Catching "Montréal on the Move" and Challenging the Discourse of Unilingualism in Québec

Patricia Lamarre   *Université de Montréal – (CEETUM)*

Abstract: A complex linguistic dynamic is emerging in Montréal, yet most of the research on language in Québec relies on census statistics or survey data, leaving many questions unanswered. Specifically, what are young Montréalers who are increasingly bilingual and multilingual actually doing with languages as they move through the city and how do they perceive traditional conceptions of language and identity? To answer these questions, a non-static ethnographic approach was designed, following 15 multilinguals through their daily lives across sites and networks. Participants collaborated in analysis through discussion and reflection on the verbatim and texts collected. The findings reveal a complex portrait of language in Montréal, challenging current ways of thinking about language and doing research.

Keywords: language dynamics, multilingualism, youth, urban ethnography, identity, politics of language

Résumé : Une nouvelle dynamique complexe émerge à Montréal, alors qu'une majorité des jeunes Montréalais d'aujourd'hui sont bilingues ou multilingues, quelle que soit leur langue maternelle, en contraste frappant avec le bilinguisme unidirectionnel des années 1960. Pourtant, il y a de nombreuses questions que la recherche existante omet de soulever. Plus particulièrement, comment les Montréalais utilisent-ils les langues dans leur fréquentation de la ville, et quels enjeux sous-tendent leurs choix de langues? Comment les jeunes Montréalais avec des pratiques langagières complexes perçoivent-ils les conceptions traditionnelles de la langue et de l'identité? La recherche ethnographique sur les pratiques langagières réelles remet en question la recherche démolinguistique fondée sur les données de recensement, de même que le discours sur les menaces pesant sur le français, qui colore le quotidien au Québec.

Mots-clés : dynamique des langues, multilinguisme, jeunesse, ethnographie urbaine, identité, politiques linguistiques

Introduction

Like most other North American cities, if you wander down the streets of Montréal and through its neighbourhoods, you will hear most of the languages of the world, brought to the city through immigration flows. Montréal, however, offers a particular twist to linguistic diversity in urban settings by the number of native-born speakers using two languages in their day-to-day lives (French and English) and the number of immigrants using three languages or more. In this respect, Montréal presents an unusual language dynamic, one still in the midst of the major transformations launched during Québec's Quiet Revolution, but also increasingly caught up in the changes wrought by globalization, rapid communication technologies and the new economy. Montréal's unusual language dynamic in North America has its roots in a colonial past and a history of language contact between two strong language communities that has more recently been influenced by the use of language legislation to improve the status of French. Despite the considerable success of language legislation, Montréal's workplace remains one where French-English bilingualism is of high value. A final factor compounding the complexity of today's language dynamic is an immigrant population of diverse language backgrounds, likely to learn two languages rather than one within the process of social and economic integration (Pagé et Lamarre, 2010).

Surprisingly, despite the growing bilingualism and trilingualism of the population, very little attention has gone to how Montréalers are drawing on their language repertoires in their everyday lives. While there is a corpus of sociolinguistic research from a variationist perspective,[1] most of the research on language in Québec has focused on measuring the vitality[2] and position of the French language, a major public concern with strong and ever present political ramifications. A limitation of this type of research, however, is that its focus is on language dominance and language competition, and therefore questions

are framed to determine which language is *being used most often*. What this type of research is unable to reveal is how people are drawing on all of the languages in their daily lives. What is still needed is research on the *actual* language practices of young multilingual Montréalers, a generation that has grown up in the wake of Bill 101,[3] many of whom have been schooled in the French school sector but who have acquired three or more languages along the way to adulthood.

To counter this lack of data, we[4] designed a study on how young Montréalers are using languages in spaces that are increasingly multiethnic and multilingual and in which diversity is becoming a trait of the official language "communities" historically established—populations divided along linguistic lines, but where there is increasing blurring of boundaries and ambiguity over definitions, such as what is meant by Québécois, Anglophone and Francophone. This study examines how young multilinguals draw on their linguistic resources as they move across sites in their daily lives, take part and position themselves in different interactions and networks. It also examines the representations underlying their decisions about language use, stakes and boundaries as they move through the city.

To do this, we developed a *non-static* case study approach to data collection, a term coined to describe the approach to urban ethnography we have elaborated to go beyond site-bound studies of language use. To catch how language is used as people move through their daily lives and through the city, we "followed" 15 young multilinguals, thanks to a variety of data collection strategies, observing how they draw on their multilingual repertoires. In addition, through introspective techniques, participants were asked to reflect on their practices and the thinking underlying these practices. This approach has yielded rich data on the diversity and complexity of language practices of young multilingual Montréalers, revealing also their awareness of the different stakes underlying language and their ability to negotiate these. In effect their life in Montréal is much like a parkour[5] terrain, a linguistic obstacle course that they navigate with considerable flexibility, while keeping a distance from the politics of language and identity in Québec, which has little emotional resonance for them.

Our analysis of data draws heavily on critical sociolinguistics, which Heller (2003) describes as a perspective built on traditional interactionist approaches to sociolinguistics (Gumperz 1982), but able to relate language practices and discourse to social categorization (identity) and social stratification (power) by drawing on sociological theory. The analytical tools proposed in critical

sociolinguistics can, therefore, not only interpret language use and discourse as related to social and ideological practices, but use language practices as a window to reveal how these processes and ideologies are constructed and how frontiers are maintained or transformed. The emerging complexity of language dynamics of Montréal begs to be approached through the type of ethnography we have undertaken. This said, a non-static critical sociolinguistic approach to language practices rather than traditional site-bound urban ethnography also has value for the study of language in other cities, including ones described as "unilingual."

Context

Much has been written on how the sociolinguistic context of Montréal has been transformed over the past three decades. Montréal is often cited as an example of how language shift can be reversed through the mobilization of a linguistic minority around shared interests and through efforts at social engineering (Fishman 1991; Bourhis 2001; Oakes and Warren 2007). Indeed, if we look back to the 1960s, Montréal seemed well on its way to becoming a multicultural English-speaking city (Levine 1990). The 1960s, however, also marked the beginning of a period of rapid social transformation in Québec (McRoberts 1999). Today, three decades past Québec's Quiet Revolution, Montréal is a far more French city than it once was, thanks in part to language policy and legislation.

Montréal offers a significantly different linguistic context from other cosmopolitan Canadian cities such as Toronto and Vancouver. On the one hand, Montréal is the only major metropolitan centre in Canada to function predominantly in a language other than English. It is also the Canadian city in which bilingualism has the most value within the local "linguistic market" (Bourdieu 1982). Census data reveal that Montréal is the city where knowledge of both official languages is highest in Canada (Statistics Canada 2013). While Francophones and Anglophones are more bilingual than they were in the past, among Allophones (in census data, this refers to speakers whose first language is neither French nor English), what can be observed is a fairly recent phenomenon of trilingualism. What these statistics suggest is that while French is increasingly necessary for social and economic integration into the life of the city, a complex bilingual/ multilingual language dynamic is emerging, in which the value of French-English bilingualism figures importantly.

Montréal further differs from other Canadian or North American cities by its history of divided institutional systems (including schooling, social and healthcare services). This type of institutional parallelism has

been considerably eroded (Juteau 2000) but, in the past, allowed the two major language communities to live side by side, yet in relative isolation. Until quite recently, the division of language communities extended to the geography of the city, with a west end primarily inhabited by English speakers, an east end primarily inhabited by French speakers and a "buffer" zone between the two (the Main/boulevard St.Laurent), historically occupied by immigrants. The city can no longer be so tidily divided into linguistic zones as the population within neighbourhoods becomes more diversified, yet it remains that these zones are still pertinent when it comes to predicting dominant language behaviour (Lamarre et al. 2002) and in how the city is imagined and described (Lamarre, in preparation).

