know the language for its functional purpose. So I want them to constantly engage in different languages whatever they are, so I talk to them about Mandarin, Cantonese, different dialects and I always tell them that these languages, so we must use them more often, then so on, so forth. So they always see that English is just one of the languages, not the language that they have to learn. (Rose, Quote 1110)

The above description points to the view that generating a multilingual focus in communication allows the students the flexibility to move from language to language encouraging
communication based on their full linguistic repertoires. This freedom in conversation encourages a natural flow of language that is not limited to their proficiency in the target language. Sandra indicated that allowing students to have conversational freedom in the classroom is crucial in language development. She stated: “there is nothing that I don’t allow actually, I mean classrooms have a lot of freedom...this is the key to learning English” (Sandra, Quote 1385). The participants who promoted multilingual conversations still oriented the classroom space around acquiring the target language but believed that multilingualism was a conduit for natural flow of conversation.

Three of the participants also emphasized inviting contentious topics of discussion into the classroom as a strategy for facilitating student conversation in the target language. Contentious discourse involved encouraging students to discuss politically and culturally sensitive topics. Rose indicated how speaking about contentious issues in the classroom facilitated conversational fluency.

When something flares up, because that creates the most memorable class, they don’t forget the way they had negotiated meaning and English in that particular class. They always remain with them rather than constantly talking about butterflies, which has no impact whatsoever, emotional bond with the language, you emotionally bond with the language and when you speak you are emotionally involved. So let me get them more emotionally involved, let them get emotionally involved, so I had most of risky stuff done in class. (Rose, Quote 532)

From Rose’s excerpt, we can see how contentious discourse requires students to negotiate social interactions that are emotionally sensitive, leading students to respond on a personal level and therefore invest emotionally in their opinion about the topic being discussed. The emotional
investment in the conversation generates active conversations between students in the classroom as well as in non-academic contexts. Sandra indicates that contentious discourse propels students to discuss classroom topics outside of class. She indicated: “it contributes to language learning outside of the classroom more than I think, because they go away from the classroom, and they are still asking about this” (Sandra, Quote 1187). These participants indicated that the emotional investment in conversation propelled students to continue conversations outside of the classroom to continue debating topics initiated in the classroom.

From the accounts of the participants, it is evident that their experiences of language learning and language use during the migratory process have led them to construct naturalistic conditions for language learning in their classrooms. Their pedagogical approach focused on developing students’ communicative fluency in the target language by creating group work scenarios where the students would engage in conversations that flowed naturally to mimic social interactions in authentic settings.
Chapter Six
Discussion

Re-conceptualizing Language Ideologies, Identity, and Language Pedagogy through the Lens of Migration

This chapter summarizes and examines the major findings presented in this thesis by responding to the research questions posed in the Chapter One. The discussion is broken down according to the three major research questions, which guided my investigation:

Research Question One: Do language teachers’ migratory experiences contribute to their beliefs and values about languages? How?

Research Question Two: Do language teachers’ migratory experiences contribute to a translingual sense of self? How?

Research Question Three: Do language teachers’ migration and language-learning experiences affect their pedagogy in the second-language teaching classroom? How?

6.1 Research Question One: Do language teachers’ migratory experiences contribute to their beliefs and values about languages? How?

Findings oriented around my first research question revealed that the six participants found themselves having to navigate the perceptions of ownership in both social and professional spaces where others would identify them as inauthentic or non-native speakers based on their speech patterns and country of origin (Bourdieu, 1991; van Dijk, 1995; Widdowson, 1994). As these participants began to identify others’ perception of language ownership, their beliefs about language being a tool for negotiating their communicative goals in social interactions emerged. The participants laboured to speak like the native-speaking members of the linguistic in-groups
in their migration contexts. By learning the language from the position of an outsider, the participants began to treat language as a social tool to grant social membership. By perceiving language as a social tool, participants did not view language as an internal facet of themselves that was intrinsic to their perception of identity. The perception of ownership became especially pronounced in the professional context where participants were not considered to have ownership of English because they were not born in countries where English is the dominant language. The stakeholders in their teaching contexts (parents, students, school management) associated ownership of English with being a native speaker of English; suggesting that the authority to establish the norms of English usage is based on the ownership associated with native speakers. From the participants’ narratives it seemed that the stakeholders perceived the participants to have derivative expertise in English as they acquired it as a skill for a profession rather than as a native of an English-speaking country. In this way both the participants and their perception of stakeholders associated their use of the English language as a social tool, rather than an internalized facet of the self as with a native speaker.

