2020

Language Ideological Debates and Intercultural Learning in French Immersion Education

Kelle L. Marshall
Pepperdine University, kelle.marshall@pepperdine.edu

Wendy D. Bokhorst-Heng
Crandall University, wendy.bokhorstheng@crandallu.ca

Recommended Citation

Language Ideological Debates and Intercultural Learning in French Immersion Education

Kelle L. Marshall & Wendy D. Bokhorst-Heng

Language in Canada is about borders. It is about defining

borders, building borders, crossing borders, even ignoring

borders, insofar as to deliberately ignore a border you

have to accept that there is a border to ignore. (Heller,

1999, p. 167)

Canada's Multiculturalism Policy (1988) and official bilingualism (Official Languages Act, 1969/1985) appear to provide an aspirational model of language education for intercultural citizenship (Byram et al, 2017), a society without borders. Not easily perceived, however, are the invisible borders established by the language ideological debates (Blommaert, 1999; Heller, 1999) underpinning these policies nor their impact on language education in Canada, particularly on French language education in Anglophone schools. How these debates play out in each of Canada's provincial education systems depends largely on provinces' unique histories.

For instance, in New Brunswick (NB), where 31.6% of its population of 747,101 are Francophones[1] and 67.1% Anglophones, and where 34% are English-French bilinguals (Statistics Canada, 2016, n.p.), language ideological debates led to the adoption of a provincial Official Languages Act (OLA) (1969/2002), rendering it Canada's only officially bilingual province. NB's OLA provided for equal opportunity to be served in the official language of choice—French or English—for all public sectors, including healthcare, legal services, and

education. While the province's OLA was initially intended to ensure the Francophone minority's linguistic rights (Haque, 2012), English-French bilingualism has since become essential to New Brunswickers' imagined (Anderson, 2016) provincial identities (OCOL-NB, 2013). However, the basis of this imagining also presents fractures: NB's OLA has precipitated competing imaginings of the *language-as-right* and *language-as-resource* ideologies, adapting Ruíz's notion of *orientations* (Ruíz, 1984): Francophones' right to protect and promote their language and culture(s) (Stanley, 1984); and Anglophones' access to bilingualism and its perceived economic capital (Hayday, 2015). The provincial OLA provides for separate Francophone and Anglophone school sectors: The Francophone schools offer instruction solely in French (with mandatory ESL instruction); the Anglophone schools offer instruction in English with mandatory FSL instruction through Intensive French or one-way French immersion (FI). Such siloed educational sectors prevent regular interaction between Anglophone and Francophone children, thereby creating localized French-language communities of practice (Wenger, 1999) within Anglophone FSL classrooms. By extension, the school sectors must imagine to which linguistic community(ies) FSL students may belong (Kanno, 2003; Norton, 2001; Norton & Toohey, 2011). In light of NB's invisible language ideological borders (Heller, 1999), we were led to wonder how national and provincial language ideological debates (LIDs) have shaped FSL curricular objectives, and by extension, the target language communities imagined for FI students (Kanno, 2003) – an increasingly important goal of second language acquisition (SLA). Specifically, we wonder how LIDs frame cultural curriculum within NB's FI program and serve as an interpretive reference for its implementation.

To that end, we first outline the theoretical constructs invoked in our analysis: *language ideologies* (Blommaert, 1999; Kroskrity, 2000), *language ideological debates* (Blommaert, 1999), *culture* (Kramsch, 2013), *intercultural competence* (Byram, 1997; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013), and *imagined communities* in SLA (Kanno, 2003; Norton, 2001; Norton & Toohey, 2011). We continue with a brief history of LIDs surrounding Canada's bilingualism policy and the Multiculturalism Act (1985). We then discuss NB's unique history among Canadian provinces, LIDs surrounding its provincial OLA, and the impact of these debates on the organization of the province's dual educational sectors. Our analysis will focus on the discourse of general outcomes outlined in the Atlantic provinces' Foundation document that guides NB's FI outcomes, and on how the broader provincial and national LIDs create incongruities with respect to intercultural learning in the FI program. Finally, we suggest ways to train curriculum developers and language educators to recognize and teach through language ideologies, facilitating deeper intercultural instruction and learning in their programs.

Theoretical framework

We adopt Kroskrity's (2000) model in which language ideologies (LIs) 'represent the perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest of a specific social or cultural group' (p. 8). LIs are social, comprising the beliefs, affect, and conceptions about language shared by a group. 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, social groups may invoke LIs against one another in order to create greater separation between the groups or to reinforce cohesion among members of the same

group. Kroskrity (2000) further affirms that LIs underpin language use. One might think of

ideologies which inform language choice in certain social spaces, such as minority linguistic

spaces (Keating, 2014). In turn, these patterns of language choice also inform LIs in a dialectical

relationship between ideology and language use. Finally, Kroskrity (2000) suggests that there is

variation in individuals' awareness of LIs: individuals may explicitly describe language

ideologies, or their language ideologies may only be observable through their language use.

 While Kroskrity's (2000) model is useful in describing LIs' influence on social structures

and interactions, Blommaert's (1999) notion of language ideological debates suggests how LIs

are actually formed and promulgated. For Blommaert (1999), *language ideological debates*

(LIDs) are 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). He describes these

debates as historically-rooted, not merely synchronic, and involving power relationships among

groups (Blommaert, 1999). LIDs regard such interrelated issues as the quality or value of a

language or variety, power relations between speakers of different languages or varieties, or the

promotion of a language for national, community, and cultural identity.

 As our focus is on how Canadian national and local LIDs may impact the formation of

cultural objectives in NB's French immersion program, we align ourselves with those who

regard *culture* as discursive (Byram, 1997; Kohler, 2015; Kramsch, 2013; Liddicoat & Scarino,

2013). For example, Street (1993) made the claim that culture should be regarded as a 'verb,' as

a 'signifying process – the active construction of meaning – rather than the static and reified or

normalizing' (p. 23) sense. And Liddicoat and Scarino (2013) define culture is a dynamic

'framework in which people live their lives, communicate and interpret shared meanings, and

select possible actions to achieve goals' (p. 22). Of interest to theorists in the field of SLA is teachers' engagement with cultures – of their own communities and of their students – in the language classroom in order to foster their students' development of bi/multilingual identity and intercultural competence (ICC) (Norton, 2001).