In present-day Montréal, traditional boundaries are in the process of "blurring," whether one thinks in terms of linguistic and cultural identity, institutional separation or the geographic distribution of the population. An obvious factor contributing to this blurring of boundaries is the increasing weight within the city's population of immigrants and the children of immigrants, their presence in previously more homogeneous institutions such as schools, and their impact on how group identity in Québec is defined, whether we are discussing what it means to be an Anglo-Montréaler/Québecer today (Norris 1999; Jedwab 2008; Floch 2008) or what is meant by Francophone (CSLF 1999; Meintel and Fortin 2001; Helly 1992; Fontaine et Juteau 1996). A further compounding factor in approaching the notion of linguistic boundaries in Montréal is the fact that an increasing number of young people have the language skills to cross traditional boundaries. And what little existing qualitative research there is, confirms that many are increasingly comfortable doing just that (Radice 2000).

The final element confronting traditional conceptions of the language dynamics of Montréal, however, comes from beyond the territory of Québec and is part of a much larger trend affecting populations around the globe: the impact of globalization and modernity on how languages are perceived and on how identity, community, citizenship and immigration are defined and experienced (Appadurai 1996; Block 2006; Heller 2000; Meintel 1997, 1993; Kearney 1995). As Heller (2000) has argued, globalization challenges existing social structures, networks and relationships by the creation of new ones not bound by the local context. If we think specifically in terms of language, globalization redefines how individuals perceive their linguistic resources in relationship to linguistic markets, allowing for the possibility of using what is owned beyond the constraints of the local context, and calling

for a more nuanced understanding of language as a form of capital (Lamarre and Dagenais 2003). Globalization and the movement of populations are also contributing to the emergence of new identities (Hall 1988; Harris 2006) and, in the case of immigrant and second generation youth, to notions of community and citizenship that can be described as transnational (Meintel 1993) or plurinational (Laperrière 2002).

In summary, at one level, the language dynamics of Montréal are currently being transformed by internal trends: more specifically, through efforts at "francisation," the increasing bilingualism and multilingualism of the entire population, regardless of first language(s) learned, and the blurring of traditional collective identities that results from the growing ethnic and cultural diversity within language communities. On another level, local language dynamics are also being transformed through broad external trends, the forces of globalization and post-modernity. It is within these complex and ongoing processes that we need to approach the study of language use among young Montréalers and interpret its findings.

Towards a New Approach to Urban Sociolinguistic Ethnography

The approach developed in this study contributes to the field of urban sociolinguistics, a recent field that has elicited considerable debate as to its definition, and even its existence as distinct from the larger field of sociolinguistics (Calvet 2005; Bulot et al. 2001; Heller 2005). Given these debates, the theoretical stance of this study needs to be clarified. Simply put, cities are considered as much more than a backdrop to ethnography: Montréal is not just an *arrière plan*, it is also the object of study. Hence, what we claim to be doing is more than ethnography *in* the city, but also ethnography *of* the city (Fox 1972, 1975; Gulick 1989; Jackson 1985; Kemper 1991; Bierbach et Bulot 2007; Hannerz 1980). The linguistic and social interactions captured through our research cannot be teased apart from Montréal: the two are intimately interwoven, rising out of a particular history and the place of languages within that history, but also contributing to what Montréal is today and what it will become tomorrow. Like Heller (2005) and Mondada (2000), we recognize the role of actors and consider their relationship to the city, and to all other structures, as interactive, constructed within a material and historic context, but not fixed or bound, rather always in evolution. The approach is also multiscalar: the linguistic and social interactions of the city's inhabitants are understood as constructed locally (Pennycook 2010:128), but also under the effect of larger

globalizing trends which are transforming what is considered local. It is within larger processes, always and necessarily in evolution, that actors understand and make sense of their lives, negotiate the everyday, and contribute to the production and reproduction of the world.

How then can researchers *do* a sociolinguistics of the city? Cities, even midsized ones like Montréal, are a challenge to tackle given their size and complexity. To study a city, we have to reduce and delimit what we are tackling, make it smaller, more manageable, so that it can be apprehended, analyzed, theorized. If we turn to urban anthropology, an older field that has much to offer urban sociolinguistics, we can identify a number of ways of "cutting up" cities: from an "urban ecology" approach looking at "natural" social milieus (Park and Burgess 1925), to "community studies" (Ware 1935; Whyte 1975) and "network" analysis (Bott 1957). Cities can also be broken down into social units, such as the family or street gangs, or approached through ethnographies conducted in specific sites, such as the workplace or the school. Pertinent as these different types of ethnographic approaches may be, what they share is that they offer "a fragmentary picture of urban reality" (Fox 1977). These studies simply haven't the capacity to offer us the inherent diversity of how individuals live their daily lives, as Goffman (1959) proposes, a series of performance of parts.

Site-bound approaches to the use of languages allow us to learn much about how individuals use languages in specific sites, such as the school, the workplace, or even nightclubs, but these approaches have their limits (Lamarre et al. 2002): they cannot show us how individuals draw on their linguistic repertoires according to different social spaces, networks and stakes—in other words, the diversity of linguistic practices they engage in daily. We are left in the dark as to how these delimited spaces and sites are different from the other spaces visited in the course of the day by any one individual. Yet, movement through the city seems to particularily characterize the daily lives of young adults (Amit-Talai 1994) and this has been shown for those living in Montréal, who are often only somewhat attached to the neighbourhoods they return to at the end of the day (Dansereau 1999) and who are likely to move across many neighbourhoods and parts of the city for work, study and leisure activities (Lamarre et al. 2002). Site-bound studies defined by social unit or by network can only capture some of the ways individuals are performing/living their lives and draw on their linguistic resources in the process.

A different approach to urban anthropology and urban sociolinguistics can, however, be imagined as Hannerz proposes (without seeming to actually believe): "To really study a city as a whole, one would have to take into account all of its people .... Moreover one would have to take them through all domains of activities, not only as they make a living, but also as they run their households, deal with neighbors, brush against each other in the city square, or simply relax" (1980: 297). While Hannerz's proposition might at first seem quite impossible to translate into a data collection approach, it actually merits reflection. Without pretending to study all of the population of the city as they move through all of the spheres of activity (or domains), why not imagine a case study approach that actually follows a small group of people through their daily lives? Why not design an approach to data collection that is not static, not bound by sites, or even by the notion of place, but rather dictated by the participants as they move through their daily lives, different sites and spaces, including virtual space (facebook, emailing, textmessaging, etc) and social networks.

An ethnography of this sort, which actually follows participants in their daily trajectories, has much to offer sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology at the data collection level, but also for what it can allow us to examine theoretically through empirical data. Furthermore, it has much to offer the study of Montréal, as an ethnography "on the move" can catch the diversity of an individual's linguistic practices and how these practices are related to the different stakes, situations and networks encountered within the specific language dynamic of the city. Verbatim interactions recorded *in situ* allowed us to seize the diversity of language practices of young Montréalers, but in order to really probe the stakes of language choice as perceived by participants, we designed an approach that is interactive and reflexive, asking participants to reflect on their language practices during the interviews and also through a form of journal keeping. In an effort to push analysis further, participants were also asked to interpret their own verbatim, giving the reasons for a particular form of language practice, thus allowing them to engage in a reflection on their own multilingual experience, as well as participate in the preliminary analysis of data. .

