Title

Examining Students' Co-construction of Language Ideologies through Multimodal Text

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7b48k9c0

Journal

Authors

Bokhorst-Heng, Wendy D.
Marshall, Kelle L.

Publication Date

DOI

Copyright Information

Peer reviewed

Examining Students' Co-Construction of Language Ideologies through Multimodal Text

WENDY D. BOKHORST-HENG

Crandall University
Email: wendy.bokhorstheng@crandallu.ca

KELLE L. MARSHALL

Pepperdine University
Email: kelle.marshall@pepperdine.edu

French immersion (FI), one of the hallmarks of French as a Second Language education in Canada and mandated in New Brunswick, Canada's only officially English/French bilingual province, is often the target of language ideological debates surrounding its purposes and expected outcomes. Yet, notably absent in FI scholarship has been a focus on the ideologies informing students' investment in French, including what bilingualism might mean for their language learning and identity. In this article, we discuss nine Grade 8 French immersion students' co-construction of language ideologies regarding bilingualism. In a focus group, these students created a promotional video regarding the merits of bilingualism whose audience was comprised of fictional peers in a predominantly Anglophone province. Our analysis was guided by Darvin and Norton's (2015) model of investment. We employed the tools of multimodal critical discourse analysis to consider the students' construction of language ideologies through their video production. Through macro and micro analyses, we identified five primary ideologies: Bilingualism (a) is a matter of personal decision; (b) provides access to jobs; (c) provides access to economic capital; (d) provides access to Francophone communities of practice; and (e) provides access to symbolic capital. We discuss how the students have "remixed" the dominant provincial ideologies on bilingualism into their own, considering the implications of these ideologies on their investment in French. Finally, we suggest how multimodal practices provide a means to develop language students' meta-cognition and expand their investment in their target language.

_____

INTRODUCTION

"Do you feel the implementation of BILINGUALISM has gone too far? Join ARA [Anglophone Rights Association] today to ensure your voice is heard!" Thus reads a bus advertisement in a bilingual city in New Brunswick, Canada captured on camera by one of the city's citizens and posted on her Facebook page (Facebook, Nicole Doiron). The picture immediately went viral, picked up by regional and national news agencies and international groups, and became the target of acrimonious debate with some celebrating the appeal for Anglophone rights and others challenging the right of the linguistic majority to make a claim of discrimination. We reference this incident because of how it captures the competing ideological positions regarding the meanings of language and bilingualism in this community and in New Brunswick, Canada's only officially bilingual province. It is in the midst of these kinds of language ideological debates (Blommaert, 1999) that provincial French Second Language education is situated, including French immersion (FI). Yet, little research to date has investigated the influence

these ideologies may have on Anglophone FI students and on their understanding of the purposes and meanings of bilingualism for them and their identities as language learners. In fact, the Douglas Fir Group (2016) recently advocated that researchers in all areas of instructed second language acquisition investigate the ideological contexts of language teaching and learning more deeply. Here, in response to these gaps and to the Douglas Fir Group's (2016) call for such research, we aim to illuminate how such macro-level, societal language ideologies inform FI students' investment (Norton, 2013) in French within the ideologically-rich context of New Brunswick.

In this article, then, we examine the perspectives of nine New Brunswick FI students regarding English/French bilingualism.[2] Using the tools of multimodal critical discourse analysis, we analyze a promotional video created by these students on the merits of bilingualism. Our discussion is guided Bonny Norton's (2013) concept of investment, which has been succinctly described by Kramsch (2013) as being "synonymous with 'language learning commitment' and is based on a learner's intentional choice and desire" (p. 195). Darvin and Norton (2015) have identified three interrelated constructs that inform investment: identity, capital, and ideology (Figure 1). This model, embedded in a social approach to bilingualism (Heller, 2007), demonstrates "the socially and historically constructed relationship between language learning identity and learning commitment" (Darvin & Norton, 2015, p. 37). We focus especially on these students' ideologies regarding English/French bilingualism in New Brunswick. We begin with a brief overview of Darvin and Norton's model of investment. After introducing the context of our study and our methodological design, we then analyze students' co-construction of language ideologies in their video productions. We conclude by considering how these ideologies may inform their investment in French, and how, globally, language educators might consider multimodality as a means to engage students' meta-awareness of such ideologies, their identities as language learners and users, and ultimately their investment in their L2.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: MODEL OF INVESTMENT

Social embeddedness underscores Darvin and Norton's (2015) model of investment (Figure 1), delineating each of its triadic constructs.

Figure 1. Model of Investment

Note. Reprinted from "Identity and a model of investment in applied linguistics," by R. Darvin & B. Norton, 2015, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35*, p. 42. (Reprinted with permission).

First, Norton (2013) defines *identity* as "how a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is structured across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future" (p. 45). She presents identity as inherently complex, fluid, and even multiple as learners negotiate the dynamics of language ideology through social interaction in different contexts. *Capital*, a construct she derives from Bourdieu (e.g., 1986), is defined as power, and can be economic, cultural, or social (Norton, 2013). The value of capital is dynamic, determined by ideological structures within particular fields and must be continually renegotiated as one traverses different fields. Once capital, whatever its form, is seen as 'legitimate' (i.e., is recognized as capital), it becomes what Bourdieu calls symbolic capital. Tied to symbolic capital is a notion Bourdieu (1991) calls symbolic violence, an intimidation of those with lesser symbolic capital in a social situation by those with more. He underscores the fact that such symbolic violence often occurs implicitly in interactions, perhaps by speakers of a more and less standard variety of a language on the linguistic marketplace. Finally, Darvin and Norton (2015) define *ideology* as a "normative set of ideas" (p. 43), or "dominant ways of thinking that organize and stabilize societies while simultaneously determining modes of inclusion and exclusion, and the privileging and marginalization of ideas, people, and relations" (p. 44). With respect to language ideologies, then, perspectives and meanings about language and language practices are rooted in social experience and linked to specific political-economic interests. For Kroskrity (2000), given the complexity of social divisions within sociocultural groups (e.g., social class, gender, age), and given how these divisions can produce divergent perspectives, language ideologies must be considered as multiple and contested. For example, language ideologies can be used by members of some social groups to distinguish themselves from other groups or, conversely, to reinforce cohesion among members of the same group. Blackledge (2000) similarly argues that because they are embedded in social relations, ideologies are also characterized by "partiality, contestability, instability and mutability," as are the forms of identity embedded in these ideologies (p. 26). It is important to note, especially when considering the place of language ideologies in the discourses of youth, that often ideologies are embedded in everyday practices and most often function at the level of the subconscious (Kroskrity, 2000; Marshall & Bokhorst-Heng, 2020b; Wodak, 2014).

Taken together, identity, capital, and ideology—each bearing similar characteristics of fluidity and ongoing (re)construction—form the core of investment, enabling us to consider the complexities of language learners' impetus to learn their target language and imagine their identities as speakers of that language. Situated within this triadic model of investment, our focus in this article is on language ideologies at play in New Brunswick (from here, NB) adolescents' investment in bilingualism, locating their investment within the wider conversations and meanings about bilingualism active in their communities, which Blommaert (1999) refers to as *language ideological debates*. As we discuss elsewhere (Marshall & Bokhorst-Heng, 2020b), Blommaert (1999) regards language ideological debates as those debates "in which language is central as a topic, a motif, a target, and in which language ideologies are being articulated, formed, amended, enforced" (p. 1). Such debates are embedded in power relations between speakers of different languages or varieties and developed in and through socio-historical narratives presented through institutions like government, mass media (Bokhorst-Heng, 1999), and education (e.g., curriculum documents). For example, in our analysis of NB's FI Grade 12 'cultural diversity' learning objectives (Marshall & Bokhorst-Heng, 2020b) we noted how language ideological debates, both national (Heller, 1999) and provincial (Marshall & Bokhorst-Heng, 2020b), and their resulting language policies have contributed to an ambiguous framing of the FI program's cultural objectives and conception of its overall

purpose. Elsewhere (Marshall & Bokhorst-Heng, 2020a), we note similar ambiguity in the curriculum documents related to the development of learner identity, which then makes way for a dominance of neoliberal priorities in which language learning is defined as "linguistic instrumentalism" (Kubota, 2011). In such a view, language is defined according to economic or symbolic value, and the skills acquired through language learning are characterized as leading to social mobility and economic opportunity. Our analysis leads us to conclude that, "in neoliberal terms, then, English/French bilingualism is presented as allowing FSL [French Second Language] students to have greater opportunities (whether through jobs or studies) in the bilingual province" (Marshall & Bokhorst-Heng, 2020a, p. 4). Furthermore, learners are thus "'pushed' to learn a language to make them more competitive in the market, rather than to fulfill a desire regarding language and culture" (Marshall & Bokhorst-Heng, 2020a, p. 4). In our discussion below, we discuss the socio-historical language ideological debates within New Brunswick.