We draw from Liddicoat and Scarino's (2013) framing of ICC as they have been actively engaged Australian national curriculum development. Liddicoat and Scarino (2013) propose that having ICC 'means being aware that cultures are relative' and that 'all behaviors are culturally variable' (pp. 23-24). They note that ICC constitutes minimally the following elements:

- Accepting that one's practices are influenced by the cultures in which one participates and so are those of one's interlocutors

- Accepting that there is no one right way to do things

- Valuing one's own culture and other cultures

- Using language to explore culture

- Finding personal ways of engaging in intercultural interaction

- Using one's existing knowledge of cultures as a resource for learning about new cultures

- Finding a personal intercultural style and identity.

(Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013, pp. 23-24)

Liddicoat and Scarino (2013) further describe ICC as the ability to decentre oneself from his or her first language and culture. For language teachers, this involves decentring in instructional practice to mediate between students' cultures and the target culture (Kohler, 2015). Liddicoat and Scarino (2013) further distinguish between *cultural* perspectives and *intercultural*

perspectives in language teaching: the former presupposes culture as 'external to the learner;' the latter 'emphasizes learners' own cultures as a fundamental part of engaging with a new culture' (p. 29). In sum, an intercultural approach to language teaching and learning would allow students to engage in transformative critical reflection about their culture and the target culture, guiding them to decentre and develop an interest in engaging with others' cultures and practices.

We turn to Norton's (2001) notion of *imagined communities*, which draws on Wenger's (1999) *communities of practice* (CoP), to bring together how LIDs might influence language instruction and students' development of ICC. Norton (2001) interprets *imagined communities* as communities that 'transcend[ed] time and space,' and exist outside the language classroom (p. 164). These imagined communities could be immediately accessible, but could also be more intangible, and perhaps ideological, 'a desired community that offers possibilities for an enhanced range of identity options in the future' (Norton & Toohey, 2011, p. 415). Of import for language students is how their investment in imagined communities (both present and future) might impact their trajectories as language learners and their imagining of target language use outside of the educational context (Norton, 2013; Norton & Toohey, 2011). Administrators may also imagine target language communities for their students, designing programs and curriculum around these imaginings which may also be ideologically-laden (Kanno, 2003). LIDs thus may have direct bearing on the development of language programs, including immersion programs, as discussed below.

Language ideological debates in Canada

The historical development of LIDs between Canada's two Charter groups, the British and the French, dates from the sixteenth century (Heller, 1999). Before Confederation, the

groups lived mostly separately in dispersed rural territories, but were nonetheless regimented by socio-economic and power inequalities which at times marginalized Francophones (Heller, 1999). After World War II, Francophone intellectuals, in Québec and in minority Francophone communities, began to imagine an alternative Canadian society in which Francophones could equally benefit from the economic and social resources available to their Anglophone neighbours (Heller, 1999). The resulting *Révolution Tranquille* in Québec spanned the 1960s and 1970s and united Québec's Francophone elite and middle class, initiating an LID related especially to French as the language of economic capital – the language of the workplace, of trade, and of public spaces (Heller, 1999, p. 153). This LID led to the creation of Bill 101, or *Charte de la Langue française* (today's C-11) (Quebec, 1977), which not only established French as Québec's official language, but also reified an essentialist ideology enshrining French unilingualism as a defining feature of Québec's independence movement (Heller, 1999).

In response to the 'national unity crisis' created in part by this LID accompanying Québécois nationalism (Haque, 2012, p. 51), Prime Minister Lester Pearson established the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (1967) to examine how to better foster 'an equal partnership between the two founding races' (RCBB, 1967, p xxvii). Their report led to the establishment of two key policies that now define Canadian national identity: the Official Languages Act (1969), granting citizens the right to all governmental services in the official language of choice, French or English; and, to address non-Charter groups' reaction to the OLA which they interpreted as omitting the significance of non-Charter group communities in Canada, the Multiculturalism Act, 'Multiculturalism within a bilingual framework.' The latter was enshrined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (section 27) in 1982 and made law in

1988, ensuring the right of all individuals to preserve their cultural heritage while enabling their right to full and equitable participation in Canadian society. The Multiculturalism Act emphasises 'respect'—the word appears in four sections of the Act – and assumes the right of individuals to define their own cultural identities. The two policies have an uneasy ideological relationship, evident in such caveats as in the Preamble to the Multiculturalism Act which explicitly confirms that the Official Languages Act does not diminish the importance of other languages: 'AND WHEREAS the Constitution of Canada and the *Official Languages Act* provide that English and French are the official languages of Canada and neither abrogates nor derogates from any rights or privileges acquired or enjoyed with respect to any other language' (Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 1988, n.p.).

The official language groups reacted differently to Canada's OLA and its attempted resolution of the LID: Anglophones feared 'the fragmentation of the nation' (Heller, 1999, p. 158) while Francophones feared the OLA ignored the continuing unequal power dynamics between Anglophones and Francophones. The Multiculturalism policy only added to their fears, regarded by many Francophones as diluting their distinctiveness in Canadian society (Brosseau & Dewing, 2009/2018). Francophones also worried that the OLA could pressure Anglophones to learn French, possibly further entrenching the majority's economic advantages (Heller, 1999). This LID, then, framed language as 'the terrain on which to carry out our struggles for equitable participation in the resources and power structures of Canadian society' (Heller, 1999, p. 159). On the one hand, the OLA included a language-as-right (Ruíz, 1984) ideology through the legitimization and protection of minority Francophones' linguistic rights. On the other hand, the OLA provided a language-as-resource (Ruíz, 1984) ideology for Anglophones through the

promotion of English/French bilingualism as economically advantageous (Haque, 2012; Hayday, 2015).

These ideologies within Canada's OLA and Multiculturalism Act opened the door to different imaginings of FSL education. Not long after the OLA's enactment, Anglophone parents in various provinces began to advocate for FSL instruction, including immersion education (Hayday, 2015). Though there was some consideration in these parent-driven movements of the socio-cultural benefits of immersion education – that it might enhance intergroup relations among Anglophones and Francophones – greater emphasis was on Anglophone access to jobs requiring English/French bilingualism (Hayday, 2015; Heller, 1990, 1999). At the very inception of FI across Canada, then, LIDs ensued over its purpose in each province. In the following section, we examine the LIDs in NB and their impact on the province's educational sectors, beginning with a brief history of the province.