Our approach not only allows the creation of a much less fragmented corpus of data on language practices, it also provides more complex and textured insights into the language dynamic emerging in Montréal. With this non-static approach to data collection, we claim, in effect, to be doing a sociolinguistics of the city, putting movement and multiplicity at the center of methodology. The time is right for research of this sort in Québec. There are very few studies of multilingualism or of bilingualism, as lived and understood by an important and growing number of Montréal's population. Ethnographic research of this

sort reveals the politics of language use in the everyday, as well as the discursive and interactional construction of political and ideological positioning. It also challenges some of the taken-for-granted concepts that are used to study language in Québec and Canada. Most research, and particularily demolinguistic research, considers linguistic categories as closed and impermeable: you are either a Francophone or an Anglophone or an Allophone (a category that lumps together all speakers of home languages other than French and English). While it has become commonplace to accept hyphenated identities such as Italo-Québécois, Anglo-Montréaler, Polish Canadian, etc, when it comes to the hyphenation of linguistic traits, an invisible wall goes up. Perhaps because of the potency of language as a distinctive trait of the French-speaking collectivity in Québec's social and political world, there seems to be an inability to accept linguistic identity as composite or perhaps not even that important in an individual's sense of self. Research needs to go beyond these traditional conceptions of linguistic identities and examine empirically how a new generation of Montréalais are drawing on linguistic and identity repertoires. As will be taken up in the conclusions to this article, a study of this nature counters the often alarmist public debates on language in Québec, offering a more complex understanding of language practices, as well as informs our understanding of how larger global transformations play out in localized contexts, reshaping boundaries and stakes defined historically.

Methodology

The study attempts to catch "Montréal on the move." To meet this objective, our first challenge was to find strategies for data collection, allowing us to follow the fifteen young adults participating in the study, as they move across settings and social networks in their day-to-day lives, revealing how specific settings elicit different types of language practices and performance of linguistic identity. We also wanted to examine how young multilinguals make sense of the spaces they cross in the course of the day and position themselves in relation to sites, social networks (in the older sense) and the politics of language and identity, so our second major goal was to build in reflexivity and interactivity in the analysis of findings. Our case study approach to data collection can be described as follows:

Participants were recruited through existing networks at the college (*cegep*) level, primarily through student radio but also through local free newspapers. A few participants proposed friends who were interested, so a small number actually know each other outside of the

study. We looked for participants who were of immigrant background, had lived in Montreal for at least five years and were using three or more languages in their daily lives. Efforts were made to keep a balance between male and female participants and socioeconomic status. Following an introductory meeting to explain what participation in the study entailed and obtain initial consent, we asked the participant to fill in a short questionnaire on his/her background and to write a short biographical account of their life history and acquisition of linguistic resources; to keep field notes in the form of a logbook on how and where languages are used in the course of a week; to draw up a list of the places they frequent within a week and explain what draws them to these different places; and finally, to select a number of emails and text messages to be included in the corpus.

The next phase was a semi-directed interview, lasting 90 minutes, in which representations of languages and language use in daily life (with friends, family, at work, in educational settings, on the internet, etc) are explored. We also asked questions on how spaces in the city are perceived and to help do this we drew on geographical and subway maps of the city of Montreal. At the end of this phase, participants were asked to reflect on what they have learned so far about their own use of languages in Montréal. Thanks to data already generated, a list of places and situations was drawn up in which verbatim would be digitally recorded. Participants were provided with a digital recorder to record 12 to 15 different natural interactions *in situ*. Participants kept field notes and were asked to provide comments on why they adopted language practices in these different situations. With the research team, field notes were discussed and used to determine what verbatim would be transcribed by participants. Finally, to complete this phase in data collection, a member of the research team accompanied the participant in a walk through a part of the city of the participants' choosing, much like the "go along" technique used to explore neighborhoods in urban geography (Kusenbach 2003).[6]

A second semi-directed interview was scheduled (90 minutes). This interview probed data collected throughout the case study, including the verbatim of natural interactions and the initial interpretation of these by participants. Focus group interviews brought participants together, five at a time, to discuss their experience of the city and of languages as young multilinguals. A final short reflection was requested, in which participants were asked to write about what they learned about languages in Montréal, the city, and about themselves.

Case studies usually ran over a period of four months during which we remained closely in touch with

participants. Participants were paid as research assistants for their hours of involvement and for transcribing the interviews and the verbatim recorded *in situ*. Contact has been maintained with this original group of participants so that they can be interviewed periodically, making the study longitudinal—rather like Michael Apted's "7 UP" documentary series in which he interviewed an initial group of children every 7 years to see how their lives were evolving. We will roughly follow the different stages to data collection in the presentation of data in the next section.

Montréal Français, Montréal Multilingue: Some Findings from the Case Studies

Complex Stories and Complex Language Use

> I speak five languages. The first language that I was in contact with was szechuanese. To be honest, I dont even know if szechuanese is the right translation for the language that I speak. In fact, it's not a language, but rather a dialect, among so many hundreds of others in China. I don't know the origins of szechuan.... In my opinion, the political situation in China ... media, culture and education... are factors which explain our ignorance about the history of dialects.... My grandparents and my parents are Chinese, except for one grandparent who is Cambodian. My Chinese grandparents fled China for Cambodia in the hope of finding a better quality of life. That's why they didn't want me to forget my origins and "imposed," if I can say it that way, Szechuan. One thing that needs to be said is that communication among the elderly in my family is always in Cambodian ... but they never taught it to me. I spoke only in Chinese (Szechaun) until the age of 6 or 7.... Cambodian, no one ever "officially" taught me ... I just somehow managed on my own.... The more I learned it and mastered it, the more my grandparents and parents forced me to speak in Szechuan. I presume they were afraid I would lose Chinese as I learned Cambodian. They weren't wrong. Today, I master Cambodian much better than Chinese if we are talking about a mother tongue. I only use these languages with my family (except my brother), at work and in the Chinese and Cambodian communities.... When it comes to French, it's easy, I learned it when I started kindergarten.... My first real contact with French was my first day of school.... I would say that I use French most of the time. That's kind of logical when you think of the amount of time I spend in school and on assignments. Even though most of my friends are "Asian," we communicate most of the time in French. You could say we have all been assimilated. [Laughter]. As for English, I hardly use it.... When I go out, the city is mostly bilingual, so intuitively I would tend to use my French. However, when I watch a TV series, that's in English. Sometimes I have conversations in English, also emails and text messages.
>
> [Lana's autobiography, translated from French]

This is an extract from a short language biography that Lana (pseudonym), one of the participants in the study, wrote at the beginning of the data collection process, before she actually sat down with the research team for an interview. These biographies tend to be stories of migration and of settlement, as most of the participants in this study came to Québec when they were quite young. From the biography, it becomes clear that the relationship that Lana and her family had towards language, place and identity before migrating to Québec was a complex one. There is really nothing simple in this story of a family from Szechuan and their relationship to Cantonese, Mandarin, Szechuan, Cambodian, and more recently, French and English. What is clear is that they have never known a situation of unilingualism: living with many languages is the norm. From the biography, a rather clear cut portrait of language use emerges: here Lana uses Cambodian, here French, here English. A text message from her brother provided in the initial phase of the study, however, quickly reveals language practices that are not quite so tidy:[7]

Stevo:	Huet a Washington
Lana:	Yack !!!!!!!!!
Lana:	Hossa y est ou?
Stevo:	He goes to Pittsburgh
Lana:	on a rien com dhab
Stevo:	faut attendre1,2 heures pour avoir les resultat finale.... maybe we got something will now later

[Original verbatim, transcribed by participant]

One of the main goals of this study was to confront how people talk about language use and what they actually do in real life practices. As these two extracts reveal, there is much to be probed. Lana's biography gives the impression of the tidy use of different languages in different domains. Actual texts and verbatim reveal, however, complex language practices and ways of speaking that can best be called "parler bilingue" (Lüdi and Py 2003) or even "parler multilingue." The complexity of Lana's language biography and the complexity of her ways of speaking immediately challenge bound conceptions of language that are the cornerstone of so much Canadian research.