In one salient example, Bina was hired as a native teacher of English due to her native-like English language skills, despite her Polish background. Her belief in language ownership led her to feel like an impostor where she was perpetually on guard that her students would recognize her as a non-native speaker and cause her to lose authority as an English expert. This experience is what Kramsch (2012) terms imposture where a multilingual subject can achieve legitimacy as a speaker of a language but not authenticity as an authority in a subsequent language. This perception of non-native speakers was similarly found in Inbar-Lourie (2005) who indicated that non-native English teachers assumed their students perceived them as non-native speakers of English even when students did not always have this perception. The
participants relayed that their authority as experts in English was dependent on the perceptions of stakeholders about their ability to reproduce normative English usage as determined by native-speakers as owners of English. Other studies have shown that non-native English speakers are less confident in asserting ownership of English than native English speakers (Higgins, 2003), or are more likely to refer to exonormative sources, such as textbooks, for authority on English norms rather than their own personal authority (Subtirelu, 2011). Although the participants argued against the notion of language ownership and the valorization of native speakers as the standard for determining English norms, it appears that their belief in others’ perception of language ownership still impacted their willingness to assert their endonormative authority over English in their classrooms.

The participants additionally voiced the belief that English was, for them, the most valued language for communication in multiple contexts. This belief was developed from their early-education experiences where their parents and schools presented English as an economic commodity (Heller, 2003, 2010) that would be valued in multiple linguistic contexts. This belief was further substantiated by their ability to barter their English language skills in the English teaching market to achieve financial stability. The financial stability seemed to be mitigated by the aspect of ownership where participants indicated that despite being hired as English teachers, they were subject to a lower pay scale than their native-speaking counterparts. Research by Park (2011) speaks to the common belief in the promise of English as a valued international commodity that will yield those who possess it professional benefits. His research based in the South Korean context, argues that South Koreans learn English from a young age based on the promise of English, only to find that their accent is not recognized as legitimate, undermining the value of English in their repertoire. Similarly, Pennycook (2007) explains, “this thing called
English colludes with many of the pernicious processes of globalisation, [and] deludes many learners through the false promises it holds out for social and material gain...” (p. 101). What can be distilled from the findings is that despite the participants acquiring the valued commodity of English, the exchange value of English was variant according to whether a teacher was a native speaker or not. Although these participants believed that English was the most valued language for communication in multiple contexts, their experiences suggest that attaining the most value from a language in a linguistic exchange is dependent on others’ perceptions of their legitimacy and authority as owners of English.

6.2 Research Question Two: Do language teachers’ migratory experiences contribute to a translingual sense of self? How?

My second research question addressed the process of participants’ language learning during their migratory trajectory and its impact on identity formation. Through the process of migration, participants learned languages in various socio-cultural contexts thereby developing a multilingual repertoire. Findings from my participants’ narratives indicated that their socialization experiences through the acquisition of languages inherently influenced their formation of identities. Similar research has suggested that the acquisition of language is embroiled in socialization experiences that influence the formation of a learner’s identity (e.g. Baynham, 2003, 2006; Block, 2003, 2006; Baynham & De Fina, 2005; Casanave, 2002; De Fina, 2003; Gee, 2000; Harklau, 2000; Kanno, 2003; McKay & Wong, 1996; Norton, 2000; Pavlenko 2001; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004; Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000; Toohey, 2000). The participants in my study described their identities as hybridized; this was associated with the constant flux of disconnecting and connecting with cultures and languages as they moved between multiple
cultural contexts. Every time participants acquired a new language and expanded their multilingual repertoire they needed to renegotiate their self-concept according to their experiences of language learning within every localized sociocultural context. This behaviour consequently resulted in an understanding of their identity as a hybridized aggregate of their multiple local language-learning experiences. Similarly, studies by Kooy and de Freitas (2007), Menard-Warwick (2008) and Motha, Jain, and Tecle (2012) found that for language teachers multiple migratory experiences led to multiple identity affiliations to varying degrees across the multiple contexts in which they lived. Overall, the participants in my study embraced the hybridity of their identity as an inevitable consequence of globalization associated with complex migratory trajectories and the acquisition of subsequent languages resulting from such a process.