New Brunswick: History, language ideological debates, and education

Originally part of the French colony *Acadie* (Daigle, 1993), NB has one of the lengthiest provincial histories of contact between Francophones and Anglophones. Areas within the territory transferred between French and British control numerous times throughout the seventeenth century, with the French ceding *Acadie* to Britain in 1713 (Daigle, 1993). While the Acadians continued to live in the territory until the mid-eighteenth century, British settlers also arrived. During the Seven Years' War, in events collectively called *le Grand Dérangement* (1755 to 1763), the British ordered the Acadians' deportation. Some Acadians returned to the territory when the war ended in 1763; however, British settlers had moved onto the Acadians' former lands, pushing their resettlements to the margins of the territory (Thériault, 1993). Thus,

beginning in the eighteenth century and continuing to present, the majority of NB's population has been Anglophone, but with a substantial Francophone minority (Heller, 1999). Yet, just as in Québec, until the 1960s and 1970s, Anglophones controlled most of NB's political, economic, and social capital.

The LIDs of 1960s' NB were similar to those at the federal level, with a strong push for Francophone minority linguistic rights. Linguistic tensions among Anglophones and Francophones were at times exacerbated (Boudreau, 2016; Stanley, 1984). However, with Francophones (mostly Acadian) making up only 35.2% of the population in 1961 (Anglophones comprised 63.3%; Brunswick Press, 1963), their struggle was defined much more by a pursuit of minority linguistic rights than by a majority-led independence movement as in Québec. NB's Premier Louis Robichaud, himself an Acadian, led the movement with his platform of 'equal opportunity' (Stanley, 1984) in all areas, including language. Unlike Québec's nationalist agenda based on uniformity, his agenda was one of linguistic co-existence (Stanley, 1984). Robichaud's conception of NB's OLA, designed to mitigate NB's LID was couched in the language-as-right ideology (Ruíz, 1984), intended to promote and preserve the Acadians' culture and language (Government of NB, 1968).

However, the wording of NB's OLA is such that, without a complementary multiculturalism policy as exists at the federal level, and with a strong emphasis on minority Francophone rights, NB's Anglophones were left to interpret what linguistic equality within duality might mean for them. The parameters of bilingualism outlined in Robichaud's *Statement on Language Equality and Opportunity* (a precursor to NB's 1969 OLA) presented to the NB Legislative Assembly on December 4, 1968, only muddied the waters:

On an individual basis it is the right of New Brunswickers to be and remain

unilingual, or to speak two or more languages. The Government does not expect

that as a result of its action to promote linguistic and cultural equality of

opportunity, that all New Brunswickers will become fluent in the two official

languages… [the] the objective is to ensure that no unilingual New Brunswicker

finds himself at a disadvantage in participating in the public life of our Province.

(Government of NB, 1968, p. 7)

While no unilingual New Brunswicker should be disadvantaged, Robichaud's conception of

official bilingualism with complete provincial linguistic duality in all public sectors suggested

clear advantages to English/French bilingualism. The disadvantage of English monolingualism in

a bilingual province spurred heated LIDs concerning the provision of FSL education for

Anglophone children (Edwards, 1986). School districts took the lead: In the early 1970s, School

District 15 (Moncton) established the first official FI program (Edwards, 1986). By 1977, NB

instituted the first provincial policy (Policy 501) on immersion, giving schools the option to offer

FI education – amended in 1981 to *require* all Anglophone schools to offer FI where numbers

permitted. In 2009, Policy 309 replaced Policy 501 to include all FSL Programs, again with the

mandate of mandatory FI (Bokhorst-Heng & Keating Marshall, 2016).[2] Thus, unlike elsewhere

in Canada where FI programs began as a result of pressure from parents to have an educational

response to the prevailing LIDs, in NB, it was the school districts that initiated this response and

mandated it through law. This has made the provision of FI in NB a right and not the totem of

class status seen in other provinces (Heller, 1990). It is within the context of this unique history

and LID that we analyze NB's FI curriculum documents.

Methods and data

Curricular documents for all elementary and secondary subjects may be found on the NB Department of Education's Anglophone Sector webpage, and apply to both English and FI instruction. Documents are listed for each of the four education cycles: kindergarten to Grade 3, Grades 4-6, Grades 7-9, and Grades 10-12 (Government of NB, 2018). For each of these cycles, the FI language arts curriculum includes the same referential document, *Foundation for French Language Arts in French Immersion in Atlantic Canada* (NB DEPSB, 2001). The document was collaboratively developed in 2001 by stakeholders from the provinces of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland and Labrador and published by the NB Department of Education. Because this document is foundational for all four cycles and serves as a reference for the development of NB's FI curriculum, it is our point of analysis. It is also the sole place where the Anglophone curriculum's cultural diversity objectives, typically found in social studies outcomes, are aligned with FI programming outcomes.

The Foundation document includes three main sections. The first comprises the six primary cross-curricular 'Essential graduation learnings' – *Aesthetic Expression, Citizenship, Communication, Personal Development, Problem Solving*, and *Technological Competence* – and aligns the FI Programs' curriculum outcomes with students' expected 'knowledge, skills and attitudes' upon graduation. For each, the document provides specific examples to illustrate the role of the FI program in developing those learnings. The document's second section applies these essential learnings to the 'General Curriculum Outcomes' of the FI Program. It lists four components: *Appreciation of the French Language and of Cultural Diversity*, which 'forms the backdrop of the French program;' and three interrelated 'communication methods:' *Listening*

and Oral expression, *Reading and Viewing*, and *Writing and Representing* (NB DEPSB, 2001, p. 11). A Venn diagram depicts the interconnectedness of the three communication methods and their location within the overall auspice of appreciating French language and cultural diversity. In the document's third section, these general outcomes are further delineated according to the four education cycles, ultimately aligning the Grade 12 FI outcomes with the Anglophone sector's overall graduation learning outcomes (NB DEPSB, 2001, p. 12). Together, then, these three sections guide each Atlantic province's development of grade-level 'Specific Curriculum Outcomes' for FI curricula.