Catching Multilingual Montréalers "on the Move"

In the following section, we pull in data from the study to provide a taste of what the 15 case studies look like and how this group of young multilinguals are living Montréal languages. At the time of data collection, most of the participants were still studying or had only just integrated the workplace.

The first phase of the study immediately involves participants, giving them a very active role in data collection. It essentially requires that they become neophyte researchers on their own lives: they are called upon to observe their language practices and to reflect on their practices in writing and then in interviews. After writing a short language biography, participants kept logbooks of how and where they use language in their daily activities and provided us with various texts produced in the everyday (text messaging, email, facebook, etc). From this initial data, prior to any interviews or digital recording of verbatim, a portrait of life being lived with many languages quickly becomes apparent. It is very clear that these young adults are using language in ways that completely escape census and other surveys built on questions that ask "which language do you use most often at work, with friends, in the home, etc." Here is a logbook extract from Nadine, a young Lebanese woman who was teaching both ESL and FSL at the time of the study. Her brief description of an ordinary work day gives us a first glimpse of the diversity of language practices in her everyday experience of home, work, and leisure:

6:30
> Coffee with my sister.... We talk in French and Arabic. I'm listening to the radio Mix 96 in English. Talk to my boyfriend in English (Egyptian living in Boston).

7:30
> Pick up my teaching files in the office. Talk briefly to a colleague in French.

8:00-9:30
> Teach an English Class

10:00-12:30
> Teach English to two Saudi women. Use some Arabic to explain difficult words

13:30
> Reserve equipment at university (French)

14:00
> Gym. Speak to the receptionist in French. Exercise while listening to music in English

15:30
> Speak to my best friend in French and Arabic
> [Nadine's logbook, translated from French]

This description provides a very different portrait on language use from that generated by survey and census questionnaires. It is perhaps a startling portrait to those who think in terms of language shift theory, as do a great many of the demolinguists in Canada who measure the vitality of official language communities, and a great many of those measuring the vitality of the French language in Québec and who focus on language shift and language transfer. Underlying the demolinguistic approach to the study of language is the question of whether immigrants are learning French or English and whether French speakers are in decline in the Canadian and Québec context. Language shift views bilingualism as a transitional phase within the intergenerational shift from one mother tongue to another and uses language transfer as an indicator (French or English adopted in the home).

This type of approach, with its focus on one dominant language in the home emerged in the 1960s and the 1970s in the politics of language at the time, and its pertinence in the current 21st century context needs to be at the very least reconsidered.

Jumping to any quick conclusions on language practices from Nadine's logbook, however, would be a mistake. For example, it is only later, when she has provided us with recorded verbatim that we learn that Nadine, who shares an appartment with her brother and sister, tends to use French and Arabic with her brother who is studying in French, and French, Arabic and English with her sister who is studying in an English language university.

The next extract is again from Nadine's case study and reveals the complexity of even teasing out which language is being used, when and where. In this extract, she is cleaning house with her sister in preparation for their parents' visit from Beirut and they are remembering fondly how their mother tries to "kill" them with housecleaning products; apparently, even if she actually reads the instructions on cleaning products, she doesn't tend to follow them.

Loréna:	ya3ni, maman, hafli/ *le ménage du four pour elle/ elle lit... les instructions/ c'est une option pour elle/ une fois elle allait suffoquer parce qu'elle a mélangé deux produits de nettoyage ensemble*
Nadine:	*Tu te rappelles quand une fois ils étaient là à Noël ... elle réveille tout le monde/ genre à 6 heures du matin*
Loréna:	*Avec l'odeur...*

Nadine: *Pour commencer à nettoyer le four*
Loréna: *Mais on a suffoqué/* a3 min a3yit / *attends
il faisait froid dehors et on s'est mit à
l'extérieur pour prendre de l'air* wakta /
*juste parce qu'on pouvait plus de l'odeur/
Il faisait froid et ça puait dans la maison/
imagine*/It can't get worse/ *Parce qu'elle
mélange les produits/ C'est sûr les instruc-
tions/ c'est* Spray, leave in and wipe and
throw the chiffon and that is the end of it
Nadine: Ya allah
[Original verbatim, transcribed by participant]

Many teachers, laypeople and a good number of research-ers automatically consider this type of "code switching" as a sign of semilingualism, a lack of mastery of any lan-guage (Skutnabb-Kangas 1981). But other verbatim from Nadine's case study would clearly reveal that Nadine is well able to tease the "code switching" out and talk "uni-lingually" in all of the languages that are in her reper-toire. In fact, she teaches English and French to business people in Montréal and has done Masters degrees in both English and French universities. The larger body of ver-batim within her case study would also reveal that Nadine only uses her linguistic resources in this particular way with people who have these resources as well. Rather than "codeswitching," it can be considered a "third" way of talking, a "parler multilingue," another form of linguistic resource, beyond her ability to perform "unilingually" in French, English and Arab.

Nadine's language practices in her home also make evident the weakness and even non-pertinence of using language in the home as an indicator of linguistic assimila-tion or integration. Nadine is very well integrated into life in Montréal, as the case study reveals and as she would be quick to point out. What she does in the home is complex but so are her language practices once she steps out the door, as her logbook made evident.

The case study data also reveal that Nadine's inter-actions in her daily life are not completely bound by the local. She speaks regularly to her parents in Beirut on the phone (using French and Arabic). She has friends scat-tered around the world that she "talks" to regularly via facebook and email and she gets a morning wakeup call every day from her boyfriend of Egyptian origin who lives in Boston. Like many of the participants in this study, Nadine's social world is international and transnational and her links to people are maintained thanks to digital technologies and, more recently, Skype. Leave taking, the rupture between place and people, that characterized earlier waves of immigration, has evaporated in the last few decades and it is entirely possible for this younger generation to maintain contact with friends and family all over the world on a daily basis thanks to the internet, and to visit regularly thanks to cheap airfares. Mobility, either through new communication technology or through actual travel, is somehow a "given" in the lives of this younger generation, and using language in the everyday does not mean using language only locally. Here, as an example, is an email correspondence that Nadine has with a Korean friend, which is mostly in Spanish:

> Escucha la noticia de libano en televicion.Tus padre
> estan alla? Verdad? Como estan tus padres? Estan
> seguros? Me preocupe de seguro de tu familia y tu. *I
> pray for u.* Suerete, h.[8]

The reason for this becomes apparent thanks to Nadine's explanation included in her field notes: "Message from a friend in Korea that I met during an exchange pro-gram in Mexico. The only language we have in common is Spanish."

In the study, we also examined representations of spaces and language use. Participants kept field notes on the spaces that they frequent on a regular basis and what language practices can be expected in those spaces. Here is extract from Gabrielle's field notes.