In contrast to the participants’ perception of global trends towards complexity, they indicated that speaking to other people would often lead to others trying to fix their linguistic patterns to one cultural context, which suggested others’ higher comfort with a singular identity. As self-identification was for these participants rooted in their dynamic life history, their identity could not be perceived as singular or fixed to one context and language. Although the participants suggested that fixing their identity to one category was more important to others than it was for them, participants still referred to their identity using singular terminology such as global citizen or international person. These identity referents suggest perceived membership in a global community of transnational persons (ie. people with multiple migratory experiences and a multilingual repertoire) all of whom share similar experiences of globalization. As hybridity does not specifically describe a given community (imagined or real) the reference to a global community, or a global imaginary (Menard-Warwick, 2011) allows for the participants’ identity referent to generate a sense of group membership (Norton, 2010; Pavlenko & Norton, 2007).
Additionally, it seems that global citizenship requires both a complex migratory trajectory leading to a multilingual repertoire, but also proficiency in the English language as the perceived lingua franca of the global community. The participants’ continued reference to the benefits of English according to the access to multiple contexts that the language provides suggests that English proficiency is a necessary component of being global in the current manifestation of globalization.

Additionally, the experiences of transnational migration influenced the participants’ identities through their socialization experiences in cultural contexts where they acquired cultural mentalities through their acquisition of languages. Shweder, Goodnow, Hatano, LeVine, Markus, and Miller (2007) argue, “the self is grounded in the mentalities and practices (the custom complex) associated with being an ‘I’ (a subject) in a particular community” (p. 750). The development of a mentality occurs in relation to participating in a community where meanings are generated and shared through linguistic exchanges (Shweder, Goodnow, Hatano, LeVine, Markus & Miller, 2007). The socialization experiences an individual has in a given cultural context can lead to “many mentalities through the symbolic mediation of experience” (p. 740) in language use. Interestingly, the participants in my study categorized each language in their repertoire according to a different cultural mentality, which they developed in the sociocultural context where they acquired the specific language. The findings suggest that a cultural mentality was domain specific, being defined according to various contexts: national, academic, familial, etc. The determination of a domain was based on the function of the language in the participants’ socialization experiences in the correlating context. For example, Helene learned French while interacting with French community members in France, and as such she associates French language with the cultural mentality of French people within the national context. Lisa and Rose
learned English while interacting with professors and students in university settings, leading them to associate English with the cultural mentality of academia present in an academic setting.

Bylund and Athanasopoulos (2014) suggest that the cultural environment of an L2 learner influences his/her behaviours and attitudes relative to the language he/she is learning as “an L2 speaker who is immersed in the L2 community is exposed to the behavior of the target language speakers, as well as the environment they interact with” (p. 972). Increased exposure to an environment, where the learner acquires greater proficiency in their L2, will lead to greater changes to his/her behaviours and attitudes associated with that language use (Bylund & Athanasopoulos, 2014). The participants in my study had prolonged experiences of exposure to multiple cultural contexts, statements in their narratives suggested that the socialization they experienced through language acquisition impacted their cultural mentalities.

By having multiple cultural mentalities associated with each language that was learned in specific sociocultural contexts, participants described themselves as being more open to cultural differences. Alred, Byram, and Fleming (2003) argue that when individuals migrate into new cultural contexts they experience “the conventions and values by which people in other groups live” (p. 3). The understanding of how individuals are socialized into given cultural mentalities can lead an individual to develop intercultural competence, which is “the capacity to reflect on the relationships among groups and the experience of those relationships. It is both the awareness of experiencing otherness and the ability to analyse the experience and act upon the insights into self and other” (p. 4). In a study with language teachers with transnational experiences, Bujas-Grubar (2014) found that for her participants “their multilingual and multicultural experiences contributed to their personal growth [into] tolerant, open and understanding personalities” (p. 13). Similarly, Widiyanto (2005) found that transnational migration led a language teacher to
become open to cultural and linguistic diversity through his situated knowledge of cultural and linguistic relativity derived from his migratory experiences. For the participants in my study, their first-hand experience of developing diverse cultural mentalities situated in sociocultural contexts led them to understand the diversity of others and how other cultures and languages could be conducive to having other cultural mentalities. The participants described having internalized this understanding leading them to become more open-minded towards diversity, which is suggestive of intercultural competence.

