



HAL
open science

A language socialization account of translinguistic mudes

Anna Ghimenton, Katheleen C. Riley

► **To cite this version:**

Anna Ghimenton, Katheleen C. Riley. A language socialization account of translinguistic mudes. Jerry Lee; Sender Dovchin. *Translinguistics: Negotiating Innovation and Ordinairness*, Routledge, pp.37-48, 2020, 9781138326330. 10.4324/9780429449918-4 . hal-04504261

HAL Id: hal-04504261

<https://hal.science/hal-04504261v1>

Submitted on 25 Oct 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

A language socialization account of translinguistic mudes

1. Introduction

The language socialization paradigm was formulated to understand how individuals acquire cultural knowledge, practices, and identities through specific social interactions (Duranti et al., 2011; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984). Given that language socialization is enacted at the intersection of language use and language ideology (Riley, 2011), this paradigm elucidates local ideologies as they are constructed, negotiated and reinforced through individuals' specific social engagements, and how these impact individuals' translinguistic practices and related identities. As a lifelong process, language socialization is an apt prism for illuminating the continuity and discontinuity of individuals' interactional dispositions across cultural communities, life stages, and social settings. Thus, the ethnographic study of language socialization allows researchers to "follow" individuals' movements through various geographic and symbolic spaces, examining the social situations they confront, the linguistic resources they acquire, and the heteroglossic strategies they exploit in these spaces.

In this paper, we use Bakhtin's (1981) term *heteroglossic* to refer to the everyday lamination of linguistic forms from distinctive linguistic systems – whether languages, dialects, speech genres, or quoted voices – within specific socio-spatio-temporal settings; by contrast, we reserve *translinguistic* to refer to speakers' transitions across and transforming commitments to various linguistic systems and dialogic identities. We adopt the term *mudes*, proposed by Pujolar & González (2013; see also Lamarre et al. 2015), to explore how individuals' habitus (Bourdieu 1979), ideologies, and identities are socialized as they traverse key junctures in life where symbolic and economic power are interlaced in contemporary society: schooling, working, and parenting (González, Pujolar, Font & Martínez, 2009). Mudes are thus the moments when social subjectivities are expressed and transformed through heteroglossic practices (Pujolar & Puigdevall, 2015). The interconnectedness of language and social life is made manifest by how language repertoires (re)configure and are (re)configured by the social developments within an individual's translinguistic trajectory.

As social groups are the loci for the establishment of norms via ordinary practices (Sacks, 1985), they also provide the contexts within which vectors of innovation and change are unleashed. Authoritative voices (Bakhtin 1986) and established structures of normalcy have an impact on - threatening, constraining, or supporting - individuals' agency and the extent to which new and creative practices emerge and are accommodated in a group. For multilingual speakers, their heteroglossic practices, translinguistic ideologies, and dialogic identities (Bakhtin, 1981; Hill, 1986) challenge structures of normalcy in various ways.

In this chapter, we present data collected through participant observation, interviews, and natural discourse in two contrasting contexts in order to identify some of the relationships between the language ideologies and socializing practices of the communities and the individuals who emerge from these contexts, probing some of the discursive exchanges through which linguistic resources, values, and dispositions are acquired in ways that forge mudes, i.e., socio-spatio-temporal junctures of translinguistic change in a speaker's life. Comparing several heteroglossic engagements in two multilingual contexts, we illustrate how new discourse practices and ideologies, institutions and actors, can emerge similarly out of ordinary practices even in distinctly different sociocultural and political economic contexts. The overarching aim is to demonstrate how mobile and multilingual social actors are not only shaped by but also shape the conditions (practices, institutions, and ideologies) of their own socialization.

2. Fields, settings and data collection

Data were collected in French-and-Italian speaking immigrant families in France and French-and-English speaking youth in Montreal, Canada. In the first context, developmental and language socialization data were collected between 2013 and 2015 and consist of French-Italian interactions recorded during family dinners and interview data with the caregivers in three upper-class Italian families having recently moved to France (in Grenoble and Paris). The children's ages range between two and six. The second set of data was collected in Montréal between 2004 and 2007 and contextualized by background research and ethnographic observations in that city. Situated, semi-structured interviews were conducted in relevant domestic and public settings, focusing on the language socialization biographies of the participants (19-40-year-old multilingual youth), and then transcribed and analyzed for their heteroglossic practices.