> Supermarché PA (avenue du Parc and St-Joseph): It's
> the supermarket closest to where I live / The employ-
> ees speak French and English (it's a Greek business)
> but my conversations there tend to be in French
> [Gabrielle's logbook,
> translated from the original in French]

Gabrielle is actually surprised by her logbook on lan-guage use. She comments that it made her realize that, since moving to Montréal from Toronto, she is actually using French *less* in her daily life. In Toronto, the family used mostly French in the home and she attended a French school where everyone was bilingual, but where there was great emphasis on never using English within the walls of the school. She moved to Montréal to attend an English language university and where her new net-work of friends is mostly other students from the same university. As is revealed later in the study, at the time of participation, her use of French was fairly limited to shop-ping and interacting with strangers in the city.

What Nadine's, Lana's and Gabrielle's language hist-ory drives home is the need to think of language practices as an audible moment in an ever moving, evolving and life-long process of language socialization (Ochs and Schiefflin 2008). And that things change as we move through life: Gabrielle has since completed a Masters degree and is

still in Montréal, working in French in a very French work environment. Her boyfriend is American and they speak mostly in English. Nadine has since moved to Boston, is married and is raising two small boys who speak Arabic, English and French in her home, while she is teaching French at the university level. Her brother still lives in Montréal in a home that Nadine's parents bought to serve as a meeting place for a family that is scattered across three countries.

All of the information provided by participants gets fleshed out further when we meet for the first interview. The information provided in the language biographies and logbooks is used as a base from which to gather more information and a better grasp of how participants use language and how they position themselves in respect to language. Some of the participants, like Gabrielle, are surprised by what they are learning about themselves, language and Montréal, thanks to their involvement in the study. Some are fairly quick to point out that they mix languages up much more than they realized and a few notice, at this early stage, that using three languages at once ("parler multilingue") is something that is only done with those with the language repertoire to follow:

> I consider myself perfectly trilingual.... Obviously the people I am with determine my choice of language... my room to manoeuver is amplified if they are also bilingual or...
>
> [Nadine's autobiography, translated from French]

What also quickly transpires even at this initial stage of data collection are young people with the linguistic resources to accommodate to the people they interact with in the course of the day. They move quite permeably through the linguistic zones of the city and are not at all constrained by the historic and psychological boundary of boulevard St-Laurent or the "Main," the street that marked the end of a linguistic comfort zone for Anglo and Franco Montréalers for many decades. The first interview ends with a mapping activity in which, working with a city map and a metro/subway map, participants show us the parts of the city that they move around in. An extract from an interview with Mitko shows how young multilinguals see no problem in crossing the traditional geographic line that divides Montréal into east and west, French and English. Mitko makes clear that he is comfortable crossing over linguistic boundaries: he has the linguistic "passport" that allows this.

I go to McGill (métro) here because that's where Paramount (cinema) is .. to Rosemont because of my poker club... either Sherbrooke or Berri UQAM for my chess club... the chess competitions are at PIE IX in the Olympic Stadium.

[Mitko interview, translated from French]

Following the first interview, participants are given a digital recorder and we determine with them what interactions they will record and in what settings. This is the most challenging part of the data collection. Most participants are at ease recording interactions with friends and family and in most leisure activities. Recording quick interactions while shopping with the permission of store clerks is a bit more challenging, but most manage to do this. What we found difficult to obtain were verbatim recorded in the workplace. This is something that needs to be taken into account and we have had to rely more on the perceptual data provided than on actual recorded language practices. Here, however, is a verbatim from Nadine shopping for pyjamas in a mall in Montréal. Half way through the interaction, she makes the switch to English and the clerk simply follows along in her wake, a practice which clearly challenges surveys based on unilingual conceptions of language use.

Nadine:	you found one? great
Clerk:	there you go
Nadine:	this is the one... medium/ *J'espère que le haut va être correcte/parce que le pantalon était trop grand mais le haut était correcte*
Clerk:	*Ça va être un peu serré*
Nadine:	*C'est pas grâve*
Clerk:	*Voilà/ j'aurais besoin de votre numéro de téléphone*

[Original verbatim, transcribed by participant]

The "go-along" technique is the next step in the data collection. The go-along is basically an accompanied walk in a neighborhood or part of town that the participants like, not necessarily the neighborhood in which they live. Mitko chose to walk the downtown Chinatown area with Stéphanie, a graduate student research assistant, and had this to say about language in the federal passport office and language use:

Le complexe GuyFavreau ... c'est pour un / faire un passeport ... j'irai là-bas puis si je vais parler anglais là-bas ils vont pas me comprendre ou faire semblance de ne pas me comprendre ... parce qu'ils veulent que je parlent français[9]

[Mitko, go-along]

He also provided us with a rather unexpected comment on how his knowledge of Hebrew helped for a part-time job he had in a Chinese restaurant:

> Je travaillais dans un restaurant chinois mais c'était nourriture chinoise cachère/ C'était très spécial / j'ai rencontré beaucoup de juifs chinois quand je travaillais làbas / c'était très... parce qu'ils parlent chinois à leur table puis quand je viens ils commencent à me parler en hébreu / c'est comme deux langues que ne se sont jamais rencontrées...[10]

Whenever possible, the go-along technique is also an opportunity for participants to do some errands and thus provides us with more interactions recorded *in situ.* The following is an excerpt taken from the go-along with Irena. She and Stéphanie have just gone into a pastry shop close to where Irena studies on the western side of the city. Irena, with the usual sensitivity to the politics of language, has chosen to speak only in French with Stéphanie, who she perceives as a "francophone québécoise." Irena walks into the shop, turns to the shopclerk and uses English, without waiting for the usual *"bonjour*—hello" (Heller 1978) that starts most interactions in the downtown core of Montréal and allows people to size each other up linguistically and determine the language of the interaction-transaction to follow (and, interestingly in Montréal, it is not always the language of the client that is used—rather bililinguals will make the effort to adjust to someone with less fluency, regardless of whether they are the client or the shopclerk).

Irena:	*ok je vais vous dire là qu'est ce que vous allez acheter quand vous allez venir ici ... si vous voulez quelque chose de léger ça c'est très bon ... ceux-là si vous aimez le chocolat sont merveilleux / et aussi ça si vous avez vraiment faim là /mais vraiment faim / choisissez ceux-là parce que après ça*
Sté:	[laughter]
Irena:	*mais ça* // we're just looking (she turns and talks to the pastryshop clerk behind the counter)
Clerk:	ok (in English)

<div align="center">[Irena, go-along in the city, original verbatim transcribed by participant]</div>

If the go-along is an opportunity to talk about the places participants frequent (or chose to avoid), it is also where more traditional interview techniques tend to get turned on their head. Quite often and quite suddenly, the interview can become a conversation and sometimes the roles of interviewee and interviewer will be flipped

around. If the more relaxed feel of the go-along provides an opportunity for the research team to probe sensitive issues, such as participants' feelings about Bill 101, it is also an opportunity for participants to sound out the positionings of members of the research team. In the following extract, Jessica, the participant, has actually taken on doing the interviewing, including the "hmm-hmms" that are absolutely *de rigueur* in any good interviewer's techniques. Stéphanie has been probing to find out if she has ever been in an incident where someone got upset with her for using English or French. Jessica, a very reserved participant, turns the interview around 180 degrees to do some quizzing of her own and this is followed by an openness to telling us what she really thinks about language skirmishes:

Sté:	Have you witnessed anything like that and with who where?
Jessica:	eeeeeeeeeeen /no, no I don't remember anymore/hum hum (7 sec) / has that happened to you?
Sté:	euh well, um, I tend to always speak in French
Jessica:	that's what I would have thought but / exactly so if...
Sté:	but it has happened to me sometimes in restaurants and the person will say euh I can't understand...
Jessica:	humhum
Sté:	so, um, depending on how I am feeling that day / either I'll repeat in French or I will repeat it in English
Jessica:	hum hum ok / so it's never happened that you will say "how come you don't speak French" and then they get xxxx
Sté:	it's not really my style to confront people
Jessica:	ok
Sté:	it's more likely to be / if I continue in French / it'll be to speak more slowly y'know....]
Sté:	does this remind you of anything?
Jessica:	ouais some situations when /me it's never happened to me ... / for me it's a waste of time because / actually I don't have that emotion / I don't have that language barrier maybe...