BILINGUALISM IN NEW BRUNSWICK

New Brunswick's population comprises 67.7% Anglophones (English speakers) and 31.8% Francophones (French speakers) (Statistics Canada, 2017b).[1] The province's Official Languages Act, established in 1969 and later enshrined in the Charter of Rights and Freedom, declares NB an officially English-French bilingual province. The Official Languages Act entitles all New Brunswickers to government services in the official language of their choice and forms the premise of duality in education: two education sectors, English and French, with compulsory French and English second language instruction respectively. Originally, the policy was established to provide equal linguistic rights to Francophones (the linguistic minority of the province) and Anglophones (the majority) as a means to bring equality to the linguistic marketplace and provide the means, perhaps, to lessen symbolic violence against Francophones in the province (Boudreau, 2016). Symbolic violence in NB against Francophones is exemplified in an encounter between Moncton's mayor, Leonard Jones, and a group of Francophone student protestors from l'Université de Moncton at a city council meeting in February 1968, captured on film in the documentary *L'Acadie, l'Acadie?!?* (Boudreau, 2016). The mayor belittled some of the students who struggled to express themselves fully in English, admonishing them to return to their university, continue their studies, and let the politicians worry about linguistic rights (Boudreau, 2016).

Linguistic equality was thus the goal of New Brunswick's official language policy, not the guarantee of individual bilingualism (Hayday, 2015). Yet the increasing status of French in the province in the late 1960s resulted in the perception among Anglophones of increased employability for bilingual speakers, most of whom are Francophone (Hayday, 2015). Anglophone parents demanded greater access to French language education for their children, and some sent their children to French medium schools (until Francophones, fearful of assimilation, implemented strict admission policies) (Edwards, 1986). French Second Language (FSL) learning opportunities became increasingly available in English medium schools, and by 1977, one-way FI was required where demand and resources afforded (Edwards, 1986). The current legislation concerning the mandatory provision of FSL instruction and FI programming is captured in Policy 309. In the 2017-2018 school year, 86% of all eligible students were enrolled in FSL learning; 33% in FI; 40% of students in Grade 1, the first entry point, were enrolled in Early FI (New Brunswick [NB] Department of Education, 2018).

In addition to the socio-historical context, the province's language ideological debates may be a factor in students' investment in bilingualism. Some of these ideologies are framed by the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, including a view that the province's policy of bilingualism is about individual rights regarding choice of linguistic code and that bilingualism is equally accessible to all. Anglophone parents profiled this ideology in their protests in 2008 against the government's plan to eliminate the Early French Immersion program in Anglophone schools (Bokhorst-Heng & Marshall, 2016). There is also a strong ideology of bilingualism for economic capital. For example, the Commissioner's 2015 report featured a commissioned study prepared by economists Desjardins and Campbell entitled, "Two languages: It's good for business." However, while bilingualism is generally regarded positively by the province's citizens (Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, 2016), there are also counter debates from within the linguistic majority that are also based on linguistic rights. For example, as evident in our opening vignette, some Anglophones argue their rights have been violated due to perceived discriminatory hiring practices that put Anglophone monolingual speakers at a disadvantage, and some have argued official bilingualism is not economically feasible in a province with limited economic resources (see the Anglophone Rights Association website at https://www.aranb.ca).

Students' language investment may also be informed by the NB Department of Education's objectives for FSL and the FI curriculum (Marshall & Bokhorst-Heng, 2020b). A recent 10-year education plan includes the government's vision for FSL education in the province (Province of New Brunswick [NB], 2016). According to Objective 8, one of the goals of FSL learning is to "Improve levels of French language literacy to help all learners access a variety of bilingual opportunities and life experiences," such as being able to function "in the workplace and society" and "in global society," access "post-secondary and employment opportunities," and "the ability to engage with others" (Province of NB, 2016, p. 15). Other curriculum documents for FI programming (New Brunswick [NB] Department of Education, 2001) reiterate these themes, mentioning also cultural understanding (one's own, but also that of Francophone communities locally and globally). The primary ideology dominating FSL learning is thus one of bilingualism (linguistic capital) as a means of access to education and ultimately expanded job opportunities (economic capital), and to a lesser extent to social and cultural capital. Notably absent in these documents is any explicit focus on identity development, the third component of Darvin and Norton's (2015) investment model.

It is within these broader conversations about language, and within a system of educational duality separating Anglophone and Francophone students, that Anglophone students develop their investment in French. Yet, learners are not passive and will not always appropriate the (socio)linguistic forms, practices, and values of their teachers, or of the curriculum (Duff, 2008). So, while we can identify the language ideologies circulating in NB, and learning objectives within education documents, we nonetheless ask: What is students' investment in their target language, and especially, what language ideologies do they draw upon in articulating what English/French bilingualism means to them? Below we describe the methodology used to investigate these questions.

METHODOLOGY

Our data is drawn from a 2016 multimodal focus group study conducted in four schools in Southeastern NB, involving 31 (13 male, 18 female) Grade 8 students; they were in their fifth year of FI (the entry point for their cohort was Grade 3). Six schools had been invited to

participate in the study, selected on the basis of (a) their provision of Early French immersion, (b) their location within the greater metropolis (two from predominantly Anglophone neighborhoods, and two from the official bilingual community, one of which was also attended by Anglophone students from the predominantly Francophone neighborhood) and (c) socio-economic status of the neighborhood. Of the six invited schools, four agreed to participate. In two of the schools, the principals sent invitations to all 8th grade students in Early FI, asking for their participation in our study "on what it means to be a bilingual youth in Canada"; all who responded affirmatively were included. In the other two, including the school discussed in this article, the principals selected the students a priori on the basis of academic standing and engagement. Furthermore, in the school discussed here (Green Acres Elementary School [pseudonym]), the principal provided access only after school, unlike the others where focus groups sessions were held during school hours.

Green Acres Elementary School is a K-8 school located in a predominantly middle to upper middle class community which we will call Green Acres, with a strong Early FI program. There were 9 participants in this school's focus group, with 5 male and 4 female students. As reported by participants in a bio-survey (Table 2), they all spent most or all of their schooling years in this bilingual community, and, while two indicated Francophone heritage and one Francophone-Anglophone mixed parentage, all but one declared English as their dominant home language.

Table 1
Participants

Name (Pseudonyms)	Heritage	Place Born	Home language(s)
Boyle	Dad, French Mom, English	USA (moved to Green Acres at age 2.5)	English
Steven	Quebec, Ontario Scotland	Green Acres	25% French 75% English
Roslyn	Scottish, English, Irish	Green Acres	Mostly English, occasionally French
Tanner	French	Ontario (moved to Green Acres at age 8)	English
Leslie	Canadian	Nova Scotia (moved to Green Acres at age 4)	English
Bob	Unknown	Green Acres	Mostly English, occasionally French
Karla	Canadian	Green Acres	English, little French
Jamal	Acadian	British Columbia (moved to Green Acres at age 4)	Mostly English, occasionally French
Stella	European, Irish	Green Acres	English, French 50%-50%

Our study was inspired in part by Roy's (2009) research regarding French immersion students' identities in the Canadian province of Alberta. However, while her methodology

used dyadic interviews and classroom observation, our methodological design was premised on the pedagogical principles of constructivist learning theory (Vygotsky, 1978) and 'Universal Design for Learning' (UDL), which is a tool used by educators to design and implement inclusive learning environments through differentiation (www.cast.org). The aim was to actively engage our student-participants as actors in constructing their own meanings of bilingualism and their identities as language learners through collaboration, engagement, and multiple forms of representation (Bokhorst-Heng & Keating Marshall, 2019). This approach is also consistent with what Kearney (2015) calls transformative language learning, which is seen as semiotic practice. By embracing the unique characteristics of each learner, UDL leverages talent, character, and creativity, and increases overall learner engagement. Specifically, the method allowed for participants to employ creativity (Levine, 2020), humor, and language play (Bell, 2009, 2012) in expressing their views, sometimes through the medium of their L1, sometimes their L2.