Because speakers are socialized by their movements among variable social settings, a useful approach to analyzing data is to identify and compare the socio-spatial settings, the spatio-temporal movements between settings, and the socio-temporal developments of multilingual individuals within and across these settings, thus identifying important junctures of change (*mudes*). To accomplish this, we employed three main methods to provide multiple perspectives on the heteroglossic socialization trajectories: ethnographic participant observation, semi-structured and situated interviews, and recorded and analyzed socialization discourse.

2.1 Participant observation

Everyday socializing interactions were collected in and/or contextualized by ethnographic research, especially participant observation. This classic anthropological method allows researchers to identify and conceptualize: a) the locally salient micro settings (spatial, temporal, and social) in which these interactions take place, b) participants' spatio-temporal movements between social settings as well as the praxes through which they enact symbolic interplay indexing these settings, and c) the macro contexts (including language ideologies and regimes) shaped by the political-economic and ideological forces at work in that place and time in history.

2.2 Semi-structured, situated interviews

Semi-structured and situated interviews, i.e. open-ended yet guided conversations within socially relevant settings, enable researchers to elicit participants' narratives and self-reports about their behaviors and beliefs concerning language, society, caregiving, personal development, etc. From multiple interviews with caregivers, we can extrapolate patterns concerning the macro context – i.e., the influential settings, events, and forces that affect individuals' acquisition of and commitment to various linguistic resources and strategies over historical and developmental time. Conducting interviews with participants about their own language socialization histories can provide insight into the processes by which they developed their language ideologies and practices over the course of their lives, their significant moments of change (i.e. *mudes*), and their present-day interactional and socializing practices through which praxes are reproduced or transformed. Moreover, these semi-naturalistic discourse data can also allow for the pragmatic and metapragmatic analyses of individuals' actual language practices, the ideologies shaping these, and the ways these emerge in real-time socializing discourses.

2.3 Socialization discourse analysis

Socialization discourse analysis requires the longitudinal recording and ethnographic transcription of socializing interactions, focusing on the routine practices of socio-spatial settings and socio-temporal events. These data allow us to analyze how specific language ideologies, practices, and identities are socialized and developed by individuals as they move physically and symbolically within and between a range of socio-spatial contexts, and as they transform socio-temporally over the course of a few weeks or a lifetime. In the first study below, we were able to research the socializing interactions within and across two socio-spatial settings (home and school), allowing for a comparative analysis of the socio-temporal impact of these settings over developmental time. These intercontextual data take the form of either narrated moments or semiotic re-enactments from other settings, and the socializing interactions effect in real time the individuals' translinguistic *mudes* or socio-spatio-temporal junctures of transformation. By contrast, in the second study, the socializing contexts and developmental *mudes* were only referentially discussed rather than captured in real-time.

3. Two ethnographic stories

These two ethnographic stories account for the historical settings, some heteroglossic socialization practices, and some translinguistic *mudes* in the lifespan of several individuals. By analyzing some specific discourse data, we focus on the interconnections between the micro and macro socio-spatio-temporal contexts and how the heteroglossic practices observed reflect and create new contexts of socialization. We present the analyses following a chronological perspective, representing the lifespan dimension, moving from interactions between children and caregivers to contexts where the participants are themselves older and can speak to their own translinguistic trajectories.

3.1 Immigrant France

The three upper-class families in this corpus are Italian professionals who moved to France for career purposes. Although technically immigrants, these families manifest an "elite bilingualism" (Hélot, 2006) that is different from the stigmatized bilingualism developed by those who are not welcomed - socially, politically, or economically - by the host country. Elite bilingualism is commonly viewed as an asset while immigrant bilingualism is seen as resistance or even a threat to the host community's ideals and principles of social unity. Yet, despite their relative privilege, even elite "immigrants" may experience linguistic vulnerability living as they do in a country defined by a long history of linguistic nationalism (Riley 2011).

All families have children attending French monolingual kindergartens or schools. Both the parents and children bring French words from the outer social sphere into the domestic sphere without losing their dominant Italian practices (Ghimenton & Costa 2016). See for example, how *sage* 'well-behaved' is used in the following extract¹.

1. Mother: sei stato bravo oggi vero? (*You well-behaved today, weren't you?*)
2. Child: Si (*Yes*)
3. Father: Sei stato molto **sage** sei molto sei molto bravo (*You were very **well-behaved**, you are very good?*)
4. Mother: **Très calme** [mi ha detto] (*Very calm, she told me*)

¹ In Transcripts 1 and 2, Italian is in plain script, French appears in bold and the translations appear in italics. Stretches of overlapped discourse are marked by square brackets.

5. Father: [Ubbidiente] (*Obedient*)
6. Child: **Qui c'est qui a tapé sur mon verre?** (*Who tapped on my glass?*)
7. Father: Toi (*you*) ((Mother points to her son))
8. Father: Senti ma (*Listen*)
9. Child: **Non c'est pas moi** (*No it's not me*)
10. Father: La maestra, che ha detto la maestra, sei stato bravo, hai fatto i compiti?
(*What did your teacher say, were you good, did you do your homework?*)
11. Child: Sì (*Yes*)

Words like *sage* and *très calme* have an indexical function: they point to the French world yet creatively bridge two distinctive socio-spatial socialization settings: French-school and Italian-home. In addition, the French words embedded in essentially Italian conversations are semantically and culturally specific. For instance, during one dinner, the French term *sage* 'well-behaved' was used by parents talking about their children's behavior during the day. When asking the child "Sei stato *sage* oggi? Sei stato bravo oggi vero?" (line 3), the father initiates an ordinary Italian dinnertime conversation with elements from a typical French school setting: *sage*, and then immediately and translanguistically reformulates with the Italian term *bravo*. While these two terms contain the same referential information, their side-by-side performance enact different connotations of the two types of good behavior considered compliant with the rules and expectations of these two cultural-national communities. *Sage* refers to the rational and social constraints the dominant French society (in particular in institutional contexts) imposes on behavior while Italian *bravo* is a term which is semantically less specific as it can refer to behavior but also to skillfulness. Importing French terms such as *sage* followed immediately by the Italian translation recontextualizes and embraces terms instilled in one social space of socialization to serve another one, thereby furthering the child's development of a bilingual-bicultural metapragmatic awareness of how to speak and act in each setting. The speakers' practices – children's and adults' – ingeniously index what the world is and simultaneously create and co-construct it, defining and redefining their conditions of socialization.

In another dinnertime example, a two-year-old boy in a Parisian Italian family asked his mother whether at home they had a *goûter* ('tea-time snack'). The *goûter* is a daily French sweet snack, eaten by children after school. As the interaction unfolds, the mother responded that at their home there was none but he would find a *goûter* in pre-school.

1. Child: Il **gouter** c'è? (*Is there a snack?*)
2. Mother: Qua? (*Here?*)
3. Child: Il **gouter** c'è? (*Is there a snack?*)
4. Mother: Non c'è il **goûter** a casa nostra Luigi (*No, there isn't a snack at home Luigi*)
5. Child: All'asilo? (*In preschool?*)
6. Mother/Father: All'asilo sì (*In preschool yes*)
7. Child: E a casa di nonna Betta? (*And at grandmother Betta's place*)
8. Father: Probabilmente sì (*Probably so*)
9. Child: E a casa di babbo? (*At daddy's place?*)
10. Father: È la tua (*It's yours*)
11. Mother: Vabbé che la nonna Lisa ne ha di **goûter** c'ha tutto quel che vuoi
(*Well at grandmother Lisa's there are all sorts of snacks, whatever you want*)
12. Child: Ha tantissime goûter? (*She has lots of snacks?*)
13. Mother: Ha tutti quelli che vuoi (*Whatever kinds you want*)

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 14. Child: | Si (<i>yes</i>) |
| 15. Mother: | Gelati, yogurt, di tutto (<i>Ice-cream, yogurt, anything</i>) |
| 16. Father: | Pizza (<i>Pizza</i>) |
| 17. Child: | No! |
| 18. Father: | Tortellini |
| 19. Child: | No! |
| 20. Father: | Prosciutto, formaggio, salmone (<i>Ham, cheese, salmon</i>) |
| 21. Child: | No! |

In an ordinary dinnertime conversation, parents and child interactively define what a *goûter* is, meaning it consists of sweet (and not salty) foods. Both parents are clear that this can happen in the French-school space (6) but not in their home although at the grandparents' place this is not excluded (8; 11). The child “tests the limits” of what can cross the public-private divide via a single word – what it contains referentially and what it can do performatively.

These are only two examples of how, in dinnertime conversations, both children and parents exploit their heteroglossic resources to define and acknowledge their translinguistic conditions and contexts of language socialization. These intercontextual socializing practices potentially impact children's developmental paths in that they (re)create spaces for the long-term construction and transformation of both their language repertoires and their identities.

3.2 Montréal

The multilingual practices of young adults in Montréal reflect the forces that have over the past 300 years shaped this region of North America. Used as one of the original encampments for French explorers and missionaries in the early 17th century, the island developed into the French colony's key port until 1760, when it was surrendered to Britain and transformed over the next two centuries into the primary economic hub of Canada. The *Révolution Tranquille* of the 1960s, implementation of *Loi 101*,² and several fiery referendums over Québécois independence led to the exodus of many anglophones and the transfer of economic prominence to Toronto. Nonetheless, Montréal has emerged as a linguistically and culturally diverse and cosmopolitan city due to the established population of *Québécois de souche*, continued presence of many monied anglophones, as well as an ever-increasing influx of anglo-, franco-, and allophone (i.e., neither anglo- nor francophone) immigrants from around the world and other Canadian provinces. As a result, many of the youth (aged 19-40 at the time of this study) tended to be multilinguals who had traveled much in one way or another (Das, 2016). For this paper, we focus on two adults in their twenties, A and R, who move fluently and playfully between French and English, in ways that index the significant socio-spatio-temporal moves in their lives while actively constructing new settings and stances with their code-switching (see Riley 2012, for more details about these interactions and other study participants).

A is a chef, who switches frequently between Québécois French (QF) and English in the interview situated in his home kitchen in Montréal as he tells stories of his culinary training in France. In Transcript 3³, he uses QF to point metaphorically and emotionally to the time and

² Canada's Constitution Act of 1867 provided official protection to both English and French languages; Québec made French the official language of the province in 1974; but it was Loi 101 of 1977, requiring that new immigrants be educated in French, that has been most effective at maintaining the language.

³ Transcript 3 and 4 follow these conventions: italics = English utterances; bold italics = QF utterances; (plain script) = translation of QF utterances, [= overlap, periods = pauses, : = vowel lengthening; CAPS = louder volume; small letters = softer volume.

place where he was socialized into his various kitchen roles. For instance, he switches in turn 1 to emphasize his displeasure at being assigned the menial labor in the kitchen by immediately translating *BULLSHIT work* into QF as *les jobs PLATTES. les jobs CHIANTS. le MENage. nanana* (the DULL jobs, the BORING jobs, the CLEANing, yuk). Not only does this switch elaborate his disgust, it also highlights his success in finding a way out of such tasks: *pis moi j'nettoie pas ça* (so then me I don't clean that). That is, by acquiring skills and making himself essential to the Japanese chef, he has secured, as his cousin names it in turn 2, his *higher status* as a fish-cleaner instead of a floor-cleaner.⁴ Additionally, he switches from English to QF in turn 11 to discuss, again metaphorically and somewhat emotionally, how he was socialized in France to replace the QF term for 'mop' *moppe* (one of many QF borrowings from English) with the FF term for 'mop' *serpillière*: *so... a serpillière je savais pas c'est quoi. une serpillière.. c'est une moppe. une moppe c'est une serpillière* (mop [FF] I didn't know what was a mop [FF]. It's a mop [QF], a mop [QF] is a mop [FF]).

TRANSCRIPT 3 At home in A's kitchen, with cousin/researcher C and American researcher K, discussing his culinary apprenticeship in France; here about how a Japanese chef taught him to clean fish

1. A: *okay. I'll do it huh the way you want. so then you do it one time two times. the way he wants... and then you're cleaning his fish for all time. so he has. less job to do. but since he has less job to do and you have MORE.. you sorta distance yourself from the whole. okay. I'm no longer scrubbing the floor aspect.. cause. this guy needs me.. he NEEDS me.. so he's gonna make sure that somebody else is doing the BULLSHIT work that I'm supposed to be doing. les jobs PLATTES. les jobs CHIANTS. le MENage. nanana.. pis moi j'nettoie pas ça.. (the dull jobs.the boring jobs.the CLEANing, yuk.. then me I won't clean that) okay. and then you do his fish for him. you do his fish for him. [and then he'll like okay.*
2. C: *[so you had a higher status*
3. A: *well now okay. start doing this like this and we tie this like this starts explaining stuff to you as you go along. and for him I was yakuzo.[JAP] cause I had tattoos. which XX yakuzo..[JAP]*
4. K: *yakuzo. is what*
5. A: *is the mafia in Japan. and they all have tattoo. so we could XX yakuzo[JAP] he called me yakuzo[JAP].*
6. K: *ahah ahah okay.. so he called you yakuzo. uhuh*
7. A: *and everybody else called me québec.*
8. K: *okay. and you spoke french with everybody*
9. A: *uh. yeah.. who did I speak English with. there was one. somebody spoke English there.. can't remember who.*
10. K: *did you. Miss your English part. you were happy. being. totally. in French, did you*
11. A: *NO-on. I was fine. I was fine in French.. it was fine. I mean I spoke like a Quebecker. so... a serpillière je savais pas c'est quoi. une serpillière.. c'est une moppe. une moppe c'est une serpillière* (a mop [FF] I didn't know what it was. a mop [FF].. it's a mop [QF]. a mop [QF] is a mop [FF])

⁴ His use of the loanword *jobs* may speak not only to its full incorporation into both QF and FF at this moment but also to its salience as an index of French youths' general rebellion against *Ancien Régime* purism, the professional French kitchen being a key context wherein the tensions between French chauvinism and globalization are confronted.

A also uses switching to negotiate his identity. In turn 7, he dialogically switches to French to quote how his colleagues in France called him *québec* in an apparently joking fashion. Calling someone by the name of the province they hail from, especially in a professional kitchen where homosocial name-calling is common, clearly has some performative force in the moment that we can only guess at from this remove. By contrast, in turn 11, he uses English to dialogically claim his identity as a *Quebecker* (this is the English term for a citizen of Québec), an identity that only became apparent to him as a result of his contrastive interaction with his culturally French culinary colleagues. Not only does he self-identify as an anglophone Quebecker because he is in the middle of speaking English at this moment in Montréal, he also appears to be distancing himself somewhat from the French attribution. In effect, the tension between these two labels – the French one that indexically constructed his identity in the French kitchen and the self-performing label reclaimed here in his own Montreal kitchen – say a lot about the translinguistic mudes or slippage A experienced in his movements between kitchens in Montreal and France. His code-switching here seems to index not only his evolving mastery of these various linguistic varieties plus the mixed code known as *Franglais*, but also his dialogic identification with the translinguistic Montréal identity that has emerged out of the *Révolution Tranquille*, *Loi 101*, and failed referendums for Québec national independence.

As an interesting contrast, R is a musician/performer who grew up in a small francophone community in Saskatchewan where her adolescent friends code-switched frequently and fluently. Her heteroglossic narratives in her Montréal kitchen (Transcript 4) actively reflect and indexically contribute to the ongoing performative production of her dialogic identity.

Transcript 4: At home in R's kitchen with three friends: R, P, and S (the researcher) as R reveals that two mutual friends are breaking up

1. S: *geez how long have they been together*
2. R: *fifteen years*
3. P: *yeah*
4. S: *oh fuck*
5. R: *yeah mais i est super pas conte:nt en campagne .. mais genre i voulait un chien. pis D__ i dit non. pis le i était comme ben. peut-être qu'on peut habiter XX. pis i dit non be. be.* (but he's not super happy in the country.. but like he wanted a dog. then D__ he said no. then he was like to him well. maybe we can live XX. then he says no wel. wel.) *it's like we-ll you can't always. just say no to everything that I want*
6. P: *well maybe D__'s not happy as well. c'est comme* (it's like) R: *be:n D__ euh:.* *c'est u:n. moi j'aime bien D__.* (we:ll D__ uh: he's a:. I like D__.) *I really like [him he's a really great guy*
7. P: *[NO NO he's a nice guy I mean*
8. R: *but i est difficile.* (he's difficult) *for sure.. i est vraiment. TRÈS. particulier* (he's really. VERY. special)
9. P: *a:h no:n mais ça me fait de la peine* (a:h no: but that hurts)
10. R: *ben c'est sûr là* (well that's for certain)

By contrast with A, R's discursive switches rarely indicate any sort of metaphoric connection to a socioculturally French v. English identity or setting, but serve instead a rhetorical strategy. As in transcript 4, her code-switches instigate a shift in perspectival footing or stance as she expresses an emotion or opinion about someone or something she is describing. For instance, in turn 6, R uses French to explain some sensible reasons why their friends are splitting up and finally provides her most intimate take on the situation (turns 8/10), that in fact one friend in

the couple is a bit difficult, in fact is *particulier*. This term, for which there is no good English translation, it indicates the speaker's disaffiliation from someone based on some specific grounds that will go unspecified but are presumed to be visible to others.

Our interpretation of the differences in A's and R's heteroglossic practices have to do with the socio-spatio-temporal contexts of their translinguistic mudes. R's dialogic identity emerged during her heteroglossic upbringing in Saskatchewan, such that now her code-switching practices are aimed at rhetorically framing the present interaction. By contrast, A went back and forth in his life between Québécois and Quebecker before discovering something closer to a more dialogic identity while in France; thus, his heteroglossic practices during the interview carry the metaphoric stamp of those mudes. Nonetheless, both speakers are clearly invested in a heteroglossic style that speaks to the complexities of the sociopolitical context into which they were born and their translinguistic trajectories through it.

4. Discussion/Conclusion

Despite the social, political, and economic differences in the two macro contexts, the processes and consequences of translinguistic socialization of individuals reveal remarkable similarities and interesting contrasts. In both field sites, individuals (from infancy to adulthood) receive substantial input from two or more languages both within and beyond the home, as well as ideological input about the socially marked meanings of these languages. Speakers move between monolingual and multilingual spaces throughout a lifetime, juggling varying degrees of individual and societal pressures regarding appropriate and/or creative language usage as a means to integrate and/or stand out within the social groups and settings they find themselves in. Consequently, these multilingual speakers use everyday practices to index (reflecting and creating) present and potential social and linguistic realities.

The heteroglossic interactions observed would appear disorderly by 'purist' standards and yet are all sensibly and semiotically rooted in the geographic and social mobility of these speakers (Auzanneau et al. 2016). That is, heteroglossic utterances are the traces of the translinguistic mudes wherein individuals have acquired communicative resources and social commitments as a result of socializing engagements at home, school, and job. The commonality and coherence of these engagements lie precisely in the everyday socio-temporal movements of individual speakers within and across these interactionally defined spaces of socialization – from kitchen tables to workplaces – over the course of a lifetime. Indeed, the interculturality of the spaces the individuals cross is a powerful steering force for their performances, but also for their heightened awareness of the transformative power of their translinguistic stances. Sometimes their linguistic choices match the prevailing norms; at other times their social identifications are translated into playful practices that trespass ethnic, regional, and class boundaries, challenging the established structures, and heteroglossic practices become powerful dialogic means for expanding the pragmatic potential of speakers' practices.

The power of linguistic varieties with international capital such as FF can be imported into immigrant homes in France and complexly colonized regions such as Montréal and metapragmatically reframed as relative rather than absolute. Implicit in the examples of *sage* and *gôûter* in the Italian family's home and *serpillière* in the Québec chef's kitchen is the understanding that the socialized and socializing individuals could master the power code without bowing to its dominance. We also see in the Italian-French situations how personal mobility can transform the power of a single code (Italian); in this immigrant context, the children are socialized to associate the power of the code with their parents' class status despite

the new socio-spatio-temporal setting. Finally, a core element underlying the heteroglossic practices in both contexts is a quest for ‘authenticity’ (i.e., the socio-spatio-temporal link to what is genuinely and uniquely ‘ours’) that goes beyond the expected code choices linked to age, class, gender or ethnicity. In Italian family dinners, French words encode a social reality that becomes integrated into a new ‘authentic’; similarly, in Montréal FF words, such as *particulier*, can best express the translinguistic realities the individuals have perceived and experienced and the dialogic identities they are forging as a consequence. Authenticity in both cases is expressed through the trespassing of criteria of normalcy through these heteroglossic practices. The latter are the dialectal resources that multilingual speakers can exploit to perform their reality, as they have lived and interpreted it via the translinguistic mudes in their lives.

Language ideologies linking value to linguistic forms and competencies assume different interpretations when translated into different socialization practices and socio-spatio-temporal engagements. Consequently, understandings of social identities and their translinguistic voicings can undergo radical transformations at various mudes in an individual’s life trajectory. Having acquired heteroglossic competency, the multilingual actors in our corpora, irrespective of their social or cultural backgrounds, now play with power structures and their own dialogic identities through their innovative practices. They ingeniously perform these as a challenge to normalcy and everyday praxis while their everyday performances may yet ‘normalize’ and legitimize their heteroglossic practices and translinguistic stances.

5. References

- Auzanneau, M. et al. (2016). Introduction. In M. Auzanneau, M. Bento, M. Leclère (eds). *Espaces, mobilités et éducation plurilingues*. (i–viii). Paris: Éditions Archives contemporaines.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin/London: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M., Holquist, M., and Emerson, C.. (1986) *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* (1st ed). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1979). *La Distinction: Critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit.
- Das, S. N. (2016). *Linguistic Rivalries: Tamil Migrants and Anglo-Franco Conflicts*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Duranti, A., Ochs, E., Schieffelin, B.B. (2011) (eds). *Handbook of Language Socialization*. Malden MA: Blackwell.
- Ghimenton, A. & Costa, L. (2016). Code-switching et socialisation plurilingue au sein de trois familles italophones en France. In M. Langner & V. Jovanovic (eds). *Facetten der Mehrsprachigkeit. Reflets du plurilinguisme*. Peter Lang, (pp. 97-117).
- Gonzàlez, Isaac, Pujolar, J., Font, A. & Martínez, R. (2009). *Entre la identitat i el pragmatisme lingüístic. Usos i percepcions lingüístiques dels joves catalans a principis de segle*. Research report. Generalitat de Catalunya.
- Hélot, C. (2006). De la notion d’écart à la notion de continuum. Comment analyser le caractère inégalitaire du bilinguisme en contexte scolaire? Dans C. Hélot & al. (eds), *Écarts de langue, écarts de culture. A l’école de l’Autre*. Frankfort: Peter Lang. (p. 185-206).
- Hill, J. H., & Hill, K. C. (1986). *Speaking Mexicano: Dynamics of Syncretic Language in Central Mexico*. University of Arizona Press.
- Lamarre P., Lamarre S. et Lefranc M. (2015). *La socialisation langagière comme processus dynamique. Suivi d’une cohorte de jeunes plurilingues intégrant le marché du travail*. Québec: Conseil supérieur de la langue française du Québec.

- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories and their implications. In R. Schweder A. & R. Le Vine A. (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self and emotion* (pp.276-320). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pujolar, J., & González, I. (2013). Linguistic ‘mudes’ and the de-ethnicization of language choice in Catalonia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(2), 138-152.
- Pujolar, J., & Puigdevall, M. (2015). Linguistic mudes: how to become a new speaker in Catalonia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2015(231), 167–187.
- Riley, K. C. (2001). The Emergence of Dialogic Identities: Transforming Heteroglossia in the Marquesas, F.P. Ph. D. diss. CUNY Graduate Center.
- Riley, K. C. (2007). To Tangle or Not to Tangle: Shifting Language Ideologies and the Socialization of Charabia in the Marquesas, F.P. In M. Makihara & B.B. Schieffelin (Eds.). *Consequences of Contact: Language Ideologies and Sociocultural Transformations in Pacific Societies* (pp.70-95). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Riley, K. C. (2011) Language Socialization and Language Ideologies. In A. Duranti, E Ochs, and B.B. Schieffelin, eds. *Handbook of Language Socialization* (pp. 493-514). Malden MA: Blackwell.
- Riley, K. C. (2013). L’idéologie hétéroglossique et l’identité dialogique à Montréal. In C. Trimaille & J.-M. Eloy, (eds.). *Idéologies linguistiques et discriminations* (pp. 59-83). Paris: Harmattan.
- Riley, K. C. (2016). Learning to Exchange Food and Talk in the Marquesas. In S. Blum (ed.). *Making Sense of Language*, 3rd ed. (pp. 143-153). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1985). On doing “being ordinary”. In J. Maxwell Atkinson (ed.), *Structures of Social Action* (p. 413-429). Cambridge University Press.