6.3 Research Question Three: Do language teachers’ migration and language-learning experiences affect their pedagogy in the second-language teaching classroom? How?

In response to the third research question, the findings from the personal narratives of the participants suggested that their personal migration and language-learning experiences influenced their pedagogical approach. The participants’ personal experiences of language learning involved changes to their identity formation in relation to each language they learned. As a result, some participants made pedagogical choices to openly discuss their identity formation experiences with their students to substantiate parallels between their own experiences and the experiences of their students with the goal of helping students negotiate their own identity changes. Similar research by Ajayi (2011), Ellis (2006), and Lotherington (2011) illustrated how teachers from migrant backgrounds drew on their identity in their language classrooms by expressing their biographical experiences to help students relate their own identities to the process of language learning. Morgan (2004) suggests that although a teacher’s identity can be a valuable resource during language instruction, it is important for teachers to be critical of their use of identity as pedagogy due to the authority teachers have over their students.
In my study, only one participant was critically reflective of the potential issue of using one’s identity in the context of language instruction. In retrospect of her own language-learning experiences, where one of her teachers had asserted her British identity as superior to her students, this participant avoided expressing her own identity in the classroom to prevent her students from feeling negatively towards their identity, as she had as a student. Still, for all participants the impact of language learning on their identity formation led them to actively orient their pedagogical approach where their students could navigate the formation of their identities during their own language-acquisition process.

The research also showed that by learning languages in naturalistic language acquisition contexts, the participants formed the belief that in-context language learning is an effective approach to language acquisition. For these participants language learning was situated as a social mediation where they learned languages to integrate into social communities. Language acquisition as a primarily socially determined process of interaction between interlocutors is described by Swain (2008), as *languaging*, where language use is conceived of as a sociocultural process of shared meaning making. Interaction between interlocutors is situated as the primary framework for understanding language use and acquisition (Juffermans, 2011; Møller & Jørgensen, 2009; Shohamy, 2006; Swain, 2008; Swain, Brooks, & Tocalli-Beller, 2002). For the participants in my study, language learning was situated in rapidly acquired conversational fluency to be able to attain legitimacy as a social in-group member through social interactions. Based on these experiences the participants attempted to replicate naturalistic language contexts in their classrooms to focus on the interactional nature of language use and acquisition by privileging conversational fluency over all other skills of language learning. To facilitate this approach three participants encouraged contentious discourse between students in their
classrooms. By getting students to discuss contentious topics (e.g. politics), they were more likely to invest emotionally in conversations, which instigated naturalistic conversational exchanges akin to how students converse outside of class. The participants suggested that this approach propelled students to use the target language in naturalistic conversation exchanges external to academic settings. Interestingly one participant encouraged her students to engage in translanguaging (Wei & Garcia, 2014) where she allowed her students to draw on their full linguistic repertoire and use multiple languages to best accomplish conversational exchanges. This approach was based in her belief that students should use language as it is used in naturalistic language contexts, which for her included the free use of one’s full linguistic repertoire. Furthermore, these three participants described avoiding the correction of students’ speech errors to ensure that students could speak confidently without focusing on error avoidance. In related research, Arioğul (2007), Golombek (1998), Mori (2011), and Yoshihara (2012) indicated that multilingual language teachers with migratory experiences were reluctant to engage in error correction of their students’ speech. Their reluctance was related to their experiences of language learning, where error correction made them feel insecure about speaking in the target language. My participants, similar to these teachers, wanted to ensure that their students continued to produce output confidently (Arioğul, 2007; Golombek, 1998; Mori, 2011).

The experience of learning multiple languages provided the participants with an acute understanding of technical language knowledge. Four participants described how overtly learning grammar in their subsequent languages provided them significant grammar expertise, which improved their ability to teach grammar in their language classrooms. Research on non-native teachers of English describes how these teachers indicate that learning English as a subsequent language has provided them with superior knowledge of grammar and a superior
ability to teach grammar to second-language learners (Árva & Medgyes, 2000; Ellis, 2006; Kayi-Aydar, 2011). Further, research indicates that non-native teachers who learned English as a subsequent language have a preference for grammar teaching rather than *communicative language teaching* (Richards, 2006; Richards & Rodgers, 2014) approaches (Assalahi, 2013; Azad, 2013; Nishimuro & Borg, 2013; Nishino, 2008; Woods & Çakir, 2011). In these studies, non-native teachers learned English as a foreign language in their country of origin and did not have migratory experiences. Could experiences of migration be a factor in determining which pedagogical approach was utilized? Possibly, given that my participants who had multiple migratory experiences described that they avoided grammar instruction, preferring to centralize the development of their students’ conversational fluency, an approach more in line with *communicative language teaching* methodology (Candlin, 1976; Richards, 2006; Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

Overall, participants relied on their personal experiences of language learning to inform their pedagogy, at times superseding the curriculum expectations. Related research echoed this result, stipulating that teachers with language-learning experiences in multiple contexts are likely to depend on their own personal experiences as their primary resource for setting a pedagogical approach (Borg, 1998; Ellis, 2004; Mori, 2011; Rayati Damavandi & Roshdi, 2013). Borg (1998) and Rayati Damavandi and Roshdi (2013) indicated that teachers in their studies would structure their pedagogical approaches according to their personal experiences, even when their approaches contradicted the expectations in their actual teaching practice. Based on my participants’ usage of personal experiences as a basis for their pedagogical approach, it can be concluded that they believed that they had attained sufficient understanding of the language-
learning process, as well as insights into language-identity formation, to project appropriate pedagogical approaches for their students.
Chapter Seven

Implications, Limitations, and Conclusions

The final chapter of this thesis provides implications related to this research and proposes suggestions for future research. In this section, the limitations of this research are also addressed. This chapter concludes the study with a few closing remarks.

7.1 Implications and Further Research

There are multiple implications, which can be ascertained from the research on the migratory history of language teachers. The narrative inquiry approach utilized in this research has been effective at uncovering the relationship between my participants’ personal experiences of migration and language learning to their pedagogical practices. My research approach began by writing my own auto-ethnographic migration narrative, which allowed me to reflect on my personal experiences resulting from my migration and language-learning experiences. Through this reflection I was able to better understand concepts of language ideologies, identity, and language pedagogy, which became salient during the process of narrativization of my migratory experiences. My reflection provided me insight that allowed me to explore the complex trajectories of my participants through their narratives. From analysis of these narratives, I was able to construct a holistic portrait of my participants that elucidated the multifaceted correlations between experiences of social interactions, language acquisition, and identity formation bounded by socio-cultural contexts. This approach was integral to drawing out the relationship of the participants’ vast range of life moments and their continuing influence on their current behaviour in terms of their pedagogical approaches. As a result, narrative inquiry
can be helpful in determining the associations between past experiences and current practices of teachers.

Language teachers can utilize narrative inquiry for professional development to probe their own personal experiences and better understand the relationship between those experiences and their pedagogical choices (Johnson & Golombek, 2002). Language teachers in particular could probe their own narratives to examine their own language learning from a holistic, emic, and longitudinal span relative to socio-cultural contexts. By understanding their own language-learning experiences these teachers would be better able to draw parallels to their students’ language-learning experiences to provide relevant support based on a shared understanding of the implications of learning a new language.

The study indicates that teachers’ with transnational experiences gain valuable first-hand knowledge of cultural and linguistic processes. The implications of this knowledge suggest that multilingual teachers are adept at guiding language students through the process of acquisition given their shared experience of being language learners (Ellis, 2004; 2006; 2013; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). Such teachers are able to tailor their language teaching approaches according to the individual linguistic needs of students (Kayi-Aydar, 2011; Richards & Farrell, 2005). Multilingual teachers are also able to draw on their multilingual repertoires to provide to the point grammar and vocabulary explanations by illustrating relationships between languages (Ellis, 2006; Kayi-Aydar, 2011). Also, multilingual teachers with migratory experiences understand the influence that language acquisition has potentially on cultural mentalities and identity formation. These teachers are able to help their students navigate the interlinking between language, cultural contexts, cultural mentalities, and identity that occurs in the process of becoming multilingual (Ellis, 2006). Furthermore, the participants in my study attempted to
develop classroom contexts, which mimic real world contexts of language usage by focusing on languaging (Swain, 2008) to approximate the sociocultural reality of language usage (Thorne & Lantolf, 2006). Language teachers who have experienced learning a language in a foreign context understand the need to teach language from a communicative framework based in social relations.

To this end, it seems plausible to suggest that language teachers’ personal language-learning experiences assist in their understanding of the needs of language learners in the acquisition process. However, teachers who rely on their language-learning experiences to inform their pedagogy should not assume that their own personal experiences will map onto their students’ experiences. For example, in my study all participants learned languages in naturalistic settings but it may be the case that some of their students are learning an L2 in their L1 context potentially leading to a different outcome for their identity. In this respect, teachers need to be cognizant of their student’s biographical trajectories (needs, learning trajectories, and expectations) and how their language-acquisition process may impact them differently. In the case of my participants, their journeys revealed significant variations in their biographical trajectories. These variations led to idiosyncratic perspectives in relation to language ideologies, identities, and language pedagogies. For example, when my participants discussed their educational experiences, one of the participants indicated that she did not want to be exposed to her teacher’s identity during her learning process; whereas, some of my other participants, when they reflected on their learning histories, indicated that they welcomed the expression of teacher identity in the classroom. The uniqueness of my participants’ biographies in their language-learning process is an indication of the different possible ramifications of multiple migratory experiences for the needs of learners.
The implication of language teachers projecting their understanding of language learning onto their students is that they may choose to supersede curriculum expectations and the individual goals of students in favour of their own perceptions. For example, the participants in my study avoided error correction, even though some of their students wanted to have more corrective feedback. Further research is needed to explore how teachers with language-learning experiences map their experiences onto their students’ language-learning process and to ascertain what impact this mapping might have on students’ experience of language learning. This research would require classroom observations, and student interviews to establish the dynamics between teachers’ projections of language-learning processes and students’ perceptions of their own language-learning process, needs, and goals. Educators need to be reflective of the potential pitfalls of utilizing their personal knowledge base as a primary resource in the language classroom as they might become unresponsive to the needs of curriculum as well as their students’ linguistic goals.

7.2 Limitations

This study was based on my attempt to corroborate my actual transnational experiences with those of others. This necessitated asking questions that would induce participants to explore their personal life history for experiences related to the goals of this study. The process of analyzing the narratives was subject to confirmation bias as I was the sole interpreter of the narrative data. This increased the likelihood that I would identify themes in my participants’ narratives that would have similarities with my own. The use of semi-structured interviews and open-ended questions was intended to allow participants to express their own personal perceptions and experiences related to their transnational experiences (Wengraf, 2001) reducing
the impact of interviewer bias on the resulting narratives. Although narrativizing past experiences is inherently subjective and bound to the process of revision, this is not a process where individuals intentionally manufacture fabricated stories but engage in a process of reconstruction (Strawson, 2004). As such, the narratives provided by the participants are reconstructions of their life experiences according to their own interpretation of those experiences in relation to the context of the interviews.

There are several additional limitations of this study. One of the limitations pertains to the participant selection. The requirements to participate in this study were based on highly specific criteria, which reduced the number of individuals who could qualify for the study. As a result, the influence of the demographics of the study could not be anticipated or specifically accounted for. All of the participants were female and had varied migratory trajectories with different linguistic and cultural experiences. Because of this aspect, it was impossible to consider any demographic or socioeconomic influences on the results of the study. Although I had a limited number of participants in my study, by focusing my investigation on few participants, I was able to gain an in-depth perspective of their experiences of migration and language learning. Observing my participants in the context of their classroom would have allowed for triangulation of the data by determining to what extent their prior experiences shaped their pedagogical choices.

7.3 Closing remarks

To investigate the research questions proposed in this study, I interviewed six language teachers with transnational migratory experiences. Data collection methods consisted of semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions pertaining to their migration and language-
learning experiences. Participants narrativized their transnational migratory experiences by recollecting their memories of the migration and language-learning process. The multiple migratory experiences described by the participants in this study are becoming the prevailing reality for increasingly more people (Appadurai, 1996; Blommaert, 2010; Vertovec 2004, 2009). My research reveals that the migratory process is never a simple act of an individual moving to another context; it involves the acquisition of subsequent languages and exposure to new culture and social communities. For the participants the process of acquiring new languages in new contexts is often a means for negotiation of cultural integration as well as a means of redefining self-perceptions. Analysis of the participants’ migratory experiences in relation to the pedagogical context of language learning and teaching reveals the importance of examining the relationships between migratory experiences and pedagogical choices. As language teachers’ lives are becoming increasingly complex through the process of their migration and personal language-learning processes, the impact of life experiences remains relatively underexplored in relation to second-language acquisition (Ellis, 2013). The experiences and abilities of non-native teachers are often marginalized in relation to their authority to determine legitimate teaching of language in the language classroom (Kramsch & Zhang, 2015). In the SLA context, Kramsch and Zhang (2015) indicates that it is time to draw on translingual teachers’ “rich experiences as expatriates and to learn from their unconventional trajectories, their imagination and their resourcefulness” (p. 112). This study adds to the growing body of research that reveals that narratives of teachers with migration and language-learning experiences are unique and contribute valuable expertise to the profession of language teaching.

This research provides an exploration into the complex relationships between migratory experiences and language learning in relation to identity and ideology. Understanding these
complex relationships allows a broader understanding of how such relationships within the lives of language teachers can have an impact on their pedagogical practices. Additionally, the analysis provides insight into improving the pedagogical practice and professional development of language teachers.
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Appendices

Interview Protocol

Appendix A

Interview 1:

1. What language do you teach?
2. Tell me about your first job teaching X?
3. How about your experiences getting jobs teaching this language?
4. How do you identify yourself culturally?
5. Would you draw a timeline of where you have lived, and what language/s you learned and spoke in each place for our next interview? If you have any pictures of yourself at that time, please bring them in.

Appendix B

Interview 2:

6. Where were you born? What language/s did you speak there? With whom?
7. What was your political status in country?
8. How did you identify yourself culturally?
9. How did your family fit into the cultural context of that country?
10. What were your schooling experiences in this language?
11. How were the language/s you spoke perceived at school?
   
   Loop back to 12 for new place
12. How old were you when you moved to X?
13. What was the status of your language/s there?
14. Did you have to learn a new language? Tell me about learning language X.
15. How has your language ability changed over the moves?

   Repeat basic questions for each context

Appendix C

Interview 3:

16. What languages do you speak and/or practice now? With whom?

17. How do you perceive your identity in relation to the language(s) you spoke/learned/lost over time?

18. How did experiencing and learning multiple languages during your migration process inform your beliefs and values about languages?

19. What role do you think your language learning experience/language knowledge plays in relation to your practices as a language teacher?

20. In session 1, you identified yourself culturally as X. Does that identification change with context? Does it inform your language teaching practices in the classroom?
Consent Form

Appendix D

Informed Consent Form

Study name
Self in Motion: Translingual Identity, Language Ideology, and Teachers’ Pedagogical Practice in the Language Classroom

Researcher(s)
Researcher Name : Violetta Cupial
Masters Candidate
Graduate Program in Education
Email address : violetta_cupial@edu.yorku.ca

Purpose of the research
I am a graduate student in the Faculty of Education at York University. Currently, I am working on my Master of Education degree. I am conducting this research in order to complete my Master’s Thesis. In this research, I am interested in speaking to you as someone who is a language teacher who has migratory experience and who has during the process of his/her migration learned multiple languages. I would like to hear your stories about the places where you lived and the experiences you had of learning and speaking multiple languages. The interview data you provide during our interview sessions will be discussed as a narrative in my thesis and during future academic conferences where I may present my thesis research. I may also directly quote sections of the recorded narratives in my thesis and or in conferences from our interviews. Full anonymity will be provided when I present your narratives in my thesis or during academic conferences.

What you will be asked to do in the research
You will be asked to participate in three interviews sessions. Each interview will take approximately 20-30 minutes. The first interview will take approximately 15 minutes. You will be asked semi-structured questions during the duration of each interview session. During the interviews, we will have a chat following semi-structured questions. I will ask you about where you lived and the languages you learned. I will also ask you to make a time-line of your life events and share photos with me. This is subject to your agreement.

Risks and discomforts
There are no risks of personal harm involved by participating in this research. You will not be required to answer any questions if they make you feel uncomfortable. You will be provided complete anonymity during the research process. You will remain anonymous in any write up.

Benefits of the research and benefits to you
By participating in this research, you will be able to reflect on their identity, life events, and their pedagogical practice. You stand to gain awareness how your migratory experiences and language learning experiences have shaped who you are and what you believe. The benefits will be similar for the researcher by being one of the participants.

Voluntary participation: Your participation in the study is completely voluntary and you may choose to stop participating at any time. Your decision not to volunteer will not influence the relationship you may have with the researchers or study staff or the nature of your relationship with York University either now, or in the future.
Withdrawal from the study: You can stop participating in the study at any time, for any reason, if you so decide. Your decision to stop participating, or to refuse to answer particular questions, will not affect your relationship with the researchers, York University, or any other group associated with this project. In the event you withdraw from the study, all associated data collected will be immediately destroyed wherever possible.

Confidentiality
The researcher and the researcher’s supervisor and committee member will be the only persons who will have access to the data obtained during the interview sessions. Written notes and digital files of interview recordings will be protected and stored in my office cabinet which will be locked at all times and to which only I will have access. Any data which will be transcribed and put on my computer will also be protected. The computer will be password protected and I will be the only person who will have access to the computer. Your identity will also always be protected during this research by assigning you a pseudonym. Any writing done which will include your interview data will be referred to by an assigned pseudonym. After the completion of my research, I will delete any digital material of your data and shred all written materials which pertain to your interview data.
Confidentiality will be provided to the fullest extent possible by law.

Questions about the research?
If you have any questions in regards to this research you may contact me, Violetta Cupial violetpa_cupial@edu.yorku.ca.
Any questions pertaining to ethics and the research process may be addressed by contacting my supervisor Professor Heather Lotherington, 416-736-2100 Ext. 66182, hlotherington@edu.yorku.ca.
Any additional questions regarding the research process may be directed to the Graduate Program in Education.
Graduate Program, Faculty of Education
Campus Building: Winters College, 282
Building Address: 72 Winters Lane
Telephone: (416)736-2100 x 55018 (Voicemail)
Fax: (416)650-8006

This research has been reviewed and approved by the Human Participants Review Sub-Committee, York University’s Ethics Review Board and conforms to the standards of the Canadian Tri-Council Research Ethics guidelines. If you have any questions about this process, or about your rights as a participant in the study, you may contact the Senior Manager and Policy Advisor for the Office of Research Ethics, 5th Floor, York Research Tower, York University, telephone 416-736-5914 or e-mail ore@yorku.ca

Additional Consent:

☐ I agree to be recorded during the interviews.

☐ I agree to bring photographs and/or memorabilia to share with the researcher during the interview.

☐ I agree to create a time-line of my life events during the interview.

☐ I agree to allow the content of my interview recordings to be discussed and/or quoted in this thesis and/or in academic conferences.
Legal rights and signatures:

I ____________________________, consent to participate in Self in Motion: Translingual Identity, Language Ideology, and Teacher's Pedagogical Practice in the Language Classroom conducted by Violeta Cupial. I have understood the nature of this project and wish to participate. I am not waiving any of my legal rights by signing this form. My signature below indicates my consent.

**Signature** ____________________  **Date** _______________
Participant

**Signature** ____________________  **Date** _______________
Principal Investigator