We held two 1.5-hour focus group sessions, one week apart. Our emphasis in the first focus group session was on participants' daily language use, their attitudes towards French and towards learning French, the meanings of bilingualism, and their assumptions about different varieties of French. These conversations then set the stage for the second focus group session. A detailed description of the first focus group session may be found in Bokhorst-Heng and Keating Marshall (2019). Here we describe only the data recorded during the second session's activities, which forms the focus of our current discussion.

The second focus group session involved the creation of multimodal texts designed to engage our participants in the co-construction of their emic understandings of bilingualism. Our choice to include this activity was in part inspired by Toohey, Dagenais, and Schulze (2012), who observed that learners' representations are more sophisticated through the creation of multimodal texts than through written texts. Participants were provided school-owned iPads with the video editing software application iMovie, familiar to all participants. Audio and video recorders were strategically positioned to capture their collaboration. They were given the following prompt:

> *Imagine you have been commissioned by the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages to produce a video promoting bilingualism in New Brunswick. Your audience of this video will be students in British Columbia who may not even be aware that New Brunswick is Canada's only officially bilingual province.*

The framing of the prompt was built from our analyses of curriculum documents (Marshall & Bokhorst-Heng, 2020b) and data from an earlier study (Keating Marshall & Bokhorst-Heng, 2018) involving the views of teachers and principals regarding FI education. In our previous studies, we noted how language ideological debates were enshrined in the curriculum and in educators' discourse, and we wondered in what form such ideologies might appear in students' discourse. The genre of this task follows publicity produced by the national offices of Canadian Parents for French, which continue to publish promotional materials on the merits of English/French bilingualism (www.cpf.org) and the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, which, in the early days of French immersion in Canada, actively promoted French language learning through games, comic books (e.g. the Oh Canada! Activity Kit created by Kronby, 1975), videos, and language campaigns (Hayday, 2015). We selected British Columbia (BC) for its contrast with NB. BC is Canada's western-most province, with a very different linguistic composition from NB: rather than official bilingualism, English is the provincial official language (regarding Canada's official languages, 90% speak only English and French is

not among the top ten languages spoken). This means that rather than only two primary linguistic and cultural communities, multilingualism and demographic diversity characterize BC (Statistics Canada, 2017a).

The video was transcribed along with frame-by-frame screenshots to provide a detailed, multimodal description of the video data, placed into a five-columned table (Figure 2): (*a*) frame number; (*b*) screen grabs of each move; (*c*) transcribed audio; (*d*) description of the modes; and (*e*) researcher annotations. By "moves," we adopted Knoblauch, Tuma, and Schnettler's (2013) definition as "single identifiable 'units' of action performed in various embodied communicative modalities, including vocabulary" (p. 445).

a	*b*	*c*	*d*	*e*
11a		**Bob:** Hello. **Leslie:** Hi.	Bob is the interviewer; Steven and Leslie are interviewing for the position of Vice President at Apple.	With two people interviewed concurrently, a contrast is established between a candidate with French language proficiency and one without.

Figure 2. Coding Template

Our analysis (involving columns *d* and *e* in our template) employed the tools of multimodal critical discourse analysis (CDA) (Bezemer & Jewitt, 2010; Jancsary, Höllerer, & Meyer, 2016; Kress, 2010). As described by Kress (2010), essential to this form of analysis is a view of modes as socially and culturally shaped "semiotic resources for making meaning" (p. 79). Modes include written text, but also gestures, posture, speech, visual images, and so forth. Bezemer and Jewitt (2010) distill three theoretical assumptions that guide a social semiotic approach to multimodality:

- representation and communication always involve a range of modes, which together contribute to the construction of meaning;
- all modes, or "channels of communication" (Kress, 2010), have been shaped by their cultural, historical and social experiences; and
- meaning is created through the interaction between the different modes present in a particular communicative moment.

In addition to these three assumptions, in keeping with multimodal CDA, we regard discourse as "performative and constitutive, rather than representative" (Jancsary et al., 2016, p. 183). That is, our approach is not to uncover some hidden 'truth', but rather to examine the *processes* of meaning making. Finally, informing our analysis is CDA's focus on the implications of power and ideology in the construction of meaning (Jancsary et al., 2016).

We adapted Jancsary et al's (2016) 5-step procedure of analysis:

Table 2
Procedures in Critical Multimodal Discourse Analysis

Step 1: Characterizing the genre; understanding the genre rules	*The form of genre used (e.g. rap, interview, role play) and its purpose; spatiotemporal and sociocultural context of the text; the producers of the text and their audience.*
Step 2: Capturing the manifest content	*The particular 'vocabulary' of the text, including visual vocabulary (e.g., actions, settings); rhetorical and stylistic techniques and strategies used.*
Step 3: Composition	*The particular 'roles' and 'functions' of the verbal and the visual within the text; the relationships between verbal and visual elements. What integrated 'messages' or 'narratives' are created through this composition?*
Step 4: Identifying ideology	*Ideologies are evident in the text.*
Step 5: Evaluation and conclusions	*What we have learned and implications.*

Step 2 involved analysing the modes individually in columns *c* and *d* in our coding template. Step 3 involved the interaction of the different modes used in the production of meaning, detailed in column *e*. Throughout this process we viewed the videos and recursively read the transcripts, expanding our codes and annotations as they evolved. We also listened to the recordings of the 1.5-hour video-creation process to inform our analysis.

In the discussion that follows, we describe the video created by the nine focus group participants at Green Acres Elementary School. We had selected their video (4m 39sec) for its comprehensively developed scenario and cogent organizational structure. All members participated in developing all segments of the video; each segment was video recorded consecutively with the non-acting participants observing and providing feedback during the practice rounds. While at the time of our study we were unable to invite participants to provide post hoc meta-commentary on their videos, we were able to do so four years later as we analyzed our data. In May 2020, we invited all nine students (then in Grade 12) to participate in a focus group through the medium of a recorded session in the online meeting platform Zoom. The online format was necessary due to constraints imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic prohibiting physical gathering. Four students (Bob, Jamal, Roslyn, and Karla) participated. We first viewed the video in its entirety followed by their recollections of its development, and then, segment by segment, we discussed their interpretations of the meanings conveyed. The Zoom recording was then transcribed.

Our analysis in this article employs the first, second, and third steps of the 5-step procedure given in Table 2—genre, manifest/content, and composition—at the same time weaving throughout a discussion of the ideologies evidenced in the video. We conclude with Step 5, considering the implications of our analysis.

THE VIDEO: HOW "FRENCH CAN HELP YOU OUT IN LIFE"

The Green Acres video comprises four scenarios depicting the ways in which "French can help you out in life," sandwiched between an opening and a closing scene. This format employs the structure of a six-paragraph persuasive writing essay involving an introduction, four main ideas with supporting evidence, and a conclusion (Gaetz, Phadke, Sandberg, & Sauer, 2018). In the 2020 focus group, the four students did not explicitly name their video's genre when reflecting on their creative choices. It appears to be a form of video-mediated political satire and parody, often associated with television shows such as *The Daily Show* and the *Colbert Report*, but now also appearing on video-hosting websites like *YouTube* (Gray, Jones, & Thompson, 2009; Tryon, 2008). The students described their video as being humorous by "going over the top" and to make their message "obvious," which lends credence to characterizing the video as satire. Gray, Jones, and Thompson (2009) propose that

> satire's calling card is the ability to produce social scorn or damning indictments through *playful* means, and, in the process, transform the aggressive act of ridicule into the more socially acceptable act of rending something ridiculous. Play typically makes the attack humorous, in turn enlist the audience in a social rebuke through communal laughter" (p.13).