We conducted a discourse analysis (Gee, 2014) on sections of the *Foundation for French Language Arts* document mentioning cultural goals or outcomes, specifically concerning essential graduation learnings. By *discourse* we mean Gee's (2014) small "d" discourse: 'language-in-use… in terms of actual utterances or sentences in speech or writing in specific contexts of speaking and hearing or writing and reading' (p. 19). The goal of Gee's discourse analysis is to 'construct and/or construe the situation network, at a given time and place' – to understand the construction of meaning. Analysis thus involves going 'back and forth between language and context (situations),' rather than looking for 'signals of fixed and decontextualized meanings' (Gee, 1999, p. 85). Gee's emphasis on "constructing the situation network" guided our analysis as we applied his principles to the representation of LIDs in discourse. We sought to answer the question: How, if at all, do local and/or national LIDs figure into the Foundation document's intercultural learning outcomes?

Analysis

The FI program in NB presents an obvious opportunity for the development of ICC among Anglophone students to participate in imagined communities involving both Anglophones and Francophones (Keating Marshall & Bokhorst-Heng, 2018). This conception of FI is in fact evidenced in FI curricula elsewhere in Canada (e.g. Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013). Given NB's official bilingual status, one might expect ICC to feature prominently in the FI objectives – even while sharing the Foundation document with the other (non-officially bilingual) Atlantic provinces. However, as we will demonstrate, a number of discursive constructs within the curriculum may impede the full potential of ICC in NB's FI and perpetuate imagined communities separated through policies of duality and maintained through local LIDs.

We begin with the Foundation document's opening Vision statement:

Segment 1 – Vision statement

1   The Atlantic Canada French immersion curriculum is based on the vision of

2   educating students who are able to communicate effectively in French, use French

3   as a learning tool, and demonstrate an understanding of various cultures,

4   particularly the culture of francophone communities. (NB DEPSB 2001, p. v)

In Segment 1, the sequence of information suggests a layering of priorities: first, French education is for effective communication; next for use as a 'learning tool;' and lastly, for cultural understanding. However, in later sections of this document, these priorities are rearranged, with 'appreciation of the French language and of cultural diversity' called the 'backdrop of the French program' (NB DEPSB, 2001, p. 11). Of particular note above are lines 3-4. In line 3, the goal of demonstrating 'an understanding of various cultures' is followed by the subordinate clause in line 4 which begins with the adverb 'particularly,' signaling emphasis on the noun phrase which

follows: '*particularly* the culture of francophone communities.' The 'culture of francophone communities' is thus given priority over 'various cultures.' The discourse in lines 3-4 notably straddles the two ideologies at play: multicultural ideologies defining Canadian policy and ideologies of official bilingualism prioritizing Francophone culture. Of significance as well, and frequently repeated throughout the document, the expression 'francophone culture' occurs as a singular noun, suggesting an essentialist view of language and culture in lieu of a discursive view embedded in socio-political contexts and human interaction (Kohler, 2015; Kramsch, 2013). Such a decontextualized and static view of culture limits the outcomes of cultural learning to a mere 'understanding' and 'appreciation' of culture, rather than engagement in culture through transformative learning. The vision statement thus envisions imagined communities in which FI students' communicative capacity is prioritized as a means for greater learning potentials, and in which only an 'understanding' of culture is necessary.

The Foundation document's introduction (Segment 2), which immediately follows the Vision Statement, describes its intended application in each Atlantic Province's curricular development and includes the following paragraph:

Segment 2 - Introduction

1   The French immersion program offers learners the opportunity to gain a better

2   understanding of their own culture and to discover the culture of francophone

3   communities, without diminishing the importance of Canada's multiculturalism. This

4   experience also enables them to look at francophone cultures with more awareness and

5   understanding. Such understanding encourages acceptance of all cultures and broadens

| 6 | their view of the world. It is hoped that this broadened view will lead to a better |
| 7 | appreciation of human diversity and value. (NB DEPSB, 2001, p. 1) |

In Segment 2, culture is once again objectified. The references to culture in lines 1-2 state that FI will enable learners to 'gain a better understanding' of their 'own culture' and to 'discover the culture of francophone communities.' In both instances, the word 'culture' occurs in the singular – firstly, implying that the children in FI programs are assumed to be from a homogenous background, and secondly, again suggesting that even in the plurality of Francophone communities there is one single culture. This objectified view of culture further extends into the vision of 'better understanding' (2), 'discover' (2), 'look at… with more awareness and understanding' (4-5), 'understanding' (5), 'broadened view' (6), leading to 'a better appreciation of human diversity and value.' The notion of 'understanding' does bring the curricular framing closer to the goal of ICC. However, it is combined with a distancing – perhaps most strongly phrased by 'look at,' implying that Francophone cultures are static objects of examination and distant from the learner. Positioning Francophone cultures as an object of study external to the learners, echoes Canada's LIDs prevalent during the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission, imagining the two 'founding races' and language communities as fundamentally separate. Even the word 'understanding' seems again to skirt the deeper objectives of ICC related to decentring and transformative reflection.

In Segment 2, incongruities emerging from the competing ideologies within 'multiculturalism within a bilingual framework' are also evident. Consider the first sentence's final clause (3), 'without diminishing the importance of Canada's multiculturalism.' The preposition 'without' coupled with the present participle 'diminishing,' (i.e. not making smaller) may be used rhetorically to imply 'giving equal or greater importance to' Canada's multicultural

framework. This use of the phrase 'without diminishing' is employed similarly to the adverb 'particularly' in Segment 1, though here in line 3 greater emphasis is placed on 'the importance of Canada's multiculturalism' rather than the 'understanding of *francophone* culture,' emphasized in Segment 1. In lines 1-3 of Segment 2, we thus see how the challenges of balancing 'multiculturalism within a bilingual framework' and the surrounding LIDs play out in the imagining of the FI curriculum (Kanno, 2003). While the multicultural policy's principal tenant affirms that all peoples and cultures are equal, FI education necessarily tips that balance, privileging French and Francophone culture(s). Segment 2 evidences a deliberate restoration and prioritization of multiculturalism's mandate of cultural equality. The primary goal of FI language arts is thus neither ICC nor engagement between the two 'races.' In fact, the ultimate goal is placed outside of the local communities, framed once again by the priorities of national multiculturalism and of globalization. Anglophone FI students may examine the culture(s) of the other official language group, however, the 'understanding' that students are to develop is a means to develop 'acceptance of all cultures' as it 'broadens their view of the world' (3-5). The emphasis on multicultural ideologies appears again in the concluding lines (6-7) which envision that students' broadened understanding of Francophone cultures should also enable 'a better appreciation of human diversity and value.'

In Segment 2, then, we see continual ideological shifts, with the privileging of Francophone cultures above others on the one hand, yet with the global appreciation of human diversity and acceptance of all cultures on the other. The former aligns with the ideologies undergirding both NB's and Canada's OLAs, and the latter aligns with ideologies found in Canada's Multiculturalism Act. The individual Atlantic provinces are thus faced with

considerable ambiguity in deciphering the exact nature of cultural priorities in FI programming and of the imagined communities for their students. This ambiguity continues in the wording of the document's Grade 12 graduation outcomes related to 'Appreciation of the French Language and of Cultural Diversity' in Segment 3.

Segment 3 – The general curriculum outcomes for the FI program

1   **Appreciation of the French language and of Cultural Diversity**

2   *By the end of Grade 12, students will be expected to:*

3   •   demonstrate a positive attitude towards the French language and towards

4   francophone communities in Canada and around the world;

5   •   recognize and respect cultural diversity.

6   The relationship between culture and language is so close that, in many

7   circumstances, it is impossible to communicate effectively with someone without

8   having some knowledge of that person's culture. A cultural component is

9   integrated into the French immersion program to highlight this relationship, not to

10   have immersion students adopt francophone culture. The integration of this

11   component makes it easier for students to understand their second language and

12   makes communication with francophones in Canada and elsewhere more

13   effective.

14   Instruction that focuses on culture-related curriculum outcomes must be provided

15   naturally and must be integrated into the various learning areas. The more these

16	cultural curriculum outcomes are dealt with naturally and in a variety of
17	situations, the better the students will be able to communicate effectively with
18	francophones of various origins and the more aware they will be of the presence
19	and diversity of cultures in the world. (NB DEPSB, 2001, p. 12)

Segment 3's discourse brings together the various themes discussed earlier: (a) the dominant use of multiculturalism's ideology in the rationale and purpose of the FI program, seen in lines 1, 3-5; (b) the minimizing of Canada's unique status as a bilingual country by the repeated coupling of FI to global priorities in lines 4, 12-13, 18-19; (c) and the separation of French language from French culture in lines 6-13.

Dominance of multiculturalism's ideology

The first cultural objective (lines 3-4) focuses on the affective objective of language learning: students' attitudes, first toward the French language, and second toward Francophones, both Canadian and those outside Canada. The second objective (line 5) extends the affect to 'recognize' and 'respect' cultural diversity, using terms from the Multiculturalism policy. And so we see a coupling of bilingualism and multiculturalism, where the learning of French will provide the skills and affect for broader cultural appreciation and respect. The coupling, again, presents incongruities within the document. This is most evident in lines 8-10: 'A cultural component is integrated into the French immersion program to highlight this relationship, not to have immersion students adopt francophone culture.' First, there is the acknowledgement that 'the relationship between culture and language is…close.' But, then there is the immediate assertion that the cultural component is integrated in the FI program only to 'highlight' the relationship – and *not* to 'adopt francophone culture.' Students will learn *about* the relationship

between language and culture without engaging *in* that relationship. The phrase also suggests

two separate processes of language and cultural learning. While language acquisition is framed

as an asset, cultural acquisition is presented as potentially compromising one's own cultural

identity. There is thus hedging around the relationship between language and culture:

recognizing this relationship will help language learning (14-15); will facilitate effective

communication (17-18); will increase awareness of the presence of cultures and diversity of

global cultures (18-19); but will *not* foster students' cultural adoption (9-10). The ultimate

purpose is centred on the functional aim of effective communication with those whose cultures

the students have learned to 'respect.' The subordination of the clause 'not to have immersion

students adopt francophone culture' assumes as taken-for-granted (Gee, 1999) this particular

argument as requiring specific mitigation. It alerts us to the position of the linguistic

communities imagined through bilingualism within a multicultural framework, prioritizing

respect and one's right for individual cultural self-identification. In so doing, multiculturalism's

separation of language and culture (Haque, 2012) immediately trumps the earlier declaration of

the 'close relationship' between the two.

At one level, the use of an ideology of multiculturalism to rationalize French language

learning can be interpreted as a consequence of the bilingual policy itself. As stressed by

Robichaud, individual bilingualism never was the goal of Canada's nor NB's Official Languages

Acts (Baluja & Bradshaw 2012); rather, it is a policy, resulting from national and local LIDs,

designed to ensure equal status of the two languages in the country, and to ensure Francophones'

linguistic rights. And so the bilingual policy was never meant to foster Anglophone-Francophone

rapprochement. The separation of language and culture within the Multicultural policy is thus

aligned with the Bilingual policy's objectives. However, ironically, at another level, the bilingual

policy *has* been the impetus of FI programming across the country (Hayday, 2015) and the

development of personal bilingualism. As we will discuss below, the resulting incongruity has

significance for the potential of ICC within FI education

Global priorities

Of the 18 sections in the document that mention culture, ten include reference to

francophones or *francophone communities*. But of these, only four specify *francophones in*

Canada. The other mentions are either decontextualized or direct references to global/elsewhere

Francophone communities. Statements that do mention Francophones in Canada are coupled

with reference to broader global Francophone communities through phrases such as

'francophone communities in Canada and around the world' or 'and elsewhere' (Segment 3,

lines 4, 12-13, 18-19). This discursive coupling is evident throughout the Foundation document.

While an emphasis on global connectedness is certainly important for FI programs and expands

their capital (Dagenais, 2003), it is curious how global priorities supplant the significance of

Canada's official bilingualism for developing ICC and transformative selves in FI education.

Separation of culture and language

As discussed above, while there is an acknowledged 'close relationship' between

language and culture, it is multiculturalism's separation of language and culture that dominates

the discourse in Segment 3. This separation results in an emphasis on the functional components

of language learning ('easier for students to understand their second language') and on effective

communication ('makes communication with francophones in Canada and elsewhere more

effective') (17-19). The teaching of Francophone culture thus seems to be valued for its impact

on students' communicative competence, once again aligning the objectives more with Liddicoat and Scarino's (2013) aforementioned cultural perspective to language learning than an intercultural one. There does appear to be more inclination towards ICC in the second paragraph of Segment 3, as it advocates for cultural integration in all subject areas. By incorporating cultural content 'naturally' throughout the curriculum (14-15), students will be 'better able to communicate with francophones of various origins' (17-18). However, the objectives immediately revert to a more external and detached "awareness" 'of the presence and diversity of cultures in the world,' ultimately minimizing the full potential of ICC.

In interpreting Segments 1-3, we are reminded of Liddicoat and Scarino's (2013) provisional list of ICC characteristics: there is a strong presence throughout the document on 'valuing one's own culture and other cultures,' and *perhaps* on 'accepting that one's practices are influenced by the cultures in which one participates and so are those of one's interlocutors' – at least communicative practices (pp. 23-24). There is also some emphasis on 'using language to explore culture,' although the personal transformative component in 'accepting that there is not one right way to do things,' 'finding personal ways of engaging in intercultural interaction,' or on 'finding a personal intercultural style and identity' (pp. 23-24) is lacking. The tenuous relationship between language and culture presented in the Foundation document leaves little scope for the development of students' ICC and predictably placing the program's emphasis on functional communication. As a result, the target language community imagined for FI students (Kanno, 2003) seems to be primarily one in which students are poised as cultural outsiders needing only to engage with Francophones through functional communication.

Discussion

In the above analysis, we asked, 'How, if at all, do local and/or national LIDs figure into the Foundation document's intercultural learning outcomes?' and examined the permeation of local and national LIDs throughout the discourse of the Atlantic Provinces' Foundation FI document. We demonstrated that Canada's historical LIDs emerging from its 'Multiculturalism within a bilingual framework,' with competing ideologies of Francophone linguistic rights and respect for all cultures, create tension and incongruities throughout the document. The Foundation document prioritizes students' respect of other cultures generally, including (global) Francophone cultures, without the conception that language and culture might stand in a dialectic relationship (Kohler, 2015; Kramsch, 2013). As Kramsch (1993) noted: 'In the name of cultural tolerance and democratic pluralism, some educational materials favor the horizontal juxtaposition of cultural facts when transmitting information about cultural diversity' (p. 228). And because the document consistently embeds Francophone peoples and cultures within broader multicultural and global imperatives, it also limits students' imagined or actual engagement with *local* Francophones, especially Acadians, whose history is interwoven throughout the Atlantic Provinces. The imagined community envisioned for FI students in the Foundation document is thus aligned primarily with multicultural Canada and the global Francophone community. The outcomes also lack an emphasis on the development of students' own identities as multilinguals and on how language learning within ICC can itself be transformative, even if adoption of the target language's culture(s) is not an objective. Language acquisition is framed as primarily utilitarian – for communicative purposes only, without requiring a deep engagement with a de-centring of self. Neither does the Foundation document see FI education as a setting for deeper conversations surrounding the history and purposes of

French as Canada's second official language nor a place to interrogate the on-going tensions resulting from LIDs. But that leaves no exploration of cultural mediation between the two official language groups in the Atlantic Provinces possible within this framework (Kohler, 2015). Yet, as Liddicoat and Scarino (2013) affirm, 'It is important that the scope of culture learning moves beyond awareness, understanding, and sympathy' if students are to 'negotiate meaning across cultural boundaries and establish one's own identity as a user of another language' (p. 24).

It might be argued that the framing of the Foundation document is itself inconsequential and might have no direct bearing on teachers' practice, as it is meant to be a reference document for provincial curricular development. However, its appendage to the curriculum documents for each education cycle suggests the document is essential when interpreting the provincial curriculum documents by teachers to guide classroom practice. The interpretive position of the document led Keating Marshall and Bokhorst-Heng (2018) to examine early years FI teachers' interpretation of the document's cultural outcomes. The teachers they present in this article unanimously affirmed that intercultural instruction was not a major component of their curriculum and figured only marginally, if at all, into their conception of FI instruction (Keating Marshall & Bokhorst-Heng, 2018). For example, the discourse of two of the Francophone teachers in their study, Élise and Élisabeth, suggest that this hedging is, in part, to avoid 'disrespecting' Anglophones. Strikingly, Élise admits 'I don't know how far I should go with my beliefs, and, I wouldn't want to impose anything on someone. It's not a *religion* or anything' (Keating Marshall & Bokhorst-Heng, 2018, pp. 301-302). Their discourse is notably aligned with the Foundation document's ideological framing – perhaps to the extreme. Not knowing "how much" intercultural instruction was appropriate without representing some sort of personal bias,

the teachers unanimously affirmed that developing their students' competency in French—across the receptive and productive skills—was their principal aim. Keating Marshall and Bokhorst-Heng's (2018) analysis demonstrates the potential impact that the ideological framing of curricular documents may have on teachers' goals and practice related to an intercultural conception of language education.

In addition to problematizing the impact that LIDs have on curricular framing, and eventually teachers' practice, the present analysis likewise contributes to discussions concerning the imagined (linguistic) communities that school leaders and administrators envision for their students (Kanno, 2003; Norton, 2013). While it might seem that the Foundation document's balancing of LIDs in relation to intercultural learning in NB's FI curriculum has struck a sort of discursive equilibrium, these ideological ambiguities could have a real effect on FI students. As the Douglas Fir Group (2016) notes, LIs 'influence people's choices for approaching language learning, their investments in their target languages, and their identity negotiations along the life project of multilingualism' (p. 35). A study on NB's FI graduates' current investment in the French language, their bi/multilingual identity (Norton, 2013), and their intercultural engagement with Francophones would shed light on the long-term implications of such an ideologically-laden imagining of the language / culture dialectic.

Ways forward

We are by no means the first to note how language ideologies and LIDs may directly impact language programs' curricular designs (Auger, Dalley, & Roy, 2007; Valdman, 2000). Our analysis adds to this conversation through a discourse analytic approach on a curriculum

document, demonstrating how local and national language ideological debates may become discursively inscribed in curriculum and eventually assumed by FI teachers.

While we focused on Canadian LIDs inscribed in NB's FI curriculum, our findings may be extended to language program design across the educational cycle (K-12). Here, we make some suggestions of how LIs and LIDs could be addressed in elementary and secondary language programs. Our first recommendation concerns elementary education FSL programs, in which an aim could be students' exposure to variation in French and cultural diversity found throughout *la Francophonie*. In this way, the curriculum could circumvent local and national LIDs in a way that is accessible to younger students. There could be some general discussion of how varieties of French differ in phonology and lexicon. Variation in French might be introduced through music, television, or films from various regions of *la Francophonie*. Instruction on variation in French was, in fact, recommended by a report commissioned by the *Organisation internationale de la Francophonie* as a way to create a transnational identity shared by French-speakers worldwide (Wolton, Mandigon, & Yannic, 2008). The resource guide *Éducation interculturelle et diversité linguistique* (Armand & Maraillet, 2013) offers possible starting points for addressing linguistic variation at the primary level, although their exercises are mostly tailored to comparisons between languages and do not include exercises comparing varieties of French.

One aim at the secondary levels of FI would be to introduce students to the various LIs and LIDs associated with their target language and the LIDs' impact on speakers of the language, thus developing students' critical thinking skills with respect to the socio-political embeddedness of language. This could be couched within a global competence or intercultural competence

program-learning objective. As an example, Riley (2011) describes how Francophones are

socialized to hold the ideology that 'Standard French,' which many Francophones believe

corresponds to (a variety of) Parisian French (Lodge, 1993), is the purest form of French, to be

aspired to by all. Boudreau (2016), among many others, describes how this ideology may lead to

deep-seated feelings of linguistic insecurity among Francophone minorities whose variety of

French is considered to diverge from this standard. A FI program, and in fact any FSL program,

then, should be designed to expose students to this LID, thus affording them the opportunity to

discuss the impact of LIs on Francophones' linguistic identities and on their own as

bi/multilinguals. The curriculum, too, could be designed to foster students' imagining of their

own participation in the Francophone world, with attention to their bi/multilingual identity and

investment in French and ICC (Norton, 2013).

A further recommendation has to do with language instructor training. Based on literature

and her own experiences as a teacher, Kohler (2015), concludes 'it was evident that it could not

be assumed that the language teachers had already developed an intercultural language

orientation in their teaching' (p. 6) and advocates for directed professional development. We

propose that a unit could be incorporated in a FSL language or FSL teaching methods course, or

in a course focusing on intercultural competence, to help future language educators develop a

meta-awareness of LIs associated with their target language and the LIs that might influence

their own approach to language instruction. Course assignments could include a research project

to identify personal and societal LIs, through journal entries, guided interviews, or a

comprehensive literature review. Students could also conduct a discourse analysis of a provincial

document detailing intercultural objectives in language programs or curricular documents within

their local districts, so that they might identify which LIs might impact curricular development. Another assignment could require students to create sample lesson plans designed to foster reflection on the imagined target language communities their future students might participate in, further enhancing their own and their future students' ICC.

In conclusion, we have sought to illuminate how LIDs may impact how and even what sort of intercultural instruction is included in a language program. Arguing that engagement with LIs and LIDs is part of students' ICC development (Byram, 1997; Kramsch, 2013; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013), we have proposed that critical reflection is necessary on our own ideological positions as language educators, on the LIs which might motivate or impede our practice, and on those target language LIs which we should help our students navigate. Careful consideration should likewise be given to the target language communities we imagine for our students (Kanno, 2003). Finally, we have hoped to demonstrate that if we aim to engage students in socially-situated language education (Kramsch,1993; Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013) it is paramount to design programs, curricula, and courses which enable our students to cross ideological borders, decenter, and develop a 'personal intercultural style and identity' (Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013) while avoiding the reification of ideological borders potentially impeding students' intercultural development.

Notes

1. In this paper, we follow the federal convention of capitalization for the words 'Francophone' and 'Anglophone', apart from direct citations from the curriculum documents. The classification of 'Francophone' and 'Anglophone' itself is deeply ideological. First, it ignores the fact that 4% of the population self-identify as Aboriginal

(Statistics Canada, 2016). Second, while the remaining 1.3% declare other languages as their mother tongue, there is a tendency in the province subsume all other groups into this dual classification. For example, in her speech welcoming new Canadians at a recent citizenship swearing-in ceremony, Rita Arsenault of the Order of Canada announced, 'We are very pleased to welcome 86 candidates including 17 minors to receive citizenship – candidates who come from 32 different countries and whose numbers include 73 Anglophones and 13 Francophones' (15 July 2016). Third, it erases the distinctiveness of the various Francophone groups living in the province. The majority of Francophones in NB are Acadians, but not all (cf. Forgues, Beaudin, Guignard, & Boudreau, 2009). In this text, when we speak of NB's Francophone population in general, we will use the term "Francophone" and the term "Acadian" when referring specifically to the Acadian people or society.

2. There are presently three FSL options in NB: *English Prime* (Grades 4-10); *Early French Immersion* Grade 1 entry); and *Late French Immersion* (Grade 6 entry). In 2015-2016, 85.8% of students in the Anglophone sector participated in FSL; 28.5% were in FI (CPF, 2016).

References

Anderson, B. (2016). I*magined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London and New York: Verso.

Armand, F., & Maraillet, É. (2013). *Éducation interculturelle et diversité linguistique*. Retrieved from http://www.elodil.umontreal.ca/fileadmin/documents/Guides/eal/22-complet.pdf

Arsenault, R. Speech given at the Swearing in Ceremony for new Canadian citizens at Capital Theatre, Moncton, NB, 15 July 2016.

Auger, N., Dalley, P., & Roy, S. (2007). La sociolinguistique du changement: Le cas du bilinguisme stéréotypé en classes de français langue seconde et minoritaires. In H. Boyer (Ed.), Stéréotypages, stéréotype: fonctionnements ordinaires et mises en scène: Vol. 3. Education, école, didactique (pp. 25–36). Paris: L'Harmattan.

Baluja, T., & Bradshaw, J. (2012/2018). Is bilingualism still relevant in Canada? *The Globe and Mail*, June 22 (updated April 30, 2018). Retrieved from https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/is-bilingualism-still-relevant-in-canada/article4365620/

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., & Keating Marshall, K. (2016). "French immersion in New Brunswick, Canada: A historical overview of intersecting discourses and policies." Paper presented at the 60th Annual Comparative and International Education Society (CIES), Vancouver, BC, March 6-10, 2016.

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

    Classiques Garnier.

Brosseau, L., & Dewing, M. (2009/2018). Canadian Multiculturalism (Background Paper).

    Publication Number 2009-20-E., 15 September 2009, Revised 3 January 2018. Ottawa:

    Library of Parliament, 2018. Retrieved from:

    https://bdp.parl.ca/content/lop/ResearchPublications/2009-20-e.pdf

Brunswick Press. (1963). *The Atlantic Yearbook 1963*. Fredericton, NB: Brunswick Press.

    [PANB ref: MC1620 The Atlantic Year Book fonds].

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon,

    UK: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M., Golubeva, I., Hui, H., & Wagner, M. (2017). *From principles to practice in*

    education for intercultural citizenship. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Canadian Multiculturalism Act, Revised Statutes of Canada. (1988) (1985, c. 24 (4th Supp.)).

    Retrieved from the Justice Laws website: http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-

    18.7/page-1.html

Canadian Parents for French (CPF). (2016). *French as a Second Language Enrolment Statistics*

    2011—2012 to 2015—2016. Retrieved from http://www.cpf.ca.

Dagenais, D. (2003). Accessing Imagined Communities Through Multilingualism and

    Immersion Education. *Journal of language, identity, and education, 2*(4), 269-283. DOI:

    10.1207/S15327701JLIE0204_3

Daigle, J. (1993). L'Acadie de 1604-1763, synthèse historique. In J. Daigle (Ed.), *L'Acadie des*

    Maritimes (pp. 1–43). Moncton, NB: Chaire d'études acadiennes.

Douglas Fir Group. (2016). A Transdisciplinary Framework for SLA in a Multilingual World. *The Modern Language Journal*, *100*, 19-47.

Edwards, V. (1986). *French Immersion in New Brunswick: The Early Years (1969-1985).* M.Ed. Thesis, University of New Brunswick.

Forgues, É., Beaudin, M., Guignard Noël, J., & Boudreau, J. (2009). *Analyse de la migration de francophones au Nouveau-Brunswick entre 2001 et 2006*. Moncton, NB: Institut canadien de recherche sur les minorités linguistiques.

Gee, J.P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. First edition. London and New York: Routledge.

Gee, J.P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Fourth edition. London and New York: Routledge.

Government of New Brunswick (2018). *Education and early childhood development: Curriculum development (Anglophone sector)*. Retrieved from http://www2.gnb.ca/content/gnb/en/departments/education/k12/content/anglophone_sector/curriculum_anglophone.html

Government of New Brunswick (1968). Statement on language equality and opportunity Tabled 4 December 1968 by Hon. Louis J. Robichaud, Premier.

Haque, E. (2012). *Multiculturalism within a bilingual framework*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hayday, M. (2015). *So they want us to learn French: Promoting and opposing bilingualism in English-speaking Canada.* Vancouver: University of British Colombia Press.

Heller, M. (1990). French immersion in Canada: A model for Switzerland? *Multilingua, 9*(1), 67–85.

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.

Kanno, Y. (2003). Imagined communities, school visions, and the education of bilingual students in Japan. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 2*(4), 285–300.

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*(2), 290–312. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12340

Kohler, M. (2015). *Teachers as mediators in the foreign language classroom*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

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.

Liddicoat, A.J., & Scarino, A. (2013). *Intercultural language teaching and learning.* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Lodge, A. (1993). *French: From dialect to standard*. London: Routledge.

New Brunswick Department of Education Educational Programs and Services Branch (NBDEPSB). (2001). *Foundations for French language arts French immersion in Atlantic Canada*. Fredericton, NB: Province of New Brunswick (Document number 840190). Retrieved from http://www2.gnb.ca/content/dam/gnb/Departments/ed/pdf/K12/curric/FSL/FrenchLanguageArtsInFrenchImmersion.pdf

Norton, B. (2001). Non-participation, imagined communities, and the language classroom. In M. Breen (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning: New directions in research* (pp. 159–171). Harlow, England: Pearson Education.

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

Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2011). Identity, language learning, and social change. *Language Teaching*, *44*(4), 412–446.

Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages for New Brunswick (OCOL-NB) (2013). Living with two languages (n.d.). Fredericton: Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages for New Brunswick. Online: http://www.officiallanguages.nb.ca; accessed 28 February 2018.

Official Languages Act, Revised Statutes of Canada (1969) (1985, c. 31 (4th Supp.)). Retrieved from http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/O-3.01/

Official Languages Act, Statutes of New Brunswick (2002, c. O-0.5). Retrieved from http://laws.gnb.ca/en/showfulldoc/cs/O-0.5//20180714

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2013). *The Ontario curriculum: French as a second language, Core French, Extended French, French Immersion.* Retrieved from http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/elementary/fsl18-2013curr.pdf

Québec (Province). (1977). *Bill 101: Charter of the French Language*. Quebec: C.-H. Dubé. (today known as Bill C-11). Retrieved from: http://www.legisquebec.gouv.qc.ca/en/showdoc/cs/C-11

Riley, K. (2011). Language socialization and language ideologies. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B.B. Schieffelin (Eds.) *The handbook of language socialization* (pp. 493–514). West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (RCBB). (1967). *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. General Introduction and Book 1: The official languages*. Ottawa. Queen's Printer.

Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal, 8*(2), 15–34.

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

Statistics Canada. (2016). Census of population. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-400-X2016056. Retrieved from http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/

Street, B.V. (1993). Culture is a verb: Anthropological aspects of language and cultural process". In D. Graddol, L. Thompson, M. Byram (Eds.). *Language and culture* (pp. 23-43). Clevedon, UK: BAAL in association with Multilingual Matters.

Thériault, L. (1982). Historical synthesis, 1763–1978. In J. Daigle (Ed.), *Acadians of the Maritimes* (pp. 47–86). Moncton, New Brunswick: Centre d'études acadiennes.

Valdman, A. (2000). Comment gérer la variation dans l'enseignement du français langue

    étrangère aux États-Unis. *French Review, 73*(4), 648–66.

Wenger, E. (1999). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, UK:

    Cambridge University Press.

Wolton, D., Mandigon, C., & Yannic, A. (2008). *L'identité francophone dans la mondialisation*.

    Paris: Organisation internationale de la Francophonie.