<div align="center">[Jessica, go-along interview, translated from French]</div>

The go-along technique seems to break down the formality of the interview and participants take possession of the "interaction," feeling free to ask questions, but also feeling more at ease with revealing what they really think and these two things seem to be knit together. It is usually

during the second interview, after the go-along, that participants feel more relaxed about being in the study. The everyday politics of language that go with interacting with strangers (including researchers) have diminished and at this stage we get to hear a lot more easily how they feel about language use. Here is Georges, of Greek background, explaining his general "rules" for language use in the city. As can be seen in this verbatim, we are both bilingual and willing to slide across languages, knowing that the other person can follow. All of the place names are pronounced in *québécois* and there is nothing unusual in this type of interaction among people often categorized as "Anglos" in Québec, but who are actually living their lives in two or more languages:

Georges:	sure, sure absolutely/yeah Saint-Laurent is a divide/ not so much as it used to be but of course but it still very much is / if yeah, if I'm in *Saint-Henri* or *Pointe-Saint-Charles* and I walk into a *dépanneur* I probably would maybe start speaking English/ if I was in *Hochelaga-Maisonneuve* I would walk into a *dépanneur* to buy / a candy bar I would speak in French... but I'm definitely aware there's a / linguistic ghettos
Patricia:	yeah / and what about downtown/ how do you describe downtown
Georges:	oh that's a free-for-all ...but, uhm, I would do French just as a default thing because you're safe with French / I mean it's // the English is rarely / hey speak to me in English / this is an English (place)
Patricia:	yeah
Georges:	it's very few/ it can grate on certain Francophones' nerves to be / *qu'on leur addresse la parole par défaut en anglais*/ they /that does grate on their nerves sometimes/ so default/ to be sure I'll speak in French then I might adapt myself
Patricia:	let's say you walk into a... I don't know, a *permis de conduire?*/ uhh
Georges:	well yeah, yeah French
Patricia:	passport office?
Georges:	passport office/ that's federal/ but yeah, yeah French yeah/ the language of business and officialdom in *Québec* I'll speak French
	[Georges, interview]

In this section, we have focused on using the data to show how young multilinguals are drawing on their linguistic repertoires with great fluidity as they move through the city, negotiate interactions and position themselves in contexts with different stakes. This data provides a good base from which to argue the limitations of

what survey questions, including census questionnaires, can tell us about the lived experience of multilinguals and particularly of questions formulated within a language competition model, as in *"Which language do you use the most when?"*

The research data, however, also made evident another problem multilinguals face when asked to fill in surveys: the expectation that they can fit into clearly delimited language categorizations that do not allow for blurring when it comes to language. As someone who had worked with language his entire working life once told me with complete seriousness: "You can't be a Franglo—you have to be one thing or the other—either an Anglo or a Franco. You have to take a side."

Linguistic Categorization: Whether You Like It or Not

In Québec and Canada, the saliency of language in the politics of identity has led to a tendency to reify the language and identity relationship, the "little boxes" of Canadian and *Québécois* politics that have become so important. These categorizations are often imposed on the participants in this study, who don't particularly think of any one language as a marker for who they are. This is an issue that Nadine is absolutely clear about: "I don't identify more with Arab or French or English."

In fact, Nadine sometimes hides who she is and the languages she speaks. This was revealed when, during the case study, we looked at a verbatim that Nadine recorded at *"le marché central,"* sometimes described as *"le petit Maghreb"* because so many clients and store keepers there are of North African background. In this interaction, Nadine chose only to use French with the shopclerk who was from North Africa. When I asked her why she sometimes chose to hide her ability to speak Arabic, she described a distance that she chooses to maintain:

It's like, you enter a room and there are two or three people that you know are from the same background and you don't actually know anyone. Chances are you are gonna find something in common with that person about the same background. They are gonna ask you where you are from to make conversation. But it's just, I don't generally like it when people know right away because of the mentality is so... to say she or he is from this family, she does this and does that and I saw her and she did that and I, like, pffff .... *J'étouffe trop vite*
[Nadine, interview]

In many of the case studies, a palpable frustration could be felt when it came to being put in the language boxes that we use so pervasively to categorize the people we

meet in Montréal. Here's what Gabrielle had to say: "My profile, as a franco-ontarian-american-jewish-german-torontonian, was a new concept for many people that I met in Montréal" (Gabrielle reflexion, translated from the French).

While many people in Québec still make sense of the world they live in with the categories "Francophone/Anglophone/Allophone," for many of the young adults being labelled in the process, this is not something that has any emotional resonance. This extract from an interview with Irena catches her discomfort:

Irena: I'm not a native speaker of English or French maybe in that way.
Patricia: But you didn't want any ...
Irena: No I didn't want any definite boxes ...
                                    [Irena, focus group]

When participants met as a group at the end of data collection, the frustration that they feel at being labelled as Anglophones, as immigrants, or as Allophones was made very clear:

Mitko: no, no self labeling but the people who you interact with they're gonna put a label on you ... for anything you do, and one of those things is gonna be languages and it's just, they'll attach a label on you ... immigrant or Allophone or maybe in some cases Anglophone; that's all and you'll just stick with that and
Irena: ...there's nothing you can do?
Gabrielle: actually they get offended like, whenever I feel like, someone, like I'll speak French then you sort a feel like someone just stamps a big fat red Anglo on your forehead
Irena: [laugh]
Gabrielle: I don't know, I tend to kind a be like, well, you know
Mitko: who cares
Irena: I try
Gabrielle: those are the times when I'll be like, ok, like maybe I'll sorta try to explain my situation and sorta like. be like, you know there
                              [Focus group, original verbatim]

Conclusion

As Kenji Hakuta (1986) showed us in his thought-provoking historical overview of research on bilingualism in the 20th century, social scientists and their study of language are not free from the ideological discourse and the sociopolitical issues of their time. Drawing on evidence from research studies on bilingualism and immigration conducted in the early half of the 20th century, Hakuta makes a strong case for just how much the lens we look through as researchers, including our very conceptions of language and bilingualism, can be coloured by ideology, "folk linguistics," and the political concerns of the day. In effect, in North America, many decades of research, primarily conducted to inform immigration policy, in the early 20th century associated bilingualism with a host of negative consequences, including cognitive and social handicaps and low I.Q. (Grosjean, 1982). It took research on the bilingualism of middle-class English-speaking Montréal children for this paradigm to be broken (Peal and Lambert 1962).

In similar fashion, in Québec, we have been caught up for the past four decades, and more specifically, since the Laurendeau-Dunton Report on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, with doing research on language from within a language competition paradigm, which focuses attention on the demographic weight of French speakers (determined in census data by the language used in the home) and the position of the French language in different domains (schooling, the work world, cultural and leisure activities). A good deal of the massive corpus of research on language in Québec rests on the question "which language do you use *most often* at home, at work, at play, in public interactions?"—with findings often invoked in political agendas and used to foment public alarm about the future of the French language. By seeing things through a competition and essentially assimilationist model, what has gone unnoticed and virtually unstudied is how linguistic resources are really being used in the everyday, as well as how the language dynamics and politics of identity in Québec are changing.

A second major problem with the way we conduct research, and this not only in Québec, is that we treat languages as "whole, bounded systems, associated, moreover with whole, bounded communities" (Heller 2007:11). Somewhere along the way, researchers have forgotten that these things we call languages, language communities and language identities are socially constructed and hence, subject to change.We have also forgotten that the equivalence of "language, nation and state" (Hobsbawm 1990) is very recent, the cornerstone of a political model that emerged in a particular political time and place. The world, however, is ever changing and, it would appear, changing more quickly than ever before (Harvey 1989). But it seems that we are still looking at language through the lens of the 1960s and the 1970s while, as Heller (2007) has pointed out, increasing evidence for the need to think about language and identity differently accumulates.

Critical sociolinguistics challenges a great deal of existing research on language and bilingualism in general, not only that being done in Québec, compelling a rethinking of the basic concepts on which studies are built and census data collected and interpreted, since it questions how we define language, language communities, and the relationship between language and identity. But far more challenging than anything critical sociolinguistics can throw at existing research is a social world in flux: shifting political economies and territorial structures, changing population dynamics and conceptions of place and belonging, and importantly, new ways of valuing linguistic resources.

In this article, I have argued that we need a more complex way of approaching language and language identity in Québec (but also in Canada), proposing that sociolinguistic ethnography can provide food for thought, informing public policy as well as future census taking and census interpretation. The data I have presented on how young multilinguals are using their linguistic repertoires in Montréal challenges the tidiness of linguistic frontiers, both at the level of "language," as in "when is it French, when is it English, and when is it something hard to categorize if you really look at it," and also at the levels of language community and language identity: "who is a Francophone, who is an Anglophone, and how do you define people living with two or three languages." I have argued that while Francophone and Anglophone as categories still resonate for many, there is a growing number of young people for whom these categorizations are not really pertinent, as well as not easily claimed or even desired. The traditional linguistic frontiers, however, are still there and continue to resonate as categories of belonging that make sense to some, but the way these frontiers and categories are being negotiated by a growing number of young adults is changing. In Montréal, there is a great fluidity in the language practices of many that needs to be taken into account in how we understand the language dynamic of the city and that can go a long way in countering alarm about the position of French in a city that is increasingly multilingual. There is also a growing need to make room in the language portrait of Montréal for those who are bilingual and multilingual and don't fall tidily into any one linguistic category and feel no strong need to have any one language as an identity marker.

Here, I have also looked at how young multilinguals call upon their linguistic repertoires in the day-to-day. I have argued that we need to go beyond not only a language competition model, but also the traditional bounded definitions of language. It is not only language and identity

that resist easy classification in the little boxes of census taking and survey questionnaires, but language practices themselves. If the daily language practices of the participants in this study can be described as "flexible multilingualism" (Creese and Blackedge 2011), it also needs to be said that there are constraints and stakes involved in the where, when, and with whom this flexibility is used. What we can see from practices recorded in situ, is that the boundaries between "linguistic resources" (French, English, other languages) are not maintained constantly (Auer 2007), but can be maintained when needed. In other words, when the stakes require, the young multilinguals in this study are quite capable of presenting as English speakers or French speakers and keep a "parler multilingue" for interactions with people who have the language resources to follow and for situations where the politics of language in Québec are less present.

This study also makes clear that critical ethnographic studies bring new and important information to our understanding of language dynamics that need to be considered by policy makers. Sociolinguistic ethnographies and linguistic anthropology have a recognized academic place in efforts to better understand how people make sense of their world and how language fits into constructing that world. They also, however, should have a recognized place in informing political thinking on language. The narrow focus of survey research and statistical analysis is simply unable to catch the complexity of everyday multlingual practices and the dense information that ethnography brings to bear can shed new light on traditional ways of thinking about language and language research.

Finally, what this study also shows is the value of collaborative approaches that allow participants to engage in the research process, drawing on reflexivity and reflectivity to bring more depth to observation and interview techniques. There is much to be gained in using people's language awareness very directly in research design—not only as an object of study but as an important opportunity to contribute to our understanding of the social world.

Acknowledgments

Patricia Lamarre, Centre d'études ethniques des universities montréalaises, Université de Montréal – (CEETUM) C.P. 6128, succursale Centre-ville Montréal, Québec, H3C 3J7, Canada. E-mail: patricia.lamarre@umontreal.ca.

Notes

1 There is some excellent sociolinguistic work done in Québec within a variationist perspective.

2 There is a long history to the concept of vitality in Canadian research. See Johnson and Doucet (2006): A Sharper View. Evaluating the Vitality of Official Language Minorities. http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/html/stu_etu_052006_e.php. They summarize the concept as follows: "Landry and Allard (1999: 403) draw on this approach in defining ethnolinguistic vitality as 'the structural and sociological factors that influence the survival and development of a linguistic minority. Strong ethnolinguistic vitality ensures that the ethnolinguistic and cultural community will remain a distinct, active entity, whereas weak ethnolinguistic vitality is associated with linguistic and cultural assimilation.'" This view is continued in Landry's recent work: "Objective ethnolinguistic vitality, i.e. what can be observed using certain empirical indices, is defined as being made up of specific structural variables. The latter determine the degree to which an ethnolinguistic group remains a distinct, active entity in its contacts with other groups. These variables can be grouped into three categories: demographic, institutional support and status" (Landry and Rousselle, 2003: 38).

3 Bill 101 is how Québec's *Charte de la langue française* (1977) is commonly referred to.

4 We, as in myself and my research assistant, Stéphanie Lamarre.

5 Parkour, also known as the art of displacement, is an urban obstacle course that developed out of the military obstacle course. There is no equipment involved but rather involves a freerun through an urban "obstacle" course.

6 A big thanks (merci) to Martha Radice for pointing me in this direction.

7 Verbatim have not been corrected but are presented as transcribed by participants.

8 Translation: I heard the news about Lebanon on TV. Your parents are over there right? How are your parents? Are they safe? I am worried about the safety of your family and also you. *I pray for you.* Wishing you well, H.

9 Translation: The Guy Favreau Building ... it's where you go, to get a passport ... if I go there and if I speak English there, they won't understand me or they will pretence (sic) to not understand ... because they want me to speak French.

10 Translation: I worked in a Chinese restaurant but it was Chinese Kosher food; that was special. I met lots of Chinese Jews ... because they speak Chinese at the table but when I turn up they start to talk in Hebrew, it's like two languages that have never met.

References

Appadurai, Arjun
1996   Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Béland, Paul
1999   Le français langue d'usage public au Québec en 1997: Rapport de recherche. Québec: Conseil de la langue française.

Bierbach, Christine, and Thierry Bulot, eds.
2007   Les codes de la ville. (Cultures, langues et formes d'expression urbaines). Paris: L'Harmattan.

Block, David
2006   Multilingual Identities in a Global City: London Stories. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bourdieu, Pierre
1982   Ce que parler veut dire: l'économie des échanges linguistiques. Paris: Fayard.

Bourhis, Y. Richard
2001   Reversing Language Shift in Quebec. *In* Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? J.A. Fishman, ed. Pp. 101-141. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bulot, Thierry, C. Bauvois and Pierre Blanchet, eds.
2001   Sociolinguistique urbaine (Variations linguistiques, images urbaines et sociales).Cahiers de sociolinguistique 6. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

Calvet, Louis-Jean
2005   Les voix de la ville revisitées: Sociolinguistique urbaine ou linguistique de la ville. *In* Signalétique et signalisations linguistiques et langagières des espaces de villes (configurations et enjeux sociolinguistiques). L. Dubois, T. Bulot, A. Bourdeau et G. Ledegen, eds. Revue de l'Université de Moncton 36(1):9-30.

Creese, Angela, and Adrian Blackledge
2011   Separate and Flexible Bilingualism in Complementary Schools: Multiple Language Practices in Interrelationship. Journal of Pragmatics 43:1196–1208.

Fishman, Joshua
1991   Three Success Stories: Modern Hebrew, French in Quebec and Catalan in Spain. *In* Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages. Pp. 287-336. Clevedon, UK: Multingual Matters.

Floch, William
2008   The Socioeconomic Status of the English-speaking Quebec: Those Who Stayed and Those Who Left. *In* The Vitality of the English-speaking Community: From Community Decline to Community Vitality. R. Bourhis, ed. Pp. 35-62. Montréal, Québec: CEETUM, Université de Montréal.

Fontaine, Louise, and Danielle Juteau
1996   Appartenance à la nation et droits à la citoyenneté. *In* Les frontières de l'identité. M. Elbaz et al., eds. Pp. 147-158. Québec/Paris: L'Harmattan.

Fox, Richard G.
1972   Rationale and Romance in Urban Anthropology. Urban Anthropology 1:205-233.
1977   Urban Anthropology: Cities in Their Cultural Settings. New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

Gulick, John
1989   The Humanity of Cities: An Introduction to Urban Societies. Granby, MA: Bergin and Garvey.
Hakuta, Kenji
1986   Mirror of Language: The Debate on Bilingualism. New York: Basic Books.
Harvey, David
1989   The Conditions of Post-Modernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
Heller, Monica, ed.
2007   Bilingualism: A Social Approach. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
Heller, Monica
1982   "Bonjour, hello?": Negotiations of Language Choice in Montreal. In Communication, Language and Social Identity. J. Gumperz, ed. Pp. 108-118. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1990   Linguistic Minorities and Modernity: A Sociolinguistic Ethnography. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Real Language Series.
2000   Bilingualism and Identity in a Post-modern World. Estudios de sociolinguistica 1(2):9-24.
2003   Éléments d'une sociolinguistique critique. Paris: Didier.
2005   Une approche sociolinguistique à l'urbanité. Signalétique et signalisations linguistiques et langagières des espaces de villes (configurations et enjeux sociolinguistiques). Revue de l'Université de Moncton, 36(1):9-30.
Helly, Denise
1992   L'immigration pour quoi faire? Québec: Institut québécois de recherche sur la culture.
Jackson, Peter
1985   Urban Ethnography. Progress in Human Geography 10:157-176.
Jedwab, Jack
2008   How Shall We Define Thee? Determining Who Is an English-speaking Quebecer and Assessing Demographic Vitality? In The Vitality of the English-speaking Community: From Community Decline to Community Vitality. R. Bourhis, ed. Pp. 1-18. Montréal, Québec: CEETUM, Université de Montréal.
Juteau, Danielle
2000   Du dualisme canadien au pluralisme québécois. In Relations ethniques et éducation dans les sociétés divisées. M. McAndrew et F. Gagnon, eds. Pp. 13-26. Québec/Paris/Montréal: L'Harmattan.
Kearney, Michael
1995   The Global and the Local. Annual Reviews in Anthropology 24:545-565.
Kemper, Robert
1991   Trends in Urban Anthropology Research: An Analysis of the Journal Urban Anthropology, 1972-91. Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development 20:373-84.
Lamarre, Patricia
2002   Listening in on the Language Practices of Young Montrealers. Canadian Ethnic Studies 34(3):47-75.

Lamarre, Patricia, and Diane Dagenais
2003   Language Representations of Multilingual Youth in Two Canadian Cities. In Trilingualism in Family, Home and School. C. Hoffman and J. Ytsma. Pp. 53-74. Clevedon, UK: Multlingual Matters.
Lamarre, Patricia, and Josefina Rossel Parades
2003   Growing Up Trilingual in Montreal: Perceptions of College Students. In Language Socialization in Bilingual and Multilingual Societies. R. Bayley and S. R. Schecter, eds. Pp. 44-61. Clevedon, UK: Multlingual Matters.
Lamarre, Patricia, and Stéphanie Lamarre
2009   Montréal on the Move: pour une approche ethnographique non statique del'étude des pratiques langagières de jeunes multilingues. In Formes et normes sociolinguistiques: ségrégations et discriminations urbaines. T. Bulot, ed. Paris: L'Harmattan.
Laperrière, Anne
2002   Les nouvelles frontières de l'identité chez les jeunes adultes montréalais d'origine salvadorienne, chilienne et vietnamienne. In Identité, acculturation et alterité. C. Sabatier, H. Malewska and F. Tanon, eds. Pp. 33-55. Paris: L'Harmattan.
Levine, Marc
1990   The Reconquest of Montreal: Language Policy and Social Change in a Bilingual City. Philadephia: Temple Press.
McRoberts, Kenneth
1999   Quebec: Social Change and Political Crisis. 3rd edition. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
Meintel, Deirdre
1993   Transnationalité et transethnicité chez des jeunes issus de milieux immigrés à Montréal. Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales 9(3):63-79.
Meintel, Deirdre, and Sylvie Fortin
2001   Identité et langue. Commission des États généraux sur la situation et l'avenir de la langue française au Québec, Colloque thématique sur Les enjeux démographiques et l'intégration des immigrants, 25 et 26 janvier 2001.
Meintel, Deirdre, Victor Piché, Sylvie Fortin and Danielle Juteau, eds.
1997   Le quartier Côte-des-Neiges à Montréal: les interfaces de la pluriethnicité. Paris: L'Harmattan.
Mondada, Lorenza
2000   Décrire la ville. La construction des savoirs urbains dans l'interaction et dans le texte. Paris: Anthropos.
Norris, Alec
1999   The New Anglo. The Gazette, Series on the New Anglo, Montreal.
Oakes, Leigh, and Joan Warren
2007   Language, Citizenship and Identity in Quebec. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
Ochs, Elinor, and Bambi Schieffelin
2008   Language Socialization: an Historical Overview. In Encyclopedia of Language and Education, vol. 8. P. Duff and N. Hornberger, eds. Pp. 3-15. Philadelphia: Springer.
Pagé, Michel, and Patricia Lamarre
2010   L'intégration linguistique des immigrants au Québec. Montréal: Étude IRPP, série 3.

Park, Robert E., and Ernest W. Burgess
    1925   The City. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Peal, Elizabeth, and Wallace Lambert
    1962   The Relation of Bilingualism to Intelligence. Psychological Monographs, *76*, 1-23.
Lüdi, Georges, and Bernard Py
    2003   Être bilingue. Berne: Peter Lang. 3ième édition.
Radice Martha
    2000   Feeling Comfortable? The Urban Experiences of AngloMontrealers. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove
    1981   Bilingualism or Not: The Education of Minorities. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
Ware, Carolyn
    1935   Greenwich Village 1920-1930. New York: Harper and Row.
Whyte, William Fote
    1975   Street Corner Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press