They note that parody is the mockery of a particular genre of text, yet not all parody is necessarily a form of satire (Gray, Jones, & Thompson, 2009). Intentional 'social scorn' was not part of the students' intent; however, the presence of scorn in their video (discussed below) suggests also that, as we noted earlier, ideologies most often function at the level of the subconscious. While the students may not have *intentionally* included a social rebuke in their text, in the following analysis, we will demonstrate that playful conceptions of local language ideological debates are nonetheless featured in the video's scenarios.

We now turn to each of the video's six segments, beginning with the opening scene, "On Commence!"

Opening Scene: "On Commence!"

The video's opening scene (Transcript 1) entails the components of a classic introduction, including a hook, background information, a thesis statement, and a statement that connects the background and thesis (Gaetz et al., 2018). It opens with five students—Steven, Leslie, Jamal, Karla, and Bob—directly facing the camera. They greet their audience, in unison with "Bonjour!" as they break into smiles and giggles and gesture their hands in welcome. This choral welcome then breaks into a series of individual frames where each participant speaks directly to the audience.

Transcript 1

1	**Unknown:**	Go!
2	**All:**	*Bonjour!* [Hello!]
3	**Leslie:**	We live in New Brunswick (.) The *only* bilingual province (.) And here,
4		things are a *tad* different than in British Columbia.
5	**Jamal:**	The French language is a *very* big part of our culture.

6	**Karla:**	Therefore, being able to speak French can give you a lot more
7		opportunities in life.
8	**Steven:**	But, here in New Brunswick, not everyone decides to learn the French
9		language.
10	**Bob:**	So, we've created a movie to show how, in some situations, French can
11		benefit you.
12	**Jamal:**	Hopefully this will encourage you to give the French language a shot.
13	**Karla:**	And who knows? Maybe you'll fall in love with the language.
14	**Leslie:**	*So*. Without further ado. *On commence*! [Let's begin!]

Leslie first establishes background information (lines 3-4) regarding NB's official bilingualism. She provides the impetus for the video, noting there is a defining difference between NB and BC when it comes to language. Her introductory comments serve as a phatic connection with her audience, a hook. Jamal extends that difference to note the significant role that the French language pays in NB's culture (line 5), thus presumably in ways that it does not in BC. His use of the pronoun "our," suggests a collective culture, which, particularly given the divisive nature of language in the province, is somewhat ironic, a kind of semantic erasure (Irvine & Gal, 2000) in his presentation of provincial language ideology. Karla subsequently moves away from the "our" and instead elaborates on what the role of French in NB means for Anglophones: that speaking French can expand one's opportunities in life (lines 6-7). However, in spite of NB's bilingual status and the opportunities that come to speakers of French, Steven notes that some Anglophones decide not to learn French.

Steven's use of the phrase, "not everyone *decides* to learn French" is significant. In particular, the term "decides" suggests learning French as a matter of deliberate personal choice. This ideology assumes parity within education in terms of opportunity, access, and support, an equal playing field within which one can make choices. However, this ideology is quite different from what has been previously voiced by some NB parent activists. For example, such parents have regarded the government itself to be the gatekeeper to bilingualism, interpreting the government's proposed elimination of early FI in 2008 as a denial of their children's access to bilingualism (Bokhorst-Heng & Marshall, 2016). It seems that, while perhaps not intended, the students' ideology of personal decision has implications for what it means for Anglophones to be monolingual in NB. It opens the possibility of an ideology whereby the perceived negative consequences of monolingualism are a result of one's own decision not to learn French. We see this double-edged ideology in the four scenarios presented in the students' video. The objective of the scenarios was to profile the benefits of bilingualism, but the students illustrated these benefits by demonstrating undesirable outcomes for those who decided to not learn French.

The collective in "our culture" expressed earlier by Jamal now evidences a fission, setting the stage for the remainder of the video: scenarios portraying what happens to Anglophones who do and who do not speak French in bilingual NB to demonstrate, in Bob's words, how "French can benefit you" (lines 9-10). Bob's comments also extend the benefits of learning French in NB to BC. Given that the earlier benefits of speaking French were grounded in the local NB context, it is a bit unclear how these same benefits might extend to their peers in BC. However, Jamal and Karla provide that possibility by appealing not just to extrinsic motivation: "Hopefully this will encourage you to give the French language a shot" (line 12), but also intrinsic motivation (affect): "Maybe you'll fall in love with the language" (line 13).

However, as we will see throughout the video, extrinsic motivation and the opportunities available through French will receive the greater emphasis.

Leslie code-switches into French to launch the video's main plot: "*On commence!*" (line 13), and gestures enthusiasm with fist raised (Figure 3).

Figure 3. "*On Commence!*"

The other participants enter the scene, dancing across the screen, while smiling and laughing. There is a strong solidarity in their message through their choral welcome, their orchestrated individual voices building the introduction, and their enthusiastic collective ending.

Scenario One: The Job Interview

In 2020, the students told us that their parents frequently encouraged their participation in French immersion education on the grounds that bilingualism would open up many more opportunities for them in their future careers. It is not surprising then that their first scenario depicts a job interview, in this case, for the position of Vice President of Apple. This scenario (Transcript 2) involves Bob, the interviewer, and Steve and Leslie as applicants. The scenario opens in Bob's office with Steven and Leslie seated across from him. He shakes their hands, and then poses the question about why they think they should be the Vice President of Apple (lines 3-4).

Transcript 2

1	**Bob:**	Hello.
2	**Leslie:**	Hi.
3	**Bob:**	*So* (.) I want you two to tell me *why* you should be the *Vice President* of
4		Apple.
5	**Steven:**	Well, I have a *Master's* in Computer Science, a *Bachelor* in Financing, and a
6		*Bachelor* in Programming.
7	**Bob:**	Why should *you* be the CEO?
8	**Leslie:**	*Je parle français?* [I speak French?]
9	**Bob:**	[to Leslie] You're hired! [to Steven] Get out of here! Let's go get you
10		[indiscernible word] at your office.
11	**Leslie:**	Yay!

He looks first to Steven, who introduces his answer with a thoughtful "Well," and outlines his credentials with nods, emphatic intonation, and confident posture (lines 5-6). Bob then looks at Leslie and gestures to elicit her answer. Leslie leans casually against the table with one leg tucked under her. She raises her right shoulder slightly, and hesitantly, with rising intonation, replies: "*Je parle français?*" (line 8). Besides bilingual competence, Leslie offers no other qualifying credentials or experiences. Bob leans forward and points to Leslie, saying, "You're hired" (line 9) and then to Steven he shouts, "Get out of here!" (line 9 and figure 4), aggressively pointing at him.

Figure 4. "Get Out of Here!"

Steven leaves with his head lowered and shoulders slouched while Leslie waves goodbye. Bob then walks around his desk to shake Leslie's hand and she stands on one leg (the other remains on her chair as she stands) to reciprocate. They exit the scene.

The job interview scenario deliberately contrasts English monolingualism with English/French bilingualism by having a joint interview with the two representative candidates. The linguistic capital of bilingualism is accentuated through the exaggerated difference in the two applicants' qualifications. Steven is significantly more educationally qualified for the position, made even more pronounced by Leslie's utter lack of qualifications apart from proficiency in French. This contrast is reinforced by juxtaposing Steven's strong confidence and professionalism and his control of the interview with Leslie's hesitancy and her unprofessional persona. After it becomes apparent that Leslie's bilingual competence makes her the more qualified person, Steven is physically deflated as he walks away from the scene. Yet Leslie's unprofessional demeanor remains unchanged: she waves, shakes Bob's hand while standing on one foot, and exclaims "Yay!" upon hearing she has been hired. In developing this scenario, students play out an ideology circulating among some of the region's Anglophones which posits that bilingual applicants, regardless of their qualifications, are hired over a monolingual Anglophone who may be more qualified (e.g. Anglophone Rights Association, https://www.aranb.ca; d'Entremont, 2016). At the same time, the unexpected display of aggression towards the end of the interview, a physical manifestation of the symbolic violence of opportunity denied, subverts such ideology by its recollection of the historical symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1991) committed against Francophones due to discriminatory hiring practices and marginalized political standing (Stanley, 1984).

Scenario Two: Free Money

The second scenario is entitled "Tourism" on the students' storyboard and involves Boyle, Jamal, and Roslyn. This scenario depicts a situation in which free money is being offered to Anglophone tourists in France (Transcript 3). It opens with Jamal, a monolingual Anglophone, walking down a hallway as he studies a map labeled "Map" in English. He encounters Boyle, a monolingual Francophone, who is standing on a chair while holding in one hand a sign bearing a French flag and the slogan, "*L'argent gratuit*," and several slips of paper money in the other (Figure 5). Boyle calls out to Jamal, "*L'argent gratuit!*" (line 1). A series of close-up shots juxtapose Jamal's confused expressions and Boyle's repeated offer. Bewildered, Jamal apologizes and explains that he does not speak French (line 4).

Figure 5. "L'Argent Gratuit!"

Boyle looks at him with irritation and disdain, dismissing him with an exacerbated "eh!" (line 5). As Jamal exits, he continues calling out his offer to other pedestrians. Roslyn enters the scene, and like Jamal, carries a map labeled in English as "Map." She is engrossed in reading her map as she walks. However, upon hearing Boyle's offer, she immediately looks up and profusely thanks him, in French (line 8), as she accepts the money. The scene ends with Roslyn, who we now know is bilingual, dancing to ABBA's song *Money, Money, Money* and throwing her acquired money into the air. Boyle cuts across the screen, also dancing and holding his sign high.

Transcript 3

1	**Boyle:**	*L'argent gratuit! L'argent gratuit!* [Free money! Free money!]
2	**Jamal:**	Wait, what?
3	**Boyle:**	*L'argent gratuit, oui? L'argent gratuit!* [Free money! Yes? Free money!]
4	**Jamal:**	Sorry, I don't speak French.
5	**Boyle:**	Eh!
6	**[Jamal leaves; Roslyn enters the scene]**	
7		*L'argent gratuit! L'argent gratuit!* [Free money! Free money!]
8	**Roslyn:**	*Bien sûr! Merci, merci!* [Of course! Thank you, thank you!]

The offer of free money to tourists traveling abroad is of course unrealistic; however, in this scenario the students are extending the benefits of bilingualism—cultural (travel), social

(interaction with a Francophone), and economic—for Canadian Anglophones into Francophone spaces outside of Canada. The absence of other Francophones from the scene thus underscores the students' comparison, continued from Scenario 1, of the various kinds of capital available to bilingual Anglophones that are not available to monolingual Anglophones. Scenario 2 also draws from the ideology of personal choice in learning French with personal accountability in not being able to access the benefits of bilingualism. Boyle's shrug in response to Jamal's apology that he does not speak French, and therefore is even unaware of the opportunity he is missing, suggests he sees it as Jamal's loss. Rather than access denied, it is a message of access not utilized.

Scenario Three: The Restaurant

The third scenario takes place in is a restaurant (Transcript 4) involving Karla, a waitress; Tanner, a customer; and Stella, a chef. The scenario follows a narrative structure of setting, rising action, problem, and solution (Gaetz et al., 2018). The scene opens with Tanner sitting at a table, reading from an open menu written in French.

Transcript 4

1	**Karla:**	*Bonjour! Bienvenue.* [Hello! Welcome.]
2	**Tanner:**	[indiscernible, reading a menu] Hi. *Hey*, do you have any barbeque *chips*?
3	**Karla:**	Euh. *Les croustilles?* [Uh. Chips?]
4	**Tanner:**	Uh. Yeah, I'll take- Yeah. Yeah, that. Yeah.
5	**Karla:**	Ok?
6		**[**Karla goes to the kitchen]
7		*Nous avons un client. Um. Je crois qu'il parle seulement l'ANGLAIS. Um. Je*
8		*crois qu'il veut les croustilles?* [We have a customer. Um. I believe he only
9		speaks English. Um, I think he wants chips?]
10	**Tanner:**	What are they saying?
11	**Stella:**	*Je vais pas donner les croustilles parce qu'il parle pas le* (sic.) *français.* [I'm not
12		going to give [him] chips because he doesn't speak French.]
13	**Karla:**	*Qu'est-ce qu'on va faire?* [What are we going to do?]
14	**Tanner:**	[indiscernible]
15	**Stella:**	*Tu vas voir.* [You'll see]
16	**Tanner:**	Hi, do you work here?
17	**Stella:**	*Oui?* [Yes?]
18	**Tanner:**	[indiscernible, mumbling] Are you gonna give me my barbeque chips?
19	**Stella:**	*Non? Tu parles pas français. Alors, SORS! SORS!* [No? You don't speak
20		French. So, *get out! Get out!*]

Karla approaches Tanner with notepad and pen in hand and greets him in French (line 1). Stella, the cook, is visible in the background maneuvering her cooking wares and scrubbing dishes. Tanner responds to Karla's greeting in English, asking about the menu's offerings (line 2). The exchange thus far appears cordial and casual; however, communication breaks down as it becomes apparent that they do not understand each other (lines 3-4). After attempting to guess at his order, Karla then goes to the kitchen where Stella works a pan over the stove. Karla nervously informs Stella that there is an Anglophone monolingual speaker in the

restaurant (lines 7-9 and figure 6). She repeats the phrase "*Je crois*" (lines 7-8) twice in explaining the situation to Stella, offering her interpretation of Tanner's order. Stella vehemently rejects the idea of serving Tanner on grounds that he cannot speak French (lines 11-12), picking up her frying pan as she speaks. Karla seems unsure of how to interpret Stella's intent and actions (line 13). English subtitles are provided during this exchange, presumably for the benefit of viewers in BC; Tanner is not privy to these subtitles and remains oblivious to the simmering tensions in the kitchen. While he wonders what they are saying (line 10), he maintains a confident demeanor (Figure 6).

Figure 6. "We Have a Customer Who Only Speaks English"

Stella has moved into the dining area and approaches Tanner with the frying pan in her hand. But Tanner obliviously smiles and (somewhat naively) demands in English, "Are you gonna give me my barbeque chips?" (line 18). Stella moves aggressively towards Tanner, threatening him with the frying pan. She speaks deliberately and slowly as she refuses his order, and then aggressively yells "*Sors*!" because he does not speak French (line 19-20). Tanner looks at her in confusion – apparently still unaware of his offence—and stumbles off the screen.

This third scenario has to do with Francophone spaces (Keating, 2014), established immediately by Karla's welcoming greeting, "*Bonjour! Bienvenue*." A French-only greeting would be unusual in the students' bilingual community where more commonly heard is "*Bonjour*, hello," an invitation to negotiate the preferred language of communication. This setting establishes the 'problem' in the scenario's narrative: linguistic incursion by a monolingual Anglophone in a Francophone space, as described by Karla when she nervously explains the situation to Stella (lines 7-9). Her stance evokes discourses of *faire société*, having to do with establishing public institutions and spaces where minority Francophones can speak French freely (Thériault, 2007). Tanner's apparent obliviousness to the significance of the problem underscores his 'disrespect.' When Stella comes to his table, he speaks to her with a presumption of entitlement that he should receive service in English and even a presumption of ownership of this space, invoking his own symbolic power in a minority space. In contrast to the symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1991) committed against Francophones by Anglophones prior to the enactment of New Brunswick's Official Languages Act, in this scenario, we see a role reversal: Stella's violence (not merely symbolic!) is carried out toward Tanner. The message is that Tanner is appropriately denied service because of his lack of respect for the established language of the space. This acknowledgement represents a significant shift in ideologies for NB's Anglophone population which, as a majority population, has tended to

assume their right to English in *all* public spaces in this region of the province (Boudreau, 2016).

Scenario Four: The Presidential Debate

The fourth scenario, a political debate, presents another situation in which a monolingual and a bilingual candidate compete for a single position for which linguistic competence is critical. The opening scene immediately establishes the centrality of language when the candidates' names are announced as "Bob Bilingual" and "Boyle English," introduced by Roslyn who stands in front of an off-screen audience with a microphone in her hand, announcing the "final candidates" for the Canadian "presidential"[3] election (Transcript 5, lines 1-2). She elongates her pronunciation of "Bilingual" and "English," winking toward the camera to draw attention to the significance of the candidates' names, foreshadowing the significance of language in this debate. In the background, the two candidates shake hands, first cordially but then with intensifying grip and menacing eye contact. Throughout this scenario, the actors play with exaggerated aggressive physicality in their stance, drawing on a parody of a political debate as a sparring match. They play with physical distancing, often approaching each other closely and aggressively while flailing their hands, punctuating the air in exaggerated motion, and raising their fists. They shout, growl, and raise inflection at the end of their sentences.

Transcript 5

1	**Roslyn:**	Okay, folks. It's come down to the final candidates for the president of
2		Canada. We have over here, *Bob Bilingual*, and over here Boyle English.
3		Who will *win*? We will find out!
4	**Boyle:**	Well. First of all, my great nation. I'd like to say that I am going to drop
5		Medicare and I'm going to raise taxes.
6	**Bob:**	Yeah? Well. I'm going to do that. And I'm going to build nuclear
7		reactors and destroy our ecosystem.
8	**Boyle:**	I'm dropping all alliances with our political partners in other *countries*.
9	**Bob:**	I'm going to go to *war* with all those countries! *And* I'm going to legalize
10		Justin *Bieber*!
11	**Boyle:**	I'm creating *mandatory Brussels sprouts day*!
12	**Roslyn:**	Well, folks. We've um. Tallied up the votes. And um. It looks right now
13		like it's a *tie*.
14	**Bob:**	*Wait! Je parle FRANÇAIS.* [I speak FRENCH.]
15	**Audience:**	[applauding] <*Yeah!*> <*Woo!*>
16	**Roslyn:**	Congratulations, Bob Bilingual. You're the president of Canada!
17	**Audience:**	[applauding] <*Yeah!*> <*Woo!*>
18	**Bob:**	<*Woo!*>

The debate begins with Boyle, who begins authoritatively with "Well" and punctures the air as he states his plans for the country. He directly addresses his audience: "my great nation" (line 4). The ludicrous propositions that follow contrast the weightiness typical of presidential debates and suggest parody. Bob and Boyle's exaggerated intonation and hyperbolic gestures become increasingly combative and parody a sparring match as each candidate attempts to

outdo the other. Boyle first declares that he plans to drop Medicare and raise taxes (lines 4-5). Bob steps closer toward Boyle and proposes that he will do the same, but also "build nuclear reactors and destroy our ecosystem" (lines 6-7). Boyle counters with his plan to drop all alliances (line 8). Raising his voice, Bob responds pointing at Boyle's face and declaring his plans to go to war with all of Canada's allies (line 9). He continues saying with a slight growl, "And, I'm going to legalize Justin Bieber!" (lines 9-10). Boyle interrupts Bob, responding in kind to declare his plans for a mandatory Brussels sprouts day (line 11). Bob then closely approaches Boyle, his hands on his hips.

As the tension mounts, Roslyn tentatively re-enters the scene with nervousness in her voice. She indicates that the debate has reached its conclusion and that a vote will determine the outcome and confirm the appointment of Canada's next "President" (line 12). As she speaks, the candidates continue scowling at each other in the background, maintaining combative stances. Roslyn announces that the race seems to be tied (lines 12-13). But Bob abruptly interjects with his index finger pointed upwards: "Wait!" (line 14). This sudden declaration comes with a shift in Bob's physical position: he breaks off his parodic sparring and nonsensical promises, and for the first time directly faces the camera and speaks to the audience. His shift in stance demands that weighty consideration be given to his final claim: "*Je parle français*!" English subtitles appear on the screen, "I speak French!!!" Bilingualism is the tie-breaker. The off-screen audience cheers and claps. Boyle's previous confident and combative stance changes to one of despair as he waves his arms around frantically, runs his hands over his face and through his hair, and leaves the scene. Roslyn turns to the audience with an excited smile, and gesturing toward the winning candidate, congratulates Bob as the new "President of Canada" (line 16 and figure 7). The audience cheers again (line 17), and Bob throws two fisted hands in the air, cheering (line 18). The scene closes with Bob still in his victory stance.

Figure 7. "The President of Canada!"

As the students in 2020 reflected on this scenario, they acknowledged a level of political naivety; however, they contend that their message was again to hyperbolically demonstrate the benefits of bilingualism in all spheres of life. And indeed, this debate is for the "president" [*sic*] of *Canada*, the entire nation, and is not just about leadership in NB. This scenario thus serves as a culmination of the parody, taking satire all the way to the national level and thus extends the benefits of bilingualism to the entire nation of Canada, including their imaginary BC audience. The message is that, even outside of the students' region, Anglophones who speak

French are somewhat superior. We also note once again the use of symbolic violence by the bilingual actor towards the monolingual, this time in the form of a debate 'rebuttal.'

Closing Scene: "Voilà!"

The video's concluding scene reassembles all of the actors. The first move mirrors the introductory scene with Tanner, Stella, Boyle, and Roslyn, facing the camera. In the introduction, the participants used this stance to present the collective purpose of their video: to demonstrate the benefits of bilingualism. And, in the conclusion, they bring resolution to their purpose by together saying, "*Voilà*"—a united affirmation of fulfilled objectives. In a striking contrast to the recurring use of aggressive satire repeated in their scenarios, they extend their arms out to the audience with enthusiastic, welcoming smiles (Transcript 6, line 1 and Figure 8). Once again, the choral voice breaks into close-up shots of individual speakers.

Figure 8. "Voilà!"

Tanner is first. Extending two arms, he says, "So after all that…" and then brings his two hands together as he says conclusively, "It's pretty obvious that French can help you out in life" (line 2-3). In the segments that follow, the students revisit each of their scenarios: restaurants, jobs, travel and politics. Their gestures and voices exude confidence. Stella reminds viewers of her previous scenario which demonstrates French will allow one to "try new restaurants or get an amazing job" (line 4). The next move features Boyle, who extends his hands to dramatize the way French can broaden a person's horizons by traveling "the seven seas" (line 5-6). But then, slowly and with a pained expression on his face, he comes back to his character's earlier defeat in the presidential debate (line 6); covering his face with his hand and shaking his head to emphasize his regret.

Transcript 6

	Tanner, Stella,	
1	**Boyle, Roslyn:**	*Voilà!* [There you have it]
2	**Tanner:**	So. After all that. It's pretty obvious that French can help you out in
3		life.
4	**Stella:**	You can try *new* restaurants or get an amazing job.
5	**Boyle:**	You can have a *much* easier time traveling the world, the *seven seas*- <*and*>
6		win a presidential debate.

7	**Roslyn:**	You don't have to be *Albert Einstein* to learn a new language. All you
8		need is passion!
9	**Boyle:**	And if you can *believe* it, *you* can *achieve* it.
10	**Stella:**	*Never* give up. And *give* it your all.
11	**Tanner:**	Well, this has turned a little bit cheesy, so I think we should end it here.
12	**Roslyn:**	Thanks for watching!
13	**All:**	*Au revoir!* [Goodbye!]
14	**Boyle:**	*Ah!* I can't believe I *screwed up* that *debate*. Oh. Sorry. Goodbye. I mean.
15		*Au revoir?* [Goodbye?] *Au revoir.* [Goodbye.]

The next close-up frame involves Roslyn. She assures her viewers that learning French does not require exceptional intelligence (personified in Albert Einstein); it just needs "passion" (lines 7-8). Her call for passion shifts the scene's genre to that of a motivational speech, and with it, a focus on affect. The shots that follow include a string of clichés punctuated with exaggerated actions premised on passion, self-confidence, believing in one's self, and calls for perseverance. Boyle's "And if you can believe it? You can achieve it!" (line 9), is reminiscent of the line "If you can dream it, you can do it!" from the parody film *Blades of Glory*. Stella chimes in with: "Never give up! Give it your all!" (line 10). Tanner brings an end to the clichés by acknowledging the increasing cheesiness of the video (line11), thus making it possible to conclude the video.

The frame is then briefly empty until Boyle re-enters the scene, hands cupped around his eyes (line 14). He acts startled as he looks toward the camera perhaps feigning unawareness that the camera is still recording. He puts his hand toward the camera to apologize, saying, "I mean, *au revoir*?" with doubt and then "*Au revoir*" with more confidence (line 15). He exits and the video cuts to black.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION: "WAIT! *JE PARLE FRANÇAIS!!*"

We began with the questions, "What is students' investment in their target language?" and especially, "What language ideologies do they draw upon in articulating what English/French bilingualism means to them?" In our analysis, we observed that in each scenario of the Green Acres video, these students portrayed their investment in French as motivated by a dominant ideology of capital made available through bilingualism. They premised the video's entirety on how bilingualism can "help you out in life," how it can provide opportunities otherwise not available. The students' text includes all three forms of capital, economic (jobs and free money), cultural (travel and food), and social (public esteem with Francophone strangers—notably there was no mention of expanded social networks with respect to friendship). This theme was affirmed in the 2020 focus group discussion as well: participants indicated they wanted to make obvious how bilingualism availed them more opportunities in all areas of life; the intent of each scenario was to build their repertoire of opportunity. The phrase "*Je parle français*" appears verbatim in a number of scenarios and, like a magic incantation, provides the underlying subtext that 'I speak French and therefore, I benefit…". However, their particular emphasis on economic capital, evident in three of the four scenarios, is congruent with the focus on capital in both the language ideologies circulating in their communities, and in the curriculum documents and school communities of practice discussed earlier. Boyle's repeated attempt to speak French in the closing scene, framed by his lament at his lost opportunity to be president due to his French language deficiency, underscores this emphasis on capital in

the students' language investment. He was motivated to learn French not by the immediately preceding calls to affect and intrinsic motivation, but rather, by the capital that he would gain through competence in French. In fact, the students' clichéd phrasing and gestures in the closing scene actually invalidated the illocutionary force of positive affect, clearing the way for the priority of capital. The video thus ends on the reminder of the negative consequences of not learning French.

Furthermore, the students' belief that their investment in learning French is a matter of personal decision echoes the government's discourse of linguistic choice. Implicit in this discourse is the view that if one is a unilingual Anglophone and has been subjected to favoritism in hiring practices, denied access to symbolic capital in the political domain, denied service, or has missed an opportunity to access economic capital, these are undesirable consequences of one's own choices. There is a sense of pride in their bilingual identity, which they have chosen for themselves. From this standpoint, the students' essentializing discourse seems to suggest that the benefits of bilingualism are "obvious," leaving no room for critical evaluation.

Overall, in some ways the students have "remixed" or made their own ideology. The ideology of personal choice is not new; it appears frequently in the NB government's discourse concerning official bilingualism. In such discourse, citizens are assured that the policy of bilingualism provides equal opportunity to receive service in the official language of their choice. For the students, however, the ideology of choice is used to argue (if even implicitly), that the right choice is obvious and perhaps leaves one no real choice after all. The position they present to their peers in BC is (a) becoming bilingual is a personal choice (and you *could* choose not to), but (b) why wouldn't you want to be, given the significant capital that comes to those bilingual, and also (c) if you *do* choose not to become bilingual, you risk being characterized as ignorant and disrespectful. Formulated through satire, their remixed ideologies provide for a critique of existing ideologies, which we see as an emerging ideology that has not been documented in the language ideological debates elsewhere in the province.

We also see evidence of an identity position within the students' language investment. While they did not develop identity explicitly in their videos—for example, highlighting how learning a second language makes you more confident, how it makes you more empathic, and so forth—we do see a deliberate attempt to frame their identity as distinct from the monolingual Anglophone. This is evident in the repeated phrase "*Je parle français*," which sets them apart from the monolingual job and presidential candidates, and is evident in what sets them apart from the monolingual pedestrian. We suggest this developing identity is a new, perhaps provincially-situated Anglophone ideology, not evident for example in earlier research conducted by Roy (2009), who found that Albertan FI students did not see themselves as bilingual and were uncertain in their identity as French language learners and users.

In their remixing, students notably employed humor to articulate their perspectives on bilingualism. However, at the same time, when seen as a medium of a parody video, "a new form of media literacy" (Tryon, 2008, p. 213), their humor in effect challenges dominant ideologies, specifically the Anglophone ideology that English/French bilingualism is imposed by the government and infringing on monolingual Anglophones' rights to employment and insistence on being served in English in Francophone spaces (Anglophone Rights Association, https://www.aranb.ca/). Tryon (2008) notes that the humor in such parodies often draws on intertextual references, with insider knowledge being needed to interpret the text's meaning. In the students' remixed ideology, they draw on the symbolic violence once directed at Francophones in this region (whether bilingual or monolingual) by members of the Anglophone majority, and teasingly direct it towards Anglophones who do not have at least

some competence in French. This violence is enacted by Anglophone and Francophone characters alike.

We note that this analysis is about just one video produced by one group of students in one particular moment in time. As well, the imagined audience for this video production was these students' peers in BC. A different audience may well reveal different ideologies. For example, we wonder how they may have framed their video if their audience were other New Brunswickers? Or NB parents or their teachers? Unfortunately, because focus groups were held near the end of their graduating year from middle school, we were unable to invite participants to provide post hoc meta-commentary on their videos, which we acknowledge is a limitation in our analysis. We were able to recover some of this loss through conversation with some of them four years later. While there were significant gaps in their memory, they did recall their intent to be funny through characteristic adolescent argumentation with extreme positions (APA, 2002) so as to make completely unambiguous the benefits of bilingualism.

As we reflect on our analysis, we turn again to Darvin and Norton (2015), who note: "learners have agency … to dissect, question, and sometimes resist dominant practices and ways of thinking that have become systemic within different fields" (p. 51). Darvin and Norton's (2015) model of investment provided a social approach, enabling us to consider such agency. As they described, "a more macro examination allows us to locate learners in this complex web of power and to recognize how these ideological sites shape disposition, social position, and the conditions in which learners can claim the right to speak" (p. 51). We were also able to use the tools of multimodal critical discourse analysis to examine at a micro-level the semiotic resources used by these students for making-meaning. From the Green Acres students' video, we gained insight into the powerful ideologies at play in these students' investment in language learning, and the significance of the intersection of capital, ideology, and identity in their investment. The video also reveals that students are not just passive participants in their language learning; as they reflected on what it meant to be bilingual as residents of Canada's only officially bilingual province, they also remixed and subverted the ideologies available to them. (Duff 2008; Heller 2007; Kramsch 2009; Kroskrity 2000).

While this study focused on Canadian FI students' ideologies on bilingualism, the multimodal video creation activity also suggests a pedagogical strategy for language educators in middle and high school and university programs to develop students' meta-awareness of ideologies within their investment in language learning, no matter the language. These possibilities could be explored through further research as well, by engaging students in a kind of critical discourse analysis of the videos they create to unpack their own awareness of the ideologies influencing their understanding of language and bilingual identities. In conclusion, we echo the Douglas Fir Group's (2016) appeal for further research on the role of language ideologies within language programs. We argue that investigations into ideologies held by students (and perhaps parents) may enable educators to understand how better to foster their students' investment in their target language. Such research could also illuminate, as did ours, the emergence of new ideologies, constructed by students themselves, on the purposes and expected outcomes of language education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ENDNOTES

1 The remaining 1.3% declare other languages as their mother tongue. In addition, 4% of the population self-identify as "Aboriginal" (Statistics Canada, 2017b).
2 We do not make a distinction between societal and individual bilingualism because of the reciprocal interplay between ideologies on both forms of bilingualism in NB.
3 The focus groups were held in early 2016, an election year in the USA. However, according to students in our 2020 focus group discussion, the US election did not factor in students' use of 'president', rather than the Canadian office of 'prime minister,' in their scenario.

REFERENCES

American Psychological Association (APA). (2002). *Developing adolescents. A reference for professionals.* https://www.apa.org/pi/families/resources/develop.pdf

Bell, N. D. (2009). Learning about and through humor in the second language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, *13*(3), 241–258. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168809104697

Bell, N. (2012). Formulaic language, creativity, and language play in a second language. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 32*, 189–205. doi:10.1017/S0267190512000013

Bezemer, J., & Jewitt, C. (2010). Multimodal analysis: Key issues. In L. Litosseliti (Ed.), *Research methods in linguistics* (pp. 180-197). London: Continuum.

Blackledge, A. (2000). Monolingual ideologies in multiple states: Language, hegemony and social justice in Western liberal democracies. *Estudios de sociolingüística, 1*(2), 25–45. DOI: 10.1558/sols.v1i2.25

Blommaert, J. (1999). The debate is open. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language ideological debates* (pp. 1–38). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bokhorst-Heng, W.D. (1999). Singapore's *Speak Mandarin Campaign*: Language ideological debates and the imagining of the nation. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language ideological debates* (pp. 235–365). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bokhorst-Heng, W. D., & Keating Marshall, K. (2016). "French immersion in New Brunswick, Canada: A historical overview of intersecting discourses and policies." Paper presented at the Comparative and International Education Society annual conference (CIES), Vancouver, BC, March 6-10, 2016.

Bokhorst-Heng, W. D. & Keating Marshall, K. (2019). Informing Research (practices) Through Pedagogical Theory: Focus Groups with Adolescents. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education*, *42*(2), 148-162. (Published online 8 March 2018) doi: 10.1080/1743727X.2018.1449195

Boudreau, A. (2016). *À l'ombre de la langue légitime: L'Acadie dans la Francophonie*. Paris: Classiques Garnier.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). New York: Greenwood.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. (John Thompson, Ed., Gino Raymond, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

D'Entremont, K. (2016). Let's set the record straight – Myths and realities about official languages in New Brunswick [Press release]. Retrieved from http://officiallanguages.nb.ca/newsroom/press-releases/lets-set-record-straight-myths-and-realities-about-official-languages-new

Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2015). Identity and a model of investment in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35*, 36–56. Doi: 10.1017/S0267190514000191

Pierre-Marcel Desjardins, P.-M., & Campbell, D. (2015). Two languages: It's good for business. Retrieved from https://www.gnb.ca/legis/business/pastsessions/58/58-1/LegDoc/Eng/March58-1/TwoLanguagesMarch2015.pdf

Douglas Fir Group. (2016). A Transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. *The Modern Language Journal, 100*, 19–47.

Duff, P. A. (2008). Language socialization, participation and identity: Ethnographic approaches. In M. Martin-Jones, A.M. de Mejia & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol.3: Discourse and education* (pp. 107-119). New York: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_65

Edwards, V. (1986). *French immersion in New Brunswick: The early years (1969-1985)* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, NB.

Gaetz, L., Phadke, S., Sandberg, R., & Sauer, L. (2018). *The Canadian writer's world: Paragraphs and essays* (3rd ed.). Don Mills: Pearson.

Gray, J., Jones, J. P., & Thompson, E. (2009). The state of satire, the satire of state. In J. Gray, J. P. Jones, & E. Thompson (Eds.), *Satire TV: Politics and comedy in the post-network era* (pp. 3–36). New York: New York University Press.

Hayday, M. (2015). *So they want us to learn French: Promoting and opposing bilingualism in English-Speaking Canada.* Vancouver and Toronto: UBC Press.

Heller, M. (1999). Heated language in a cold climate. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language ideological debates* (pp. 143–170). Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Heller, M. (2007). Bilingualism as ideology and practice. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism: A social approach* (pp. 1–22). London: Palgrave MacMillan. doi: 10.1057/9780230596047

Irvine, J., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In Paul Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities* (pp. 35–84). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Jancsary, D., Höllerer, M., & Meyer, R. (2016). Critical analysis of visual and multimodal texts. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed.) (pp. 180–204). London: Sage.

Kearney, E. (2015). *Intercultural learning in modern language education: Expanding meaning-making potentials.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Keating, K. L. (2014). Discourses of minority francophone space: The emergent role of an Acadian cultural center. *Language in Society, 43*(5), 515–538.

Keating Marshall, K. & Bokhorst-Heng, W. D. (2018). "I wouldn't want to impose!" Intercultural mediation in French immersion. *Foreign Language Annals, 51*. 290-312 doi: 10.1111/flan.12340

Knoblauch, H., Tuma, R., & Schnettler, B. (2013). Video analysis and videography. In U. Flick (Ed.), *SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 435–449). London: Sage.

Kramsch, C. (2009). *The multilingual subject: What foreign language learners say about their experience and why it matters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C. (2013). Culture in foreign language teaching. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 1*(1), 57–78.

Kronby, M. (1975). *Oh Canada! Activity kit.* Canada: Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages.

Kroskrity, P. V. (2000). Regimenting languages. In P.V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, polities, and identities* (pp. 1–34). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: a social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. London and New York: Routledge.

Kubota, R. (2011). Questioning linguistic instrumental- ism: English, neoliberalism, and language tests in Japan. *Linguistics and Education, 22*, 248–260.

Levine, G. S. (2020). Supplement issue*: A human ecological language pedagogy [W. Lowie, Ed.]. *The Modern Language Journal, 103*(S1), 1-130.

Marshall, K. L., & Bokhorst-Heng, W. D. (2020a). Canadian immersion students' investment in French. *The Modern Language Journal, 104*(3), 601-617. (Published online 17 August 2020) http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/modl.12663

Marshall, K. L., & Bokhorst-Heng, W. D. (2020b). Language ideological debates and intercultural learning in French immersion education. *Canadian Modern Language Review*. 76(3), 175–193.

New Brunswick Department of Education, Educational Programs and Services. (2001). *Foundation for French language arts in French immersion in Atlantic Canada.* Retrieved from https://www2.gnb.ca/content/dam/gnb/Departments/ed/pdf/K12/curric/FSL/FrenchLanguageArtsInFrenchImmersion.pdf

New Brunswick Department of Education, Policy and Planning Division. (2018). *Summary statistics, school year 2017-2018.* Retrieved from https://www2.gnb.ca/content/dam/gnb/Departments/ed/pdf/K12/StatisticalReports-RapportsStatistiques/SummaryStatistics2017-2018.pdf

Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation* (2nd ed.). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages. (2016*). Official languages and bilingualism survey research presentation to the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages*. Retrieved from https://www.clo-ocol.gc.ca/sites/default/files/official-languages-and-bilingualism-survey-research.pdf

Province of New Brunswick, Department of Education and Early Childhood Development. (2016). *10-year education plan: Everyone at their best (Anglophone sector)*. Retrieved from https://www2.gnb.ca/content/dam/gnb/Departments/ed/pdf/K12/EveryoneAtTheirBest.pdf

Roy, S. (2009, June). "Are French Immersion students part of the bilingual Canadian society?" Paper presented at the colloquium of Bilingualism in a Plurilingual Canada: Research and Implications, University of Ottawa.

Stanley, D. M. M. (1984). *Louis Robichaud: A decade of power*. Halifax: Nimbus Publishing.

Statistics Canada. (2017a). *Census profile, 2016 Census. British Columbia and Canada* (Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-316-X2016001). Retrieved from https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/details/Page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=PR&Code1=59&Geo2=&Code2=&Data=Count&SearchText=British%20Columbia&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1=All&GeoLevel=PR&GeoCode=59

Statistics Canada. (2017b). *Census profile, 2016 Census. New Brunswick and Canada* (Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-316-X2016001). Retrieved from https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/details/Page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=PR&Code1=13&Geo2=&Code2=&Data=Count&SearchText=New%20Brunswick&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1=All&GeoLevel=PR&GeoCode=13

Thériault, J. Y. (2007). *Faire société. Société civile et espace francophone*. Sudbury: Editions Prise de Parole.

Toohey, K., Dagenais, D., & Schulze, E. (2012). Second language learners making video in three contexts. *Language and Literacy, 14*(2), 75−96.

Tryon, C. (2008). Pop politics: Online parody videos, intertextuality, and political participation. *Popular Communication, 6*(4), 209–213.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wodak, R. (2014). The European parliament: Multilingual experiences in the everyday life of MEPs. In J. W. Unger, M. Krzyzanowski, & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Multilingual encounters in Europe's institutional spaces: Advances in sociolinguistics* (pp. 125–146). London: Bloomsbury.