Identities and Ideologies in Study Abroad Contexts

Negotiating Nationality, Gender, and Sexuality

SHELLEY VERONICA DAWSON

A thesis

submitted to Victoria University of Wellington
in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Victoria University of Wellington

Te Whare Wānanga o te Ūpoko o te Ika a Māui

2019

Shelley Veronica Dawson

Identities and Ideologies in Study Abroad Contexts

Negotiating Nationality, Gender, and Sexuality, 2019

Supervisors:

Professor Meredith Marra and Dr. Corinne Seals

For Caleb

for continuing to inspire me

Abstract

This thesis examines the discursive negotiation of identities in study abroad (SA) settings, examining how university exchange students in New Zealand and France use language to enact, reflect on, and problematise social identities in interaction. I push beyond the more common focus on language learning as the end goal of identity scholarship in SA, focusing instead on an emergent approach to social identities for participants as they encounter ‘new’ Discourses and norms in their exchange settings. The post-structural perspective of identities as multiple, dynamic, and a site of struggle is enriched by attending closely to *how* identities are discursively co-constructed at ‘ground level’ in interactions with attention to wider sociocultural Discourses and ideologies. I approach this complexity by weaving a strong theoretical thread throughout the thesis, acknowledging (and problematising) the social categories, knowledge, Discourses and ideologies we (re)construct for ourselves, yet recognising the structural constraints that these constructions provide for identity negotiations at any point in time in the guise of social reality.

Methodologically, I adopt a novel bidirectional approach to examine the *whats* and *hows* of identity co-construction for my participants in France and New Zealand. Data collection spanned a period of sixteen months and involved multiple sources, prioritising naturalistic interactional data and interviews. This was supplemented by an ethnographic data collection which included extensive field notes, time spent with participants, interviews with other key people (language buddies and tutors), and social media. Analytically, interactional sociolinguistics provides valuable tools for a rigorous discourse analysis which considers both micro and macro factors. The analytic focus on the processes of identity negotiation in interaction, underpinned by a social realist approach, provides a fertile platform from which to investigate identity construction in its intersubjective complexity, and to move beyond the reliance on student perspectives as the main source of accessing identity in SA.

My findings show that particularly salient identities for participants hinge on constructs of nationality (which interacted with ethnicity), as well as gender and sexuality. These identities were often ‘triggered’ by the activation of ‘discursive faultlines’ in exchange settings and ideologies (associated with the above categories) were pervasive in all participants’ ensuing identity negotiations. The emphasis on the social embeddedness of participants and the researcher has rich

implications for understandings of the relationship between structure and agency, and analysis shows that even ostensibly agentive acts are constrained by ideological structures, which act as vehicles of power. I conceptualise agency as being co-constructed, dynamic, and multifaceted, and as involving resistance, perpetuation, complicity, and strategic harnessing of Discourses - both conscious and unconscious. Within these broad parameters, my data provides evidence of greater transformative potential in forms of 'oppositional' agency, and at the same time, fledgling potential in what I term agency in a germination phase. I argue that 'seeds of agency' are planted for some participants in their new settings and that reflecting on the arbitrary nature of ideologies and accepted truths was a more common outcome for participants who had prior experience of marginalisation. In this sense, the study also speaks to notions of study abroad as social change.

What study abroad contexts afford, by virtue of movement across geographical and discursive space, is unique access to how identities are negotiated in light of ideological constraints by young people living in an increasingly mobile and globalised world. Moving beyond singular portrayals of SA university students as language learners and adding depth to existing treatments of identity has crucial repercussions for the way we conceptualise study abroad participants. My study firmly positions them as 'whole people' who continue to experience real world issues on exchange, in contexts where the revered immersion experience has been replaced by mobility and connectedness through technological advances. The increasing internationalisation of education adds economic implications to the social, emphasising the need for deeper understanding of the connections between language, identity, and ideology as impacting the study abroad experience. These understandings have the potential to benefit many groups of people, including academics, educators, policy writers, and not least the students themselves.

Acknowledgements

The research journey can be summarised as challenging, inspiring, and extremely rewarding. It has been a time of academic growth, of identity changes, and of stimulating discussions, resulting very much in an ontological excavation of my own – a phrase I return to in the thesis. Completing a doctorate is thankfully not a solo endeavour, and I would like to thank the following people who have been instrumental along the way.

To my supervisors, Meredith Marra and Corinne Seals, for their endless support, guidance, and unflinching belief in my research abilities. Thank you to Meredith for sparking my initial interest in sociolinguistics back in 2014 and opening up a rich linguistic world. And thank you to Corinne for introducing me to the term applied sociolinguistics, and showing me how beneficial this combination is. Thank you both for providing challenges for me, for letting me find my own way during my theoretical and philosophical explorations, and for pulling me out of the rabbit hole when I needed it. A special thanks to Janet Holmes, whose support and feedback has been extremely valuable. You are all academic inspirations.

To my participants and the universities that answered my request for participants. I thank this amazing group of young people for teaching me so much. I had no idea at the beginning of this adventure that my participants would come to be such an important part of my life. You have inspired me on many levels and being part of your journeys continues to be a privilege.

Special thanks goes to Myreille Pawliez, whose help at the beginning stages of my research design was deeply appreciated. To my good friend Françoise, who provided support in the form of impeccable translation skills. To Françoise, Émilie, and Bénédicte, who were especially generous during my time collecting data in Paris, providing housing and friendship. To Caleb, for providing much needed help with diagrams and formatting. To Ashley, for her impressive drawing skills, and for making time when there was essentially none. For this, I am extremely grateful.

I am also grateful to Victoria University of Wellington for the doctoral scholarship, and for data collection and international conference funding, which has been of immense financial help. Within the university, I have been fortunate to benefit from ongoing opportunities within LALS to extend and broaden my teaching experience. I thank the academic and general staff for their collegiality

and generosity of spirit. Also within LALS, I thank the Language in the Workplace team for the opportunities for research assistant work, and Discourse Analysis Group (DAG) members for their insights and contributions.

One of the best parts of this thesis journey has been meeting new, lifelong friends. I thank all of my PhD friends and officemates, but give special mention to Bianca, Khadij, and Emily, whose support, friendship, and understanding have been invaluable. You are all amazing women. Finally, a very special thank you to my family for their love and encouragement. The various forms of support you have provided have been greatly appreciated. Thank you for always being there. I am very lucky.

Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Impetus for Study.....	2
1.2 Study Abroad	8
1.3 Trends in Study Abroad Literature.....	12
1.4 Extending and Advancing Study Abroad Scholarship	15
1.5 Thesis Overview.....	16
Chapter 2: Theoretical Underpinnings and Identity	21
2.1 Ontological Grounding.....	21
2.2 Epistemological Grounding.....	23
2.3 Intellectual Genealogy	24
2.3.1 Simone de Beauvoir	24
2.3.2 Michel Foucault	25
2.3.3 Pierre Bourdieu.....	26
2.3.4 Mikhail Bakhtin	30
2.4 Identity.....	32
2.4.1 Identity - Tracing a Path	32
2.4.2 Poststructural Approaches to Identity	34
2.4.2.1 Investment.....	35
2.4.2.2 Imagined Communities	36
2.4.2.3 Struggle.....	36
2.4.2.4 Sense of Self.....	37
2.4.2.5 Beyond the Individual	38
2.4.3 Discursive Approaches to Identity	39
2.4.3.1 Social Categories	40
2.4.3.2 Intersectionality.....	40
2.4.3.3 Intersubjectivity	41

2.4.4 Discourse and Identity	42
2.4.5 Ideologies	43
2.5 Structure and Agency.....	44
2.6 Accessing Identity.....	48
2.6.1 Indexicality	48
2.6.2 Stance	50
2.7 Summary	51
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	55
3.1 Methodological Stance.....	55
3.1.1 Relationship with Participants	55
3.1.2 Ethnographic Approach	56
3.1.3 Interactional Sociolinguistics	57
3.1.4 Critical Lens.....	58
3.1.5 Reflexivity.....	59
3.2 Data Collection Processes.....	60
3.2.1 Participant Recruitment	60
3.2.2 Case Studies.....	65
3.2.3 Research contexts: Wellington and Paris	66
3.3 Data Sources	67
3.3.1 Naturally-Occurring Interactional Data.....	68
3.3.1.1 Tutorial Contexts	70
3.3.1.2 Recordings with Friends, Language Buddies, and Acquaintances.....	72
3.3.2 Ethnographic Interviews.....	72
3.3.2.1 Transcription and Translation	75
3.3.3 Ethnographic Observations (‘Deep Hanging Out’)	76
3.3.4 Tutorial Observations	77
3.3.5 Social Media: Facebook.....	78
3.3.6 Field Notes	79

3.4 Process of Analysis	80
3.4.1 A Note on Transitions	80
3.4.2 Data Selection.....	81
3.5 Summary	82
Chapter 4: Nationality and Ethnicity	85
4.1 Nationality in Study Abroad Literature	85
4.2 Nationality and National Identities	88
4.2.1 Case study 1: Hanna in Wellington – ‘French Teacher’ Identity.....	90
4.3 Ethnicity and Ethnic Identities	100
4.3.1 Case study 2: Victoria in Wellington – Negotiating Ethnicity and ‘Frenchness’ as a Caledonian	102
4.3.2 Case study 3: Persephone in Paris – Negotiating Ethnicity and ‘Frenchness’ as a New Zealander	112
4.4 Discussion.....	130
4.4.1 Cultural Capital.....	130
4.4.2 ‘Proper’ French.....	131
4.5 Concluding Remarks	134
Chapter 5: Gender and Sexuality	137
5.1 Gendered Identities in the Literature	137
5.2 Gender	139
5.2.1 Gender Order.....	140
5.3 Sexuality	142
5.3.1 Heteronormativity	143
5.4 Findings and Discussion.....	144
5.4.1 Paris: Gender, Sexuality, and Sexual Harassment.....	144
5.4.1.1 Interview Data - Persephone, Athena, and Shelley: Red Lipstick, Long Flowy Skirts and ‘Overthinking’	145
5.4.1.2 Interactional Data – Persephone and Athena: Being Followed, Being Hunted, Being ‘Prey’	151
5.4.1.3 Interview Data – Viv, Persephone, and Shelley: Being ‘Consumed’ in a Public Space	163

5.4.2 Wellington: Gender and Sexuality	168
5.4.2.1 Hanna	168
5.4.2.1.1 Interview Data – Hanna and Shelley: Le ‘Gros Dégueulasse’, the Land of the Care Bears, and a Focus on Intersectionality.....	169
5.4.2.2 Hugo.....	177
5.4.2.2.1 Interview Data – Hugo and Shelley: Redefining Social Norms, Pushing Back, and Becoming Woke.....	178
5.4.2.2.2 Facebook Data	185
5.5 Concluding Remarks	187
Chapter 6: Widening the Lens: Ideology as a Portal into the Structure and Agency Relationship	191
6.1 Ideologies, Identities, and Study Abroad Settings.....	192
6.2 Agency as Tethered to Structure.....	194
6.3 Ideological Structures in Study Abroad.....	195
6.3.1 Ideologies of French Language and Nationality.....	198
6.3.2 Normativity and Experiences with Marginalisation	202
6.3.3 Ideologies of Gender and Sexuality: Accessing Agency and Further Conceptualisations.....	203
6.4 Concluding Remarks	207
6.5 Bringing Everything Together: The Inextricability of Concepts	209
Chapter 7: Conclusion.....	213
7.1 Theoretical Contributions.....	215
7.2 Methodological Contributions	216
7.3 Analytical Contributions to Study Abroad	218
7.4 Future Research and Implications.....	220
7.5 Concluding Comments	221
References.....	225
Appendix A Participants	259
Appendix B Human Ethics Memorandum	262
Appendix C.1 Consent Form Key Participants	263
Appendix C.2 French Consent Form Key Participants	264
Appendix C.3 Consent Form Teachers and Conversation Partners	265

Appendix C.4 Consent Form Class Members	266
Appendix C.5 Information Sheet Key Participants	267
Appendix C.6 French Information Sheet Key Participants	269
Appendix C.7 Information Sheet Teachers and Conversation Partners.....	271
Appendix C.8 Information Sheet Class Members	272
Appendix D.1 Consent Form Key Participants	273
Appendix D.2 Consent Form Teachers and Conversation Partners.....	274
Appendix D.3 French Consent Form Teachers and Students	275
Appendix D.4 Consent Form Class Members	276
Appendix D.5 Information Sheet Key Participants.....	277
Appendix D.6 Information Sheet Teachers and Conversation Partners	279
Appendix D.7 French Information Sheet Teachers and Students	280
Appendix D.8 Information Sheet Class Members.....	282
Appendix E.1 Poster Phase 1	283
Appendix E.2 Poster Phase 2	284
Appendix F Transcription Conventions	285

Chapter 1: Introduction

Ka mate kāinga tahi ka ora kāinga rua.

(When one home fails, have another to go to.)

This Facebook post from Hugo, one of the exchange student¹ participants in my research, came two days after the 2016 terror attacks in Nice, France, an event felt keenly by all my French participants in New Zealand at the time. It encapsulates many of the themes in this thesis on identity negotiations in study abroad contexts, most notably the importance of connections and conversations. The post highlights connections between identities for Hugo, as his national identity as French and his identity as an exchange student merge with his developing sense of connection to New Zealand. There are further connections seen in the linguistic dexterity of choosing te reo Māori and English rather than French, feeding into notions of fluidity, mobility, and transnationalism which typify study abroad in times of globalisation. The social media platform itself also encapsulates connectivity, an increasingly important component of study abroad where maintaining overlapping connections to various ‘homes’ and groups of people is ‘the new normal’ as I outline below. Most importantly, the post above aptly demonstrates the idea that study abroad is so much more than language learning. Life continues in all its inelegant complexity, providing new and sometimes challenging vantage points from which to examine the way we see things, the way we see ourselves, and the way we negotiate and present ourselves to others. These themes run throughout my thesis and speak to the experiences of all of my participants whose identity negotiations were the locus of these connections. From a researcher perspective, identity negotiations are a key site for practice and theory to meet. Interactional data and Facebook posts are not only a conversation with an interlocutor or an online audience, but are connected with wider sociocultural concepts. By exploring these connections, we can gain not only theoretical and analytical texture, but crucial insights into the relationship between language, identity, and society as experienced by today’s mobile generation.

¹ While I use the terms ‘study abroad’ and ‘exchange’ interchangeably in this thesis, I acknowledge the difference whereby ‘study abroad’ is used as an umbrella term to encompass many types of overseas programmes, including ‘exchange’. (As I explain later in the chapter, exchange students continue paying the home institution fees, rather than the host’s.)

1.1 Impetus for Study

This study took shape as a result of personal, professional and academic experiences. In this section, I acknowledge some of my own multiple subject positions and outline the overlapping trajectory which led me to conceptualise and carry out the research. In writing about that path, I adopt a less ‘academic’ tone and emphasise my own feelings more than I do elsewhere in this thesis. The reasons for this are twofold. This style more accurately reflects my experiences, emotions, and identities at the time and is also part of my commitment to reflexivity; as a multi-faceted researcher, my own history and my changing identities and beliefs contribute to all stages of this research. Charmaz & Mitchell’s (1996, p. 300) advice resonates:

We need all our words to tell the whole story. And in the end we can only stand upon our stories. We do ourselves and our disciplines no service by only telling half-tales, by only reporting finished analyses in temperate voice, by suppressing wonder or perplexity or dread.

My interest in the relationship between language and identity initially stems from my own experiences as a French language learner. I recall the trials and exhilarations that characterised periods spent abroad in Tahiti and New Caledonia as a teenager and young adult (common exchange destinations for New Zealanders due to their geographic proximity) - the confidence that was induced by a compliment on a well-executed grammatical construction, the sense of responsibility when called upon to translate for my peers in interactions with locals, and, of course, the frustration and embarrassment so often linked to limited linguistic and sociocultural resources. Above all, crossing borders opened up new and exciting possibilities in terms of how I saw myself. Speaking French with host families and friends gave me a new voice (one I now see as imbued with sociohistorically-constructed status) with enticing transformative potential. From a small town in New Zealand, I found this liberating, as well as empowering, and I continued over the following years to embrace my love for all things French, completing a Bachelor’s degree in French language and literature, training to become a French teacher, completing professional development teaching courses in Montréal and Paris, teaching the language in high schools, and living in France on two separate occasions with my young son. To say I embodied the word Francophile is no exaggeration.

Traditional second language acquisition (SLA) literature would deem me a “good language learner” (Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, & Todesco, 1978) in my desire to immerse myself in ‘the culture’, speak

French at every opportunity, and indeed to think only in French. Accuracy assumed much importance, and I focused on sounding as ‘French’ as possible, “striving to reach the ‘target’ competence of an idealized native speaker” (Firth & Wagner, 1997, pp. 296–297). I had the ‘right’ kind of motivation, attitudes, and cognitive traits which lead to ‘success’ in language learning. But psychological and cognitive approaches are not enough to account for this success, disregarding as they do so many rich sociocultural and sociohistorical factors which bring to bear on experience. For me, as a young woman from New Zealand with no strong claims to national identity (at the time), the identity rewards were magnetic and certainly outweighed the motivation to master a linguistic system in its own right. While this may be reduced to notions of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation (see Ryan & Deci, 2000), this encapsulation does not capture the dynamism of the learning process and my own sociohistorical constructed *investment* in learning, which hinged on the above ‘rewards’ as a *return*.

Importantly, being a young woman from New Zealand who was also in the normative gender and sexuality bracket and Pākehā (of European descent) gave me certain privileges or smoothed the path perhaps in having identities ratified, though this was beyond my conscious attention at the time. There was also struggle, of course - much of which I will not recount here. One area that became part of daily life (in France in particular) was sexual harassment, but at the time I optimistically allocated this behaviour to the ‘emotional openness’ with which I had come to categorise the French culture. Living in Marseilles and Paris, I developed avoidance strategies, especially on public transport, and saw this behaviour as a normal part of life in big cities. Hindsight certainly brings clarity. What stands out from these recollections (among many things) is the fact that my experiences both mirror and provide a direct contrast with those of my participants during their time abroad.

In my professional role as a language teacher, the relationship between language and identity was further emphasised. In my early career teaching French to high school students in New Zealand and England, I was still very much in the prescriptive camp, constrained by my own experience and beliefs at the time, curriculum requirements, examinations, and other stakeholder pressures. I was yet to be ‘enlightened’ by sociolinguistics and notions of descriptivism. In saying this, my enthusiasm for the language and culture always accompanied the teaching of regular verbs, and I placed a strong focus on communicative competence. On many occasions, I saw a spark of possibility ignited in students’ eyes. It was only when learners returned from exchanges, however (and there were not many who did this), that identity was given fuller expression. I always enjoyed

hearing about their experiences, although our discussions invariably centred on language learning and confidence. I was not privy to the unfolding of the experience itself, bookmarked as I was at the beginning and end.

New insights were garnered from my many years spent teaching English as an Additional Language (firstly in France but predominantly in New Zealand). I have seen learners from many countries harnessing their repertoire of linguistic resources (and associated capital) to position and reposition themselves (cf. Davies & Harré, 1990) as particular kinds of people, or to foreground different social identities amidst new sociocultural landscapes. The poststructural definition of identity as multiple, changing and as a site of struggle (Norton, 2000, 2013) resonated clearly. There was Jason² from China who strongly rejected his classmates' attempts to position him as a reference source for all things Chinese, politely arguing that he could not speak for a population of over a billion people comprised of many ethnic groups. At the same time, he took great pride in assuming a teacher role and teaching basic Mandarin to his classmates. Dina, on the other hand, appeared to relish opportunities to explain the 'Chinese culture', China being her country of origin. There was João, who rejected his Brazilian classmates' attempts to create solidarity by conversing with him in Portuguese before the lesson. He wanted nothing more to do with Brazil and was learning English so he could pursue his dream of becoming a professional skateboarder in the United States.

Some students who were parents would foreground this identity in their conversations with their classmates and with me, while others would leave that identity at the door, preferring to embrace other subject positions newly available to them (see my discussion of Hue in Dawson, 2014). There was Mon from Myanmar, whose identity trajectory involved negotiating new understandings of her gender identity and possibilities for agency. And there was Elena from Russia who remained committed to the idea that homosexuality could be 'cured' and that depression was not a real illness even after meeting more liberating Discourses³ from her classmates and in her new setting. Julian from Switzerland embraced fervently what he saw as a Kiwi (New Zealand) identity, which resulted in his linguistic repertoire being liberally peppered for a short time with expletives, irrespective of context. Adriana, from Brazil, a trained medical doctor with experience, struggled to have her professional identity legally accepted in the New Zealand setting, yet embraced returning to a

² All names are pseudonyms

³ In this thesis, I follow the orthographic distinction made by James Paul Gee (1990, 2014) whereby capital 'D' Discourses are sociocultural, institutionalised ways of doing things (e.g. political Discourse or third wave feminist Discourse) and discourses with a small 'd' are instantiated through every day (often mundane) talk.

learner role in the language classroom, mentoring many of the younger students. This list goes on. These identity negotiations were not always smooth, calling forth Menard-Warwick's (2009b; 2014) metaphor of *discursive faultlines*, the rumblings that can occur when Discourses collide. What became clear over and over again was that language learners bring with them complex histories and multiple desires for their future (Norton, 1997, 2000, 2013; Norton Peirce, 1995). 'Language learner' is one identity of many and it may or may not be the most salient at any point in time. In this teaching context, I gained many insights into how identities emerged in interaction. Students positioned themselves in certain ways and were often positioned in different ways by others. It was compelling and it cemented my understanding of identity as an intersubjective achievement (cf. Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). My re-entry into postgraduate study occurred alongside these concrete experiences, thus adding a theoretical layer to my observations.

My postgraduate classes led to a desire to deepen these understandings. How did particular identities become salient for different students, and what processes were involved in the actual co-construction? I wondered what the *doing* of identity looked like through a more detailed linguistic lens and how these ground-level negotiations could be linked to wider sociocultural Discourses. Elena's views on homosexuality and mental illness (as mentioned in the previous paragraph) were clearly not something she was born with, and Mon's identity negotiations involved a reconciliation of Discourses around what was deemed 'acceptable femininity' in different settings. The imagined community (Anderson, 1991) was a construct ripe for further exploration. Just as Julian's understanding of what it meant to be 'Kiwi' can be seen as an imagined community guiding his identity work in the classroom, so too can Jason's and Dina's visions of their respective Chinas. In conceptualising my students as 'whole people' (Coleman, 2013b) with their own histories, changing identities, and desires for the future, going beyond the classroom as a research site was imperative. Whilst a valuable site for identity work, and for what I have termed *identity rehearsals* (see Dawson, 2014), the classroom was not the only salient context for my students, as conversations on a Monday morning would always attest to.

My learning and teaching experiences therefore led to questions, and these questions took shape as I engaged more with academic ideas during my postgraduate study. This resulted in a firm commitment to anchor my study of identity negotiations in study abroad contexts, where language learning is indeed part of a much bigger and richer social picture. I implemented a novel bidirectional ethnographic approach to the study, opting to situate both (non-linear) research phases in settings I had robust linguistic and sociocultural understandings of - New Zealand and

France. In Chapter 3 I provide further details of the methodological processes involved in participant recruitment and decisions around data collection, including specific geographic locations. For now, I turn to my participants, whose stories and conversations are at the heart of this thesis. I introduce them briefly here, and I return to them in Chapter 3 when I outline the recruitment process. Appendix A also provides more information about each participant⁴.

In phase 1 of my study, which took place in Wellington, New Zealand, where I am based, I was fortunate to have the help of students from French-speaking countries - Hanna, Victoria, Hugo, Jules, Félix, and Pierre. They were all studying in New Zealand to gain credits for their undergraduate degrees. Victoria is from the French territory of New Caledonia while all other phase 1 participants are from France. A common focus on improving their English was supplemented by a desire to experience a new culture and way of life, to gain an international perspective, and for the participants from France, this was accompanied by a 'pull factor' of geographic distance and accompanying perception of exoticism. While Hanna's degree was in Applied Language Studies (with a focus on English) and Victoria was a language major (English), none of my phase 1 participants took language papers in their New Zealand University. Topics ranged instead across Business Studies, Te Reo and Tikanga Māori⁵, New Zealand Sign Language, Cinema, Statistics, Sociology and Anthropology. I developed a strong rapport with all participants during their exchanges, as I outline in Chapter 3, gaining a valuable holistic view of their experiences. The following table presents my phase 1 participants, their ages, home countries, and lengths of exchanges.

⁴ Pseudonyms are used for all participants in my study

⁵ Māori language and customs

Table 1: Phase 1

Name	Age at time of exchange	From	To	Duration of exchange
Hanna	18	France	Wellington, New Zealand	One semester; February-July 2016
Victoria	21	New Caledonia	Wellington, New Zealand	One semester; February-July 2016
Hugo	18	France	Wellington, New Zealand	Full academic year; July 2016 – July 2017
Jules	20	France	Wellington, New Zealand	Full academic year; July 2016 – July 2017
Pierre	19	France	Wellington, New Zealand	Full academic year; July 2016 – July 2017
Félix	20	France	Wellington, New Zealand	Full academic year; July 2016 – July 2017

Phase 2 took place in Paris, and I spent six weeks there doing data collection at the beginning of my participants' stays. My New Zealand participants, Persephone, Viv, and Athena, were studying credit-bearing courses for their degrees which included International Relations, Law, and the French language. While Persephone and Athena included French language papers as part of their courses, many of their classes were delivered in English, and Viv, who did not speak any French bar the basics, enrolled in courses entirely taught in English. Being in Paris was extremely useful in regards to data collection and relationship building.

Table 2: Phase 2

Name	Age at time of exchange	From	To	Duration of exchange
Persephone	20	New Zealand	Paris, France	One semester; August 2016 – January 2017*
Viv	23	New Zealand	Paris, France	One semester; August 2016 – January 2017
Athena	20	New Zealand	Paris, France	Full academic year; January 2016 – January 2017

**Note that participants stayed on in the exchange setting or travelled in neighbouring countries/regions after their university semester had finished.*

In Chapter 3, I describe in more depth my participant focus and participant-led data collection, for which there were ramifications for the actual amount of data collected and relationships with each individual participant. In concrete terms, this meant that my wider participant pool was divided into core and peripheral participants (see diagram in Chapter 3). Being able to focus in depth on the interactions of core participants aligned well with my aims of accessing depth and not breadth. At the same time, the experiences of all participants allowed for valuable comparisons and analytical support. I will always be thankful to both groups for their enthusiastic uptake of my request for participation, and for allowing me into their lives with such willingness and candour.

Having introduced my participants and detailed the rationale behind my thesis and the ways in which my experiences contributed to a focus on identity in study abroad (SA) settings, I turn my attention to the research contexts. I first describe study abroad in general terms, before providing an overview of SA scholarship. I then situate my study within this and show how it advances understandings in the field in several ways: theoretically, methodologically, and analytically.

1.2 Study Abroad

Study abroad can be defined as “a temporary sojourn of pre-defined duration, undertaken for educational purposes” (Kinging, 2009, p. 11). Over time, access to the revered ‘immersion experience’ came to equate to “a magical formula making possible an effortless process of ‘easy learning’” (Dekeyser, 2010, p. 89) for those studying languages. While the idea of immersion rings true to my own experiences around 20 years ago (and countless others; see Kinginger, 2015), the magic formula appeared glitchy in that it did not yield the same results for everybody. Today, linguistic isolation in the form of discrete language communities is rare (especially in large cities), and remaining connected to multiple communities is the norm as technology continues to advance (see e.g. Coleman, 2013b, 2013a, 2015; Coleman & Chafer, 2010; Kinginger, 2010). The *dépaysement* involved in study abroad is therefore perhaps “less sharp” than before (Coleman, 2015, p. 40). In contexts of mobility, many groups of people, including study abroad students, live their lives across “increasingly porous geopolitical and ethnolinguistic borders and across spaces and places, both real and imagined” (Duff, 2015, p. 59). Traditional assumptions about ‘study abroad’ can no longer capture the experiences of transnational, multilingual individuals in a globalized world (Duff, 2015), whose immediate linguistic and sociocultural contexts are characterised by fluidity and access to connectivity. This has repercussions for the questions we ask as researchers.

Increasing student mobility is accompanied by expansion of higher education in many parts of the world today (Coleman, 2013a, 2013b, 2015; Mitchell, Tracy-Ventura, & McManus, 2017), though it is important to note that still only a minority of university students are mobile (see Coleman, 2013b) despite these increases. Growing internationalisation is reflected in policy documents. Traditional notions of study abroad as a gateway to language fluency, for developing intercultural competence, or indeed as a ‘frivolous’, feminised, and elitist pursuit (an idea that came to attach itself to Discourses in the U.S. and in Europe (see Kinginger, 2013)), have now been requisitioned by institutional bodies. Increasingly, we see study abroad (as part of the internationalisation of higher education in general) couched in a discursive landscape of economic benefits, both addressing and constructing new motivations for mobile students, of whom there are estimated to be five million internationally with an expected increase to 7-8 million by 2025 (New Zealand Government International Education Strategy 2018-2030, 2018, p. 11). Despite this push, it is important to acknowledge at this point that study abroad is still, for the most part, mainly accessible to those who have a certain amount of privilege.

That many resources have been allocated to furthering this economic agenda can be seen in the proliferation of research with findings linking study abroad to enhanced employability (see Trower & Lehmann, 2017) or foreign friends being a predictor of international career mobility (Parey & Waldinger, 2007). Coleman (2013a, p. 25) notes that Joseph Nye, who coined the term *soft power*, sees international academic exchanges as promoting US values and interests. Within the European Union, the large-scale student mobility scheme ERASMUS was established in 1987, as a joint project between the European Commission and the academic community bringing together goals of promoting interuniversity cooperation and expanding the European labour market (Patasiba, 2006, p. 109). Institutional goals, then, are changing the shape of study abroad.

In New Zealand, too, these economic ties are increasingly gaining prominence. The government released the International Education Strategy 2018-2030 in August 2018. The strategy depicts New Zealand’s future as “a thriving and globally connected New Zealand through world-class international education” (New Zealand Government International Education Strategy 2018-2030, 2018, p. 3), defining international education as:

International students coming here to study among New Zealanders, our own people travelling the world to experience a global component in their education, and people

anywhere, online and internationally, learning through great products, services and approaches built in New Zealand.

There is thus a strong bidirectional focus on coming and going, which adds useful scaffolding for my own methodological decision in this respect. The International Education Strategy includes the following quote from Caroline Bilkey, New Zealand's former Ambassador to Brazil: "International education contributes to the global good as it opens hearts and minds and encourages tolerance" (p. 4). That this comes before the details of the strategy itself and is given prominence (in terms of layout and position) suggests the importance attached to the broader societal value of international education and goes beyond the economic benefits. This has clear links to my study's focus on exploring the salience of social identities.

In terms of incoming students to New Zealand, the strategy maintains as one of its overarching goals 'Delivering an excellent education and student experience/Te hora hīranga mātauranga me nga wheako tauira' (p. 9), which includes a clear focus on rigorous monitoring of international education quality and the wellbeing of international students, of which exchange students are part (p. 13). In the outgoing direction, one of the overall indicators of another overarching goal - 'Developing global citizens/ Whakawhanake tāngata a ao' - is that "an increasing number of New Zealand students graduating have international components in their qualifications" (p.9), and a 'key action' within this is to "develop an outbound mobility strategy that includes a review of student scholarships and exchanges" (p. 21). The "great Kiwi OE tradition"⁶ is connected to the aim of increasing numbers of New Zealand university students undertaking an international learning experience; the University of Auckland, for example, aims for one in four by 2020 (New Zealand Government International Education Strategy 2018-2030, 2018, p. 7). Such declarations and documents themselves reflect the economic and social importance accorded by governments in many areas of the world to mobility and global citizenship.

France is a traditionally popular study abroad destination for New Zealand university students, with the country being in the top third (since 2015) of selected destinations for students at the New Zealand university where phase 1 of my research was based (D. Anderson, personal communication, August 22, 2018). French has long been a popular language for New Zealanders

⁶ The Kiwi OE (overseas experience) is often-cited as part of the New Zealand cultural makeup and involves young New Zealanders living and working for an extended period overseas, often in the United Kingdom and usually after completing their tertiary study.

to learn in high schools, only second to te reo Māori in New Zealand in 2017 (Ministry of Education, 2018). Despite the decline in foreign language learning overall (Ward & East, 2016), French was ranked the 6th most commonly spoken language in New Zealand in 2013 (Statistics New Zealand, 2013). In the opposite direction, French students (from France and New Caledonia) coming to New Zealand are said to comprise the second largest European group, with 2300 students partaking every year (1600 of whom do so to take English courses specifically) (Nourry, 2017). The number is smaller for those who take credit-bearing courses at a university⁷ (260 in 2015), explained in part by the fact that the vast majority of students in this case have to pay the expensive international New Zealand fees (Nourry, 2017). With the increasing number of university partnerships, however, outgoing students pay their home tuition fees rather than the host's. This was the case for all my exchange student participants, some of whom were also eligible for small stipends.

New Zealand as a destination for students from France is gaining in popularity but is not one of the most common destinations⁸. When I met with Laura, the Head of International Division Asia/Pacific at the Paris University from where four of my French participants came and where Persephone and Viv attended, she explained that based on previous feedback from students the main attraction of New Zealand as a destination is the perception of 'exoticism', linked to the geographic distance. It is also important to note here that a full year exchange is compulsory for all third year undergraduate students from this institution. The following excerpt is from my field notes on the 22nd September 2016:

In summarising previous students' experiences, Laura mentioned that they appreciated what they saw as an open and welcoming society, exemplified in the relations with Māori people. She said that this was such a positive societal aspect for these students to see as it was in direct contrast with France's immigration policy which values assimilation. She saw NZ, on the other hand, as embracing diversity.

New Zealand has assumed a unique position then in terms of exchange destinations. Ideologies of English as the language of commercialism and capitalist success (Schneider, 2010) appear to combine with this perceived exoticism to attract French students. This was reflected in almost all

⁷ Many French students choose to study at private language schools in New Zealand.

⁸ For students from New Caledonia, it is difficult to say at this point given the relatively recent establishment of an exchange agreement between the universities with which my study affiliates.

of my French participants' stated reasons given for selecting New Zealand. Hugo, as an example, in our preliminary email communication (before he came to New Zealand) referred to New Zealand's *geographical distance* and *natural beauty* when explaining his choice. This sat alongside his desire to improve his command of English for future career reasons.

Study abroad today is therefore characterised by increased mobility and transnationalism (e.g. Duff, 2015; Murphy-Lejeune, 2002). Globalisation is continually changing the landscape, linguistic and otherwise (e.g. Coleman & Chafer, 2010). These changes have occurred alongside the internationalisation of education and are reflected in government policy, as I have shown with the description of the New Zealand International Education Strategy where global citizenship is part of this economic (and social) vision. Motivations for undertaking study abroad vary and are increasingly linked to students' future careers. Language learning may or may not be a goal, and if it is, it often sits alongside others. The exchange partnerships that exist between France and New Zealand, and New Caledonia and New Zealand foster ongoing relationships between these countries through the bridging experiences of study abroad students such as my participants.

1.3 Trends in Study Abroad Literature

Alongside the societal and policy changes around study abroad, there have been changes to the trends within the study abroad literature. The following brief review sets the scene, and is expanded later as relevant.

Research in SA was initially strongly quantitative, measuring language gains - in oral fluency, syntax, vocabulary, phonology, sociolinguistic and pragmatic use, and communicative strategies (see Diao, Freed, & Smith, 2011). Barbara Freed's (1995) landmark publication *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context* was the first full volume to bring together many such quantitative studies and to introduce a qualitative element, expanding the focus to include the achievements and *experiences* of language learners abroad. Acknowledging students' sociocultural experiences as reasons for the considerable variation in quantitative findings led to the "multidimensional research agenda focusing on second language development" (Mitchell et al., 2017, p. 8) which has continued until today. One particularly valuable outcome of Freed's volume was the problematisation of popular myths related to study abroad, such as immersion as the only requirement for 'real' language learning and fluency to occur. Despite a large body of work aiming to dispel this myth (e.g. Dekeyser, 2010; Diao et al., 2011; Kinginger, 2008, 2009; Wilkinson, 1998), the 'ideal' of immersion is still reflected in current materials for Anglophone study abroad

participants (Mitchell et al., 2017, p. 19), and is viewed by many as the “quintessential learning experience” (Kingtoner & Farrell-Whitworth, 2005, p. 3), which carries with it an implicit message of accompanying high levels of communicative competence.

The focus then shifted from product to process, from a search for generalisability to a recognition of complexity and variation (Coleman, 2013a, p. 25). Occurring alongside the wider social turn in applied linguistics (Block, 2003), the qualitative turn in SA (Wolcott, 2016) shifts the focus to exploring social and cultural dimensions, as well as individual differences, given the significance of this finding in many quantitative studies (Kingtoner, 2009, 2013). Poststructural conceptualisations of learners as socially and historically situated underpinned this focus as did the continued call to move beyond notions of learners as theoretical abstractions (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009). As part of this qualitative shift, identity (as tied to language learning) firmly established itself as a focus in SA and continues to be an important theme in the literature (e.g. Benson, Barkhuizen, Bodycott, & Brown, 2012; Diao & Trentman, 2016; Kingtoner, 2008, 2013; Lee, Wu, Di, & Kingtoner, 2017; Shively, 2013). As part of this identity focus, the demographic categories of nationality and gender gained salience. A common finding in terms of nationality involved SA participants interpreting their new surroundings and events from a very nationalist lens, or “recoiling” into discourses of “superiority” (Kingtoner, 2010, p. 224; see also Block, 2007). While North American students’ experiences are disproportionately represented in the literature (Isabelli-Garcia, 2006; Kingtoner, 2004, 2008, 2009, 2010; Kingtoner & Farrell-Whitworth, 2005; Plews, 2015; Polyani, 1995; Shively, 2011; Talburt & Stewart, 1999; Twombly, 1995; Wilkinson, 1998), this finding is not solely in their purview. Similar findings are found in studies with European participants from Erasmus programmes (e.g. Murphy-Lejeune, 2002), students from Hong Kong in the U.K. (Jackson, 2008, 2010), or French students in Australia (Patron, 2007).

The categories of nationality and gender are often connected in these studies in that a salient experience for many women in study abroad is dealing with and making sense of sexualised, gendered attention, which often leads to comparisons with the home country. This focus on the experiences of North American students has been explored in a variety of study abroad settings (Bacon, 2002 in Mexico; Isabelli-Garcia, 2006 in Argentina; Kingtoner, 2008 and Kingtoner & Farrell-Whitworth, 2005 in France; Pellegrino Aveni, 2005 and Polyani, 1995 in Russia; Talburt & Stewart, 1999 in Spain; Trentman, 2015 in Egypt; Twombly, 1995 in Costa Rica), and because of the reliance on participant perspectives, interpretations have often angled towards ‘inferiority’ of host country norms and assumptions of moral superiority of the home country (Kingtoner, 2013).

Outside of North America, Patron's (2007) study investigates gender identity from a French perspective. Her study shows the strength of socialised ideas as French SA students struggled to reconcile their identities as women in an Australian context where flirting norms were perceived negatively through their ingrained French lens of what was 'normal'.

A small number of studies which include a gender focus go beyond the participant perspective and engage with more linguistic complexity through an explicit focus on Discourses and ideologies, perspectives of members of the host country, as well as more robust attention to the feminist theory of intersectionality. Originally coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989) to address the multiple dimensions of the experiences of women of colour, the term intersectionality refers to "the interaction between gender, race, and other categories of difference in individual lives, social practices, institutional arrangements, and cultural ideologies and the outcomes of these interactions in terms of power" (Davis, 2008, p. 68). Anya (2016) offers a rigorous exploration of the connections between the gendered, racialised, and socially-classed experience of Leti in one of her case studies of African American students in the predominantly Afro-Brazilian city of Salvador, throwing important light on the intersectionality of experience for SA participants. A strong ideological focus is included in Siegal's (1996) study, which investigates the experiences of Mary (a New Zealander who taught high school Japanese) in acquiring sociolinguistic competence in Japan. Results show the ideological and practical struggle involved in reconciling 'appropriate' pragmatic usage for women in the SA context with Mary's self-positioning as a professional woman. Kinginger & Whitworth (2005), too, investigate the role of Discourses of Frenchness and overarching gender ideologies as impacting the gendered experiences of students in a French study abroad context. This recognition of the importance of intersectional experiences, ideologies, and Discourses creates valuable room to add depth to existing treatments of gender as a salient identity in SA contexts. These concepts have particular relevance for my study which investigates the co-construction of social identities, with a focus on the different shapes these take for participants and the underpinning social factors.

Timothy Wolcott's case study of Lola (an American in Paris) offers further depth to the identity work which, as he emphasises, is "typically excluded from consideration in the existing SLA research on SA" (Wolcott, 2013, p. 130). He highlights the need to consider the symbolic resources students draw on to reconcile their study abroad experiences with what they bring to the setting in terms of their own life experience and desires. Going beyond the language learning focus and approaching identity from a position of intersubjectivity and symbolic negotiation, this study

resonates with my aims of accessing social depth and provides a solid footing on which to build even further. While language learning and intercultural development (cf. Block, 2007, and the idea of 'negotiation of difference') are important aspects of SA for many students, there is space for an exploration of identities from a “whole person” (Coleman, 2013b; Wolcott, 2013) perspective. In sum, while these identity-focused studies have resulted in fascinating insights into study abroad experiences, there remains exciting potential for depth, which requires going beyond the core focus of language learning and foregrounding the actual processes and complexities involved in identity negotiations.

This depth can be accessed through an emergent approach to social identities and a stronger sociocultural and sociolinguistic orientation which brings together emic and etic perspectives. In this sense, I see value in zooming in on interactional episodes (with ethnographic warrants) to explore the intricacies of actual ‘on the ground’ identity negotiations as they are experienced by SA participants. In advocating analytical depth over breadth I do not seek to make strong claims to the *development* of identities, as has been the case in SA identity scholarship (particularly as regards L2 identity). Despite the appearance of fixity (which I explore in more depth in subsequent chapters), identities from a poststructural lens are best regarded as being in a state of perpetual evolution and as a moving target. The ‘snapshot’ approach I take, then, allows me to capture and momentarily ‘pin down’ what is essentially a transient, ongoing process with no clear beginning and end point. Ethnographic data is especially useful in this respect, drawing as it does on time spent with participants, and knowledge of research contexts in particular.

1.4 Extending and Advancing Study Abroad Scholarship

The current study builds on and extends SA scholarship by firstly meeting the recent call for attention to a greater range of SA settings in addressing the overrepresentation of American students in the literature (Benson et al., 2012; Block, 2007; Kinginger, 2013). While France as a setting has been explored (e.g. Kinginger, 2004, 2008, 2010; Wilkinson, 1998; Wolcott, 2013), and French participant perspectives addressed in an Australian setting (Patron, 2007), New Zealand students and a New Zealand setting are decidedly more rare (but see Macalister, 2016, 2017; Siegal, 1996; Tanaka, 2007). I introduce a bidirectional ethnographic element between New Zealand and France to extend these parameters. Analytically, I go beyond the participant perspective (see Kinginger, 2013 for a criticism of this reliance), exploring how meaning and identities are constructed intersubjectively with other interlocutors as well as with Discourses and ideologies that participants bring with them or encounter in their new settings. My study also addresses the

relative inattention to ethnicity and sexuality as important components of study abroad experiences, as also noted by Kinginger (2013) in her overview. This focus answers the important wider call for attention to diversity in the study abroad student population (cf. Anya, 2016).

Methodologically, my study also addresses the repeated call for more scrutiny of social media use during SA (Coleman, 2013b, 2015; Dressler & Dressler, 2016; Kinginger, 2009, 2013) through the incorporation of participants' Facebook data. As I outline in Chapter 3, the Facebook data acts as a valuable ethnographic supplement in examining the various ways in which participants construct identities whilst on exchange. In contexts of increased mobility and globalisation, social media provide a constant, accessible form of mediation between contexts.

The thesis therefore builds on existing study abroad literature by addressing many of the calls made by scholars, and advances and problematises identity as a concept in study abroad settings. Methodologically, it introduces new contexts and a novel bidirectional ethnographic element as previously mentioned; it embraces intersectionality and complexity of experience through a diverse participant pool; and it adds depth through a combination of data sets which includes attention to social media. I view language learning as part of a much bigger picture in study abroad (Coleman, 2015) and offer an alternative emergent approach to the analysis of participants' social identities. The poststructural perspective of identities as multiple, dynamic, and a site of struggle (Norton, 2000, 2013) is enhanced by attending closely to *how* these identities are discursively co-constructed at 'ground level' in interactions with attention to wider sociocultural Discourses and ideologies. This approach adds valuable depth to existing treatments of identity in SA by giving explicit attention to the social and historical embeddedness of participants and the resources they draw on. I prioritise notions of multivocality and intersubjectivity in enriching the participant perspective. Finally, my study advances identity scholarship in SA through its interdisciplinary approach and strong theoretical anchoring, which includes a commitment to destabilising existing binaries between theory and practice, the social and personal, and agency and structure. Together, these components facilitate a deeper examination of how university exchange students in France and New Zealand use language to enact, reflect on, and problematise identities in interaction (all important components of negotiation).

1.5 Thesis Overview

The thesis is divided into seven chapters, the first of which has provided a rationale for the research focus by reflexively engaging with my own personal, professional, and academic identities and

motivations. I have also provided an overview of the study abroad context and literature, before detailing how my study builds on and extends this body of literature. Chapter 2 explores the theoretical underpinnings, providing a considered platform from which further concepts can be examined. This second chapter begins the weaving of a strong theoretical thread that runs throughout the thesis, by briefly examining ontological questions around the nature of ‘reality’ and ‘truth’ and how these can be accessed epistemologically. I emphasise the slipperiness of meaning of concepts pertaining to the social world and argue for an emphasis on fluidity, dynamism and attention to context rather than a focus on singularity and stability, and seeking essentialised connections. In so doing, I problematise the social categories, knowledge, and ideologies we (re)construct for ourselves, yet recognise the structural constraints that these constructions provide for identity negotiations at any point in time in the guise of social reality. I then present an intellectual genealogy of sorts, introducing scholars whose work lent consistent inspiration to this research, and who trouble the entrenched positivist paradigm of ‘one truth’, homogeneity, and universal structures to account for social behaviour and use of language.

The discussion in Chapter 2 then moves towards social constructionist and poststructural framings of identity which sit well within the ontological and epistemological parameters, and support a more nuanced framing of our social world. This is followed by a brief review of relevant identity-focused literature with an eye towards how this can be analytically accessed for the purposes of this study. Specifically, I investigate how the poststructural approach to identity has been harnessed primarily in applied linguistics, and I build on this by examining discursive social constructionist approaches to identity, which I argue add analytical depth to poststructural studies. The approaches, which overlap significantly, scaffold my own research, emphasising the interconnected relationship between the individual and the social, and the emergent properties of identity. I follow this with a discussion of sociolinguistic concepts which have strong analytic purchase in my study, namely indexicality (Eckert, 2008; Ochs, 1992; Silverstein, 2003), stance (e.g. Du Bois, 2007; Jaffe, 2009), and positioning (Davies & Harré, 1990). Through an exploration of these concepts I consider how identity construction can be accessed in interactional data.

Chapter 3 operationalises the aims of the study. Having established in the previous chapter my conceptualisation of identity as co-constructed, emergent, and as having its locus in interaction, I explain the processes by which I answer my research questions about *how* identities become salient and *how* they are negotiated in study abroad contexts for my participants. I do so with a view to problematising and advancing existing treatments of identity in study abroad scholarship. In telling

the methodological story of my research, I firstly provide a rationale for the overall researcher stance I take, characterised as a participant-focused, ethnographic approach with a critical lens. I detail the tenets of linguistic ethnography as the overarching methodological approach, explaining how the combination of the linguistic and ethnographic elements are mutually strengthening. I show that the bridge between the two is discourse analysis (Rampton, 2007a), the particular form of which I use is grounded in Interactional Sociolinguistics (IS). IS is well suited to the complexity of my data in its focus on how people make communicative meaning ‘in the now’ whilst acknowledging the crucial interconnectedness with sociocultural and sociohistorical contexts.

Within the overall methodological and analytical frameworks, I then outline the practicalities of data collection including participant recruitment in both phases of my research, the research contexts of Wellington and Paris, and data collection decisions. This is followed by a discussion of (and rationale for) the various data sources used to operationalise my research questions. I prioritised naturalistic interactional data (conversations between participants, between participants and friends and with language buddies), and supplemented this with an ethnographic collection (extensive field notes, time spent with participants, interviews with me and with other key people (language buddies and tutors), and social media). Data collection extended over sixteen months and this methodologically innovative approach resulted in multiple rich data sets with which to examine my research questions around the *whats* and *hows* of identity co-construction for participants in France and New Zealand. The final section explains the processes involved in data synthesis and analysis and points towards the value of combining an emic and etic approach.

These first three chapters serve as a platform for the analysis chapters which follow. These later chapters instantiate many of the theoretical and analytical commitments detailed in the preceding chapters (including engaging with complexity, depth, and multiple perspectives with an overarching critical lens) and is the point where theory meets practice and where participants take centre stage.

Chapter 4 begins the analysis section with a discussion of nationality as a salient identity category, a logical point of departure given the prevalence of nationality as a category in identity-focused study abroad literature. Throughout this chapter, in the case studies of Hanna, Victoria, and Persephone, I offer alternative explanations for how and why nationality becomes salient and investigate in depth the connections with ethnicity. I show how attention to ideologies is crucial in accounting for ways in which (imagined) national identities are negotiated in interaction. I finish

the chapter by exploring the common thread of cultural capital associated with the French language which traverses the three case studies in different ways.

Chapter 5 explores the social constructs of gender and sexuality, which became salient for several of my participants. While some of my data reflects the SA literature showing that the salience of national identity is often linked to students' experiences of sexual harassment, I reject explanations of 'cross-cultural' differences and accompanying 'misunderstandings' that are sometimes posited as having explanatory weight. I divide the chapter into two distinct halves, the first of which takes place in Paris, where Persephone's, Viv's, and Athena's experiences of sexual harassment on public transport bring their identities as young women into relief. The second half of the chapter turns to Wellington and the experiences of participants from France: Hanna and Hugo. Hanna's case study is also anchored in an occurrence of sexual harassment, reflecting the prevalence of this unwelcome conduct and the lack of boundaries in its global sweep. Hugo's case study offers an exploration of heteronormativity from another perspective, as one who has long felt the constraining effects of this ideology. I show how the particularities of Hugo's Wellington exchange serve to activate 'discursive faultlines' (Menard-Warwick, 2014) as relate to his understandings of and (dis)alignments with LGBTQ Discourses (as experienced in Paris and Wellington).

In Chapters 4 and 5, I describe how particularly salient identities for participants hinge on constructs of nationality (which interacted with ethnicity), and gender and sexuality, and how participants' intersectional experiences play an important role in the particular shape these negotiations take. I show how a focus on the ideological realm can reveal the workings of ingrained phenomena, and how ideologies of gender and sexuality as well as nationality and language permeate the locally-specific Discourses and norms which frame the identity negotiations of my study abroad participants. These chapters also begin to investigate the role of agency within these structural constraints. In short, these chapters do the heavy lifting in terms of problematisation of identity, and open up space for a discussion of how these concepts interrelate and add depth to interactional analyses.

Chapter 6 weaves together key theoretical constructs which emerged as germane to the understanding of identity co-construction for my study abroad participants, and acknowledges the connections between micro and macro aspects in moving towards a cohesive whole. I make the case that all participants' identity work, irrespective of the form it takes, is constrained by dominant ideological frames which are variously drawn on, reproduced, reflected on, and challenged in

interactions. I argue that all acts of agency are tethered to these ideological constraints, despite the differences in the ways in which agency is instantiated by my participants. I argue, too, that my data shows evidence of transformative potential in what is known as ‘oppositional’ agency (cf. Ahearn, 2001), and in the fledgling potential of agency in a ‘germination’ phase. I argue that ‘seeds of agency’ are planted for some participants in their new settings and that reflecting on the arbitrary nature of ideologies and ‘accepted truths’ was a more common findings for participants who had prior experience of marginalisation. In this sense, my study also speaks to notions of study abroad as social change (cf. Anya, 2016).

Finally, Chapter 7 concludes the study with a consideration of the theoretical, methodological, and analytical contributions of this research, as well as the implications. The next chapter provides a philosophical framing to the thesis, setting the ontological and epistemological scene, and emphasising the social world as the setting par excellence for this study.

Chapter 2: Theoretical Underpinnings and Identity

I begin this chapter by setting the overall ontological and epistemological scene, embedded as they are in the social research process, and providing strong foundations for all other research decisions, particularly methodological choices. While a deep philosophical discussion on the nature of existence and reality is beyond the remit of this thesis, increasing critiques are being made to address foundational issues of ontology and epistemology in qualitative social research (e.g. Clough, 1992; Denzin, 2003; Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Flyvbjerg, 2001). This call sits well with my own aims of engaging deeply with social processes, allowing me to not only ‘look’ at my data but to ‘see’ wider forces at play (cf. Steinberg, 1999). I therefore engage with the theoretical foundations and see value in destabilising the established “binary between the philosophical and the practical” (Pascale, 2011, p. 12), a destabilisation which I described in Chapter 1 as an overarching aim of this study. My philosophical framing begins with considerations of ontology - of notions of ‘truth’ and ‘reality’ - followed by a discussion of epistemology, or questions of ‘knowing’. I draw heavily on the work of Céline-Marie Pascale whose 2011 work *Cartographies of Knowledge: Exploring Qualitative Epistemologies* proved an excellent springboard for my thinking. Within the discussion, attention is given to important notions of social construction and social reality and I end the chapter with an intellectual genealogy of scholars whose ideas strongly resonated in this respect. Specifically, I outline the ideas of Simone de Beauvoir, Pierre Bourdieu, Michel Foucault, and Mikhail Bakhtin, whose collective intellectual daring and fortitude has had significant bearing on my own ontological and epistemological understandings and whose scholarship holds important academic purchase for my study. The second part of the chapter moves to considerations of identity, building on the ontological and epistemological groundwork, and unpacking the complexity with a view towards how it can be analytically accessed for the purposes of this study.

2.1 Ontological Grounding

The central question to ontology is whether an objective reality exists outside of subjective experience. An ontological premise is always part of social research, yet is often given scant attention (see Woodhams, 2015), primarily residing implicitly in descriptions of methodology (Pascale, 2011, p. 14). Attention to the ontological dimension at this early point in the thesis foregrounds my understandings of the social world, the overarching setting of this research. Questions I found useful to consider included whether research is a process to uncover a ‘truth’

which exists outside of my research agenda (as attached to a positivistic research paradigm), or whether concepts of truth and meaning are situated and dynamic. It was also important to consider if truth hinged on perceptions constructed primarily by the researcher without attention to other social actors or Discourses (see e.g. Bryman, 2016). Questions such as these provided an ideal platform from which to engage with the philosophical dimensions of my study, leading to a considered contemplation of the nature of reality and truth - “what can be known” (Pascale, 2011, p. 14).

So, where do I stand on the ontological continuum? While the objective existence of a physical and natural world cannot be denied, classifying our social worlds in any objective way is much more complex. As the intellectual genealogy presented below attests to, biology and physical laws cannot account for the organisation of societies and accepted narratives which produce such a wide variety of truths. Stark dichotomies such as ‘subject’ and ‘object’ or ‘structure’ and ‘agency’ are an integral part of the positivist research tradition which seeks determinacy in light of the belief that a single reality exists (Pascale, 2011, p. 2). While this approach sits well in the physical sciences (although there is a recognition that something is only ‘true’ till disproved), we immediately run into murky ontological waters when notions of causality are applied to social life, hence the many early and continuing challenges made to this position when applied to the social sciences (e.g. Gramsci, 1995; Winch, 1958). To take a basic example, scientific laws (truths) such as gravity⁹ do not have a direct equivalent in social behaviour and use of language. To seek such determinacy is unhelpful for advancing understandings in the social sciences (and linguistics in particular) where context, complexity, and contingency hold explanatory weight. Studying people (and how they use language), then, does not lend itself to a single ontological reality able to be epistemically ‘discovered’ and hence ‘known’.

In this sense, I hold fast to the principles of social constructionism which problematise notions of a single truth and reality, and see all meaning and value as continually (re)constructed by society (e.g. De Fina, 2011a; Holmes, 2007; Holmes, Marra, & Vine, 2011). Inspired by the work of phenomenologists such as Berger and Luckmann (1967) social constructionism views the relation between the individual and the social world as one of mutual constitution, and this is a point I will continue to emphasise in the thesis. While the social world often appears to those who live within it as an objective reality, it is in fact entirely constituted by and dependent on human action and

⁹ The choice of gravity for this example is a deliberate one as it parallels comments by Bourdieu on the force of social structures.

interaction. Social reality itself is therefore in a constant process of (re)construction (De Fina, 2011a). Following this, social identities, institutions, and ideologies do not exist in a social vacuum. Interactions between people create Discourses, which come to be viewed as ‘common sense’ and are subsequently accepted and normalised (a key idea in the work of de Beauvoir, Bourdieu and Foucault, as I explore later). However, in alignment with De Fina above, just because categories themselves are socially constructed does not make them any less ‘real’ for people, a reality which can seem all the more inescapable for those living in poverty or those whose identities are situated the furthest from normative Discourses. To return to my participants and their study abroad experiences, this is an important point to keep in mind so as to maintain a level of respectful engagement towards the particular realities within which they are operating. In this sense, my overall ontological stance can be described as social realist, which acknowledges that this reality is in a process of ongoing construction and contestation (Holmes, Marra, & Lazzaro-Salazar, 2017). Social constructionism, therefore, is an important part of a social realist stance in that these continually constructed categories form the ‘realities’ in which we live. This stance also speaks directly to the complexities between individual agency and social structures (Cameron, 2009; Ehrlich, 2008a), proposing that outside ‘reality’ influences and constrains individual behaviour and language (Marra, Holmes, & Kidner, 2017, p. 230).

2.2 Epistemological Grounding

Having established that there is no one objective social reality or truth, (yet with the proviso that the structures we live within are often experienced as real), we immediately enter the area of knowing; how do we know and understand what is going on around us? In terms of research and producing this thesis in particular, the important question of how valid knowledge is created immediately rears its head. Pascale (2011, p. 14) reminds us that “every ontological premise implies certain epistemological commitments, that is to say certain possibilities for producing valid knowledge”. The foregrounding of social constructionism in the previous section lessens this epistemological quandary. Just as our social reality is socially constructed through millennia of dynamic Discourses circulating in different places in the world, it follows that how we understand, or ‘know’, is also beyond the level of the individual. At a local level, our daily interactions are a constant process of meaning making, constructed intersubjectively (e.g. Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Heller, Pietikäinen, & Pujolar, 2018). In achieving meaning, interlocutors engage dialogically with historical, cultural, and social threads which feed into the words we use. In this sense, creating meaning *intersubjectively* necessitates going beyond the immediate and engaging ‘dialogically’ (Bakhtin, 1992) with historical dimensions and future projections. In brief, ‘knowing’ can be more

usefully framed as ‘making meaning’ (cf. Barkhuizen, 2011), and this in turn can be understood as an ongoing and dynamic process which, in line with the ontological stance outlined above, will not uncover one objective truth given the sheer complexity of the phenomena involved. From a research perspective, this has clear implications for methodological and analytical processes.

What then, some might ask, is the point if there is not going to be a clear measurable outcome? Here, I return to the value of exploring social phenomena, especially language and identity, from a variety of perspectives and from a position of multivocality (Chapelle & Duff, 2003; Duff, 2014). I also emphasise my position that not all perspectives are equally valid in presenting the strongest argument (cf. Heller et al., 2018). The onus rests on the researcher to acknowledge and investigate all perspectives with a critical and reflexive eye and to provide support in various forms for the argument line. All social knowledge and meaning then can be said to be co-constructed, and this thesis itself is a useful example. It has been constructed in an ongoing process of meaning-making (Heller et al., 2018), and is the combination of many views. I have read and evaluated existing literature and theory, discussed ideas with supervisors, colleagues, and participants, and I acknowledge the existence of multiple and changing ‘truths’ which feed into the ways meaning is made in different times and places. I pursue understanding whilst allowing for degrees of indeterminacy (Charmaz, 2006), weaving perspectives together in accounting for the identity experiences of my participants as they use language to navigate their study abroad journeys. These ideas can all be said to fall under a general poststructuralist umbrella, which I turn to in section 2.4.2 below. For now, I present an intellectual genealogy of the great thinkers whose ideas and arguments have resonated so strongly in my own intellectual journey, and whose concepts are a foundational part of this thesis.

2.3 Intellectual Genealogy

2.3.1 Simone de Beauvoir

Simone de Beauvoir’s (1908 - 1986) feminist theories immediately appeal for the insights they offer on the feminine condition, and how notions of femininity have been constructed over time. While not stemming from language studies, I have found her work to be ground-breaking and of ongoing relevance. Her unflinching engagement with the narratives and myths that constrain women’s existence was nothing short of revolutionary. *Le Deuxième Sexe* (1949) simply, yet thoroughly, unveiled the secondary status of women throughout history. The oft-cited quote - *On ne naît pas femme, on le devient/ One is not born, but rather becomes, woman* (de Beauvoir, 2011[1949], p. 293) - underscores her strong emphasis on societal constraints and the accompanying dismissal of

the biologically-determined narrative of the time. De Beauvoir saw herself as relatively ‘free’ from these imposed barriers, and as forging her own intellectual path as a woman through an ‘unconventional’ trajectory, yet she recognised that these experiences were outside of the gendered norm. In her writing, she astutely observed and documented what had come to be normalised in French society in terms of what it meant to be a woman at the time. In short, she took on the patriarchy by ‘daring’ to question the status quo of women’s lives, exposing the weight of myths that keep reproducing the same storylines as they become internalised and normalised by both men and women. She effectively denaturalised the ‘natural’ by stressing the controlling properties of institutional and ideological structures and emphasising the fact that women’s emancipation was not a natural by-product of economic or legal equality. This sociological lens is linked to her existentialist philosophy with Jean-Paul Sartre in which they posit the idea that freedom necessarily entails breaking free of societal expectations around gender in order to live an ‘authentic’ life. They simultaneously acknowledge the difficulty this entails, however, noting the pervasive structuring force of these myths (resonant of the social realist position described above).

To relate this to my thesis, an emerging theme has been around participants’ experiences as young women, and how their gender and sexuality identities have been made salient through encountering sexual harassment in their study abroad contexts. In analysing the recounting and negotiation of these experiences, it is valuable to engage with wider Discourses and ideologies of gender and sexuality which provide the structural scaffolding for my participants’ identity work. What constraints and affordances do these provide? Here, the foresight of Simone de Beauvoir is an excellent platform for deep investigation. Throughout my thesis there are clear echoes of Simone de Beauvoir in the attention to the role of social structures, notably those associated with gender and the heteronormative imperative.

2.3.2 Michel Foucault

The work of Michel Foucault (1926 – 1984) is particularly valuable in terms of the attention he gives to the role of *power* in reproducing societal structures (imbued in the guiding narratives and myths de Beauvoir spoke of). He based his theories on marginalised groups, (including non-normative sexualities, and those who suffered from mental illness as two distinct examples), investigating how such categories become consolidated into ‘regimes of truth’ through which to ‘understand’ (or ‘know’) groups of people (e.g. Foucault, 1972, 1976). This constructed knowledge then helps to “contribute to their becoming targets for social control” (Cameron, Frazer, Harvey, Rampton, & Richardson, 1993, p. 89). Foucault insisted that such

categories are not natural givens but are arenas of domination and contestation and, for the most part, serve to reproduce social order and the accompanying divide between dominators and the dominated. While he saw the potential for movement within these constraints (i.e. for people to use their agency to ‘push back’), he also acknowledged the many years such change would entail. His work builds on the feminist, sociological aspects of de Beauvoir’s oeuvre by introducing an explicit focus on the relationship between power and knowledge and the ensuing effect on social control.

This attention to the infiltration of power into the construction of knowledge sits well within the ontological and epistemological stances outlined above. It serves as a strong reminder of the constructed nature of social categories, which in turn legitimise social attitudes and behaviours whilst acting as a control mechanism. Attention to the hidden agenda of power and control are apt in my own data analysis, especially as regards categories and ideologies of gender, sexuality, nationality and ‘standard’ languages, all prominent in my analysis chapters. It is not enough to describe the connections between the ground-level interactional features and wider Discourses. By adopting a critical lens and asking about the function of such Discourses or ideologies, we may come to see the workings, if not the roots, of power in action. This may consequently shed light on the relationship between participants’ agency and the structures they are working within in terms of identity negotiations in their study abroad contexts.

2.3.3 Pierre Bourdieu

Pierre Bourdieu (1930 - 2002) is another of the great theorists whose work I have found inspirational and highly germane in exploring the relationship between language, society, and identity. Bourdieu’s theory offers an insightful exploration of how societal structures are reproduced through ongoing competition for resources (or ‘capital’). Like Foucault, Bourdieu anchored his theory development in ethnographic investigations. Through his exploration of many topics and fields (e.g. the Kabyle in Algeria, social class and taste, the French academic system, the world of art, of masculine domination, etc.), Bourdieu was able to empirically anchor his theoretical notion of *symbolic domination* and illustrate the processes by which people came to be complicit in their own subjugation. Habitus as a key concept provides explanatory force in this respect, as do the economic metaphors he developed to explain differential access to resources, and their power to reproduce our social worlds. I zoom in now on these key concepts given their utility in my own analyses.

Habitus, as theorised by Bourdieu (1977a, 1984, 1991), can usefully be understood as ways of being and doing, or dispositions, learned interactively through participation in practices most typical for members of a particular group or class (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2001, p. 251). Bourdieu himself has often referred to habitus as a socioculturally-acquired 'feel for the game'. The habitus we develop guides ways in which we move through 'fields' – for example, the ease with which we move through the field of education very much depends on whether our socialisation has instilled a habitus where the 'rules' of this particular field are normalised and accepted. One's habitus therefore acts as a linking mechanism between the individual and society by emphasising the socially constituted nature of the individual in the first instance. Habitus is a central concept in breaking down false dichotomies of the individual and society, and of structure and agency; it involves ways of seeing things, ways of talking about them, ways of thinking, and it also involves gesture and movement - in other words, it is embodied and internalised through primary and secondary socialisation.

Importantly, I do not see habitus as a static concept (cf. Blommaert, 2005). The metaphor of a tool kit is useful in this interpretation; one brings along this tool kit to all interactions and depending on dynamic contextual factors, one chooses which tools are most appropriate to deploy. There are clear disadvantages for those whose toolkit is not stocked with the shared tools representative of the majority. Upon entering primary school, children whose toolkit includes an interest and pleasure in reading already hold a social advantage over their peers whose habitus has not been formed with this element of cultural capital, therefore rendering the connected rewards inaccessible (momentarily at least). Certain tools become 'favourites' in their regularity and ensuing automaticity of use, yet each interaction may also provide new tools to add to the kit (as we engage with new people, ideas, norms, cultures), which may encourage a discarding of tools no longer deemed useful. Tools are long-lasting and have many similarities across social groups, but there is a concomitant capacity for change and evolution (Bourdieu, 1977). Following this line of reasoning, well-used tools will not be discarded or replaced with ease, given the extent to which they have been 'misrecognised' as normal and 'right' for the job at hand. Equally, there is a trigger generally required to act as the impetus to such reflection, which may in turn lead to a destabilisation of the habitus and potential engagement with the arbitrary nature of social structures.

The study abroad experience itself seems to provide such an impetus. In her excellent overview paper, Celeste Kinginger (2013) outlines the value of habitus as a concept when seeking to

understand the study abroad experience. She conceptualises cross-cultural encounters as a form of secondary socialisation where SA students' personal histories may enter a conflict zone with the history of another society's institutions or other social structures, resulting in a potential destabilisation of habitus and identity (Kinging, 2013, p. 341). Other literature (with ties to the study abroad context) has drawn usefully on habitus to explain identity struggles and trajectories (e.g. Block, 2007a; Kramsch, 2009; Simon & Ainsworth, 2012) and many studies investigating identity, language learning, mobility and transnationalism have also found habitus to be an analytically expedient concept (Duff, 2015; Lam, Warriner, Poveda, & Gonzalez, 2012; Mu, 2016; Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, & Liebhart, 2009).

Habitus is described as being constantly developed during interactions occurring in 'fields', conceptualised as "a social arena in which negotiations take place over resources or stakes and access to them" (Blackledge, 2001, p. 349). Through regular social practice in multiple fields, we learn behaviours which come to underpin the ways in which we make sense of and act in social worlds. This social landscape is in turn characterised by unequal power relationships and accompanying unequal access to different forms of capital, which may take the form of skills, qualifications, languages, accents, friends, or objects, among many other possibilities. The Marxist notion of economic capital therefore becomes more theoretically nuanced in Bourdieu's underscoring of the myriad ways that power is distributed and contested in society. Capital is teased apart into three distinct species, all of which fall under the umbrella term of symbolic capital, commonly referred to as prestige and conceptualised as "the form assumed by the different kinds of capital when they are perceived and recognised as legitimate" (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 230). What is key, however, is that not everybody has access to the same types of capital; not everybody develops (through socialisation) the same "feel for the game" (Bourdieu, 1977a) which results in 'legitimacy' (or not) within a particular field (cf. the above example of reading).

Bourdieu developed Marx's ideas on the importance of economic capital (material wealth) as indexing and reproducing societal power (i.e. the more capital one has, the more powerful position one can occupy), yet he went beyond the economic in emphasising the role of the symbolic realm in the reproduction of power. Social capital refers to "connections to and relationships with less, equally, or more powerful others: the greater the cultural capital of these others, the greater the social capital accrued by knowing them" (Block, 2007a, p. 38). Cultural capital, for its part, refers to having the 'right' cultural resources and assets (Block, 2007, p.38)

at any point in time, and as valued by the particular society one lives in. Cultural capital can be broken down further into three distinct states (Bourdieu, 1977a, 1986, 1991). The *embodied* state refers to the forms of knowledge that we have internalised so that they reside within us. For Bourdieu, a prominent and easily recognisable form of embodied cultural capital is language. He argues that languages and accents are the result of habitual dispositions that arise from socialisation, dispositions which do not carry the same recognised status (think of common perceptions around ‘standard’ French, for example, as opposed to Québécois French or African varieties of French). Recognition and value accorded to capital is, of course, highly dependent on context and whether the particular asset is accorded shared value in an interaction. Another example of embodied cultural capital is the knowledge we accumulate through personal experience, which again is accorded value depending on the particular field and is reliant on shared recognition.

The *objectified* state of cultural capital refers to materiality and is therefore perhaps the easiest to recognise (for those who are sensitised to capitalist ideologies at least). Modern examples may include artwork, clothing, cars and property. Crucially, what counts as objectified cultural capital at any point in time and space will change (gradually), an interpretation which highlights the non-static interpretation of Bourdieu’s theory mentioned above, placing the onus on strong ethnographic anchoring and researcher reflexivity in explorations of the analytical value of this concept. The final form is known as the *institutional* state and refers to capital gained through recognised institutions. Educational qualifications (and the prestige associated with the conferring institution) provide a useful example in the differential societal value accorded. Underscoring Bourdieu’s suite of capitals is the idea that social and cultural capital can be transferred to economic capital, thus highlighting the interrelatedness of the social and the economic in reproductions of power. While this equation may appear simple in theory, it is far more complex in practice. The concepts of field, habitus and capital are also intertwined. Fields are structured (and reproduced) by the relationship between capitals, some of which are in turn internalised by social agents as part of their habitus, rendering movement and interaction within a particular field an ‘easy’ and ‘natural’ process, or the opposite. When the tools used within a field are not legitimised, the ‘rules of the game’ may be questioned, sparking a process of struggle to ‘gain voice’ (Canagarajah, 2009) in a particular milieu.

In terms of this study’s focus on identities and study abroad, Bourdieu’s concepts of habitus and capital offer considerable potential for a rich and elucidating exploration of the

interactional data, as Chapter 3 explains. I emphasise an ethnographic approach, in line with Bourdieu's consistent emphasis on the ethnographic epistemological basis of his work. Blommaert (2005, p. 219) cogently expresses this point, arguing that an inextricable link between habitus and ethnographic inquiry may result in "better ways of investigating problems of voice - the conditions for speaking in society". With a firm grounding in the different sociocultural environments of my participants, it will be interesting to consider what capital my participants bring to their interactions, and what indeed counts as capital in their new environments, as well as the discursive instantiations of this.

2.3.4 Mikhail Bakhtin

Mikhail Bakhtin (1895 - 1975) is the final 'grand' theorist who holds analytical sway in this study. Firmly nested in the poststructural school of thought, his contributions to literary theory and to a theory of discourse shed light on the complexity of language. Opposed to structuralist views that saw language as an abstract and closed system, Bakhtin, like Bourdieu, emphasises the importance of the social realm (and in particular ideas of time and space) in moving toward a new theory of linguistics. Purely structuralist views, according to Bakhtin, were complicit in the creation of a unified language as a vehicle of centralised power (Bakhtin, 1992). Again, the overlaps with Bourdieu are striking in the focus on language as capital and the associated implications of power relations. Bakhtin, however, centres his theory development on language itself. There are several Bakhtinian ideas which resonate in this thesis. First and foremost, Bakhtin's dialogic approach (often termed *heteroglossia*) recognises a multiplicity of perspectives and voices (see Menard-Warwick, 2009, 2014; Seals, 2019a). This idea presupposes that "language is not a neutral medium that passes freely and easily into the private property of the speaker's intentions; it is populated - overpopulated - with the intentions of others" (Bakhtin, 1992, p. 294). In other words, everyday interactions can be seen as responses to statements (and not necessarily to what has just come beforehand) and as anticipation of future statements. Notions of fluidity and slipperiness are key for Bakhtin in accentuating the difficulty of 'pinning down' meaning, thus cementing his epistemological standpoint. He places no limits to the dialogic context, no single point where the 'truth serum' can be revealed given the ongoing process of ideological layering that occurs over time. In Bakhtin's 'own' words (translated from Russian by Kristeva):

Language is heteroglot from top to bottom: it represents the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past, between differing epochs

of the past, between different socio-ideological groups in the present, between tendencies, schools, circles and so forth, all given a bodily form (Bakhtin, 1992, p. 291)

Language use can therefore be described as *intertextual*. From this perspective, no utterance is entirely our own but always “carries traces of past voices” (Meadows, 2009, p. 96). Bakhtin speaks of unending chains of meaning which are constantly renewed and reshuffled as we come into contact with new language and perspectives and weigh them up against our own, perhaps incorporating them eventually into our own repertoire. From a Bakhtinian perspective, this contributes to our ongoing ‘ideological becoming’¹⁰, whereby social agents are seen to be in a constant process of “assimilating [their] consciousness to the ideological world” (Bakhtin, 1992, p. 341), a process of intense internal struggle between various available ideological standpoints (see Menard-Warwick, 2014 for an excellent overview). Within this dialogic context Bakhtin’s emphasis on the power of *authoritative discourses* (i.e. those that have been socially sanctioned) echoes de Beauvoir’s notion of *grand narratives*, Foucault’s conceptualisation of *discourse* as power-laden, and of course, Bourdieu’s idea of *symbolic domination* which exists primarily through the normalisation and legitimisation of discourses. For Bakhtin, authoritative discourse “demands that we acknowledge it, that we make it our own; it binds us, quite independent of any power it might have to persuade us internally; we encounter it with its authority already fused to it” (Bakhtin, 1992, p. 342).

Bakhtin’s theories challenged notions of linguistic creativity in the insistence on the social embeddedness of the individual, with all language and perspectives viewed as being ‘borrowed’ and moulded to fit one’s particular purpose at any point in time. In terms of this thesis, a Bakhtinian framework is doubly apt. Firstly, as outlined above, the thesis itself is dialogic in nature (cf. Heller et al., 2018). It responds to prior research, theories and analyses and simultaneously builds on these, illuminating potential avenues for future enquiry. The meaning in this thesis has been co-constructed, not from a blank slate but from engaging with this existing theory and research, and conversations with supervisors and colleagues. Secondly, the theoretical and analytical attention I give to the multiplicity of meaning also privileges the dialogic thread. This is achieved by supplementing the perspective of key participants with perspectives of various interactants (including myself as the researcher in the first instance),

¹⁰ Cf. Bourdieu’s toolkit

and using a systematic discourse analysis to access layers of meaning.

This section has engaged with foundational concepts of reality, meaning and knowledge which characterise research in the social sciences. I have argued for the utility of a constructionist approach to accessing meaning within the “constructed certitude” (Beck, 1992) of the social world which is, in effect, supported by unstable and changing truths and structures that are experienced as real by many who live within them. I have shown how the work of de Beauvoir, Foucault, Bourdieu, and Bakhtin problematise this ontological security in their calling of many *truths* to question. Notions of construction, multivocality, intersubjectivity, Discourses, ideology, and power which have arisen within this discussion provide a platform from which to understand the relationship between language and society and have clear connections to the concept of identity, which I turn to now.

2.4 Identity

In this section, I unpack the complexity surrounding identity as a concept, before exploring how it can be analytically accessed for the purposes of this study. I firstly trace a brief path through conceptualisations of identity which have taken hold at various points in history. I then outline poststructural approaches to identity and draw on relevant literature and concepts to investigate how this approach has been harnessed primarily in applied linguistics. I build on this by examining discursive, social constructionist approaches to identity, which I argue both overlap and add analytical depth to poststructural studies. I outline the meaning of Discourse, before turning to ideology, both interconnected and important layers in identity construction. Conceptualising ideology as a form of structure, I argue for a renewed focus on ideology in accessing identity as it emerges in interaction. This leads to a consideration of the relationship between structure and agency, given its ongoing salience in identity-inspired scholarship. Following this, I shift my focus to sociolinguistic concepts which are central to my study, namely indexicality (Ochs, 1993; Silverstein, 2003), stance (Du Bois, 2007; Jaffe, 2009), and positioning (Davies & Harré, 1990). Through an exploration of these concepts I consider how identity construction, despite its conceptual slipperiness, can be accessed in interactional data.

2.4.1 Identity - Tracing a Path

Conceptualising identity is as is beguiling a task as it is complex. The term has multifarious usages across disciplines, including psychology, sociology, applied linguistics, and sociolinguistics. While the ‘identity turn’ (Ellwood, 2011) is relatively recent terminology capturing the significance and

breadth of scholarship across the social sciences, identity as a concept began to gain prominence as far back as the Enlightenment. During this time, the idea of a rational, autonomous subject, often referred to as the ‘project of the self’ (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006) highlighted the separation of mind and body as linked to growing secularisation and emphasis on the human subject as free of an external cosmic order. People’s identities were seen as fixed and essential, and independent of embodied experience (Pascale, 2011). Into and throughout the twentieth century, this idea of the unique ‘nature’ of individuals continued to hold prominence and was supplemented by a focus on morality and associated obligation to “fulfil one’s destiny” (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006, p. 4), again prioritising ‘interior’ and singular notions of identity. The mind as a defining feature of one’s identity was also given primacy in the work of Freud and his hugely influential psychoanalytic work, once more serving to distance social considerations of identity constitution and ongoing construction. Interestingly, these preoccupations with an essential, a priori, and unified self are still widespread today outside academic circles (as the continued proliferation of self-help books offering to uncover the ‘real you’ serves to exemplify).

The acceptance of the subject as self-determined and disembodied began to be questioned, however, as part of the postmodern problematising of the late twentieth century. The work of Foucault, among other poststructural scholars, launched a critical exploration and reconfiguration of conceptualisations of identity in showing how social identity categories come to be ‘made’ in the first instance. Foucault’s investigation into psychoanalysis, as an example, highlights its function as a form of reproduction of discourses, a point mirrored by Michael (1996, p. 21) in the explanation that “orthodox psychological models of the individual . . . have served in the entrenchment of particular identities”. Foucault’s work on mental illness (see *Madness and Civilisations* 1971 [1961]) shows how the subject positions (and categories) created by scientific investigations feed into what we ‘know’ about groups of people (in this case, the mentally ill). As mentioned above, these ‘regimes of truth’ then contribute to groups of people becoming “targets of social control” (Cameron et al., 1993, p. 89), thus elucidating the machinations of power in how identities come to be viewed as ‘normal’ or ‘deviant’. Foucault was a key figure then in moving understandings of identity away from theories of self-determination (as in the ‘project of the self’) towards a ‘discursive production of the subject’ (Foucault, 1972). Work in sociolinguistics and applied linguistics since has continued to build on these revolutionary ideas by emphasising identity as a process with its locus in social interaction (De Fina, 2011a, p. 267) rather than an “essentialised fixed product” (Block, 2007b, p. 866). These ideas all feed into the important notion of identity as *co-constructed* in so far as there is a need to *negotiate* identity moment by moment in interaction

and that the only way to do that is to work within the established categories and Discourses that are themselves constantly (re)constructed or contested. These ideas are explored further in the sections on intersubjectivity and positioning below, but for now I highlight the idea that joint achievement refers to both immediate interlocutors with whom one interacts and wider societal constraints which provide the parameters for identity work. The following section explores two salient and overlapping approaches to this conceptualisation of identity - poststructuralist and discursive.

2.4.2 Poststructural Approaches to Identity

A poststructural approach to identity reflects the overall ontological and epistemological underpinnings of this thesis which critiques accepted knowledge and truths, and rejects the pre-discursive, rational subject in favour of an emergent approach to identity where language is central (e.g. Kramsch, 2009; Morgan & Clarke, 2011; Norton, 2000, 2013; Weedon, 1997). Rather than seeking a grand reveal of the ‘real’ identity¹¹ of my participants, poststructural theories see *identities* as multiple, contingent, negotiated, as related to wider Discourses (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2001; Block, 2007b, 2015; Norton Peirce, 1995; Weedon, 1997) and as intersectional (see Crenshaw, 1989). Block’s (2007b, p. 864) summary therefore resonates; he posits that poststructural approaches involve “moving beyond the search, associated with structuralism, for unchanging, universal laws of human behaviour and social phenomena to more nuanced, multi-levelled, and, ultimately, complicated framings of the world around us.”

Bonny Norton (e.g. 1997, 2001, 2013) has been instrumental in cementing poststructural ideas of identity in applied linguistics and second language acquisition (SLA), leading to a reconceptualisation of the language learner as a complex social being. Firth & Wagner’s (1997) initial call for this reconceptualisation was based on extensive SLA theorising that positioned the learner as a “deficient communicator, striving to reach the ‘target’ competence of an idealized native speaker” (pp. 296-7). This ‘monolingual norm’ (Ortega, 1999) and binary opposition between ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ speakers resulted in unhelpful essentialising, with Firth & Wagner’s criticism in turn creating valuable space for a deepening of SLA theory. Bringing to this space a poststructural lens allowed Norton and her peers to ‘shake up’ such static notions through rigorous problematisation. Norton uses the term *identity* to reference “how a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space,

¹¹ And note the conflation here of ‘identity’ to concerns of a singular self.

and how the person understands the possibilities for the future” (Norton, 2013, p. 4), a definition which neatly packages a wealth of poststructural depth, including the importance of sociohistorical/sociocultural contexts, the idea of movement and dynamism (as opposed to static, innate properties), and the relevance of the imagination.

2.4.2.1 Investment

The concept of *investment* forms an important part of Norton’s uptake of poststructural ideas of identity (Norton, 1997, 2000, 2013; Norton Peirce, 1995). Drawing on Bourdieu’s notion of capital (Norton, 2010), *investment* was developed as a social alternative to existing psychological constructs of motivation (e.g. Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009; Murray, Gao, & Lamb, 2011). With emphasis on the socially and historically constructed relationship between language learner identity and language learning commitment, much of Norton and her colleagues’ work has been foundational in theorising the language learner as embedded in a social world imbued with power relations which affect their right to speak (e.g. Block, 2007b; Swain & Deters, 2007). Crucially, investment presupposes a ‘return’ in the form of symbolic and material resources which will increase cultural capital and ensuing social power (Darvin & Norton, 2015, p. 37).

While investment is not a major concept in my analysis, it nonetheless holds relevance. Darvin & Norton’s (2015, p. 36) updated model has particular applicability for this study in its location of investment at the intersection of identity, capital, and ideology. This emphasis provides a useful reminder that investment may come from the individual but is bound up in ongoing social processes. To be clear, the value I derive from investment lies outside of the realm of language learning, to which it has been strongly connected in the literature (e.g. Early & Norton, 2014; McKay & Wong, 1996; Menard-Warwick, 2009, p., 2014; Mutonyi & Norton, 2007; Norton, 1997, 2013; Norton & Gao, 2008). Studies (e.g. McKay & Wong, 1996) have shown how investment in language learning presupposes an investment in social identities. Similar findings were explored and extended in Dawson (2014) where language learners were found to invest in particular social identities (including ‘good student’, ‘mother’ and ‘leader’) as well as imagined communities, which guided their identity work. The concept of investment thus holds potential relevance in accounting for the socioculturally constructed commitment to particular identities or imagined communities which become salient for my participants.

2.4.2.2 Imagined Communities

The role of the imagination, as mentioned above, also gains theoretical weight in Norton's uptake and development of Anderson's (1991) concept of 'imagined community' (Kanno & Norton, 2003; Norton, 2000, 2001, 2013; Pavlenko & Norton, 2007), which is shown to be a powerful force in guiding identity construction. Anderson's original conceptualisation referred to nationhood as being an imagined construct, as necessarily different for everybody despite some commonalities of experience. The idea of moving from peripherality to centrality in terms of social membership (cf. Lave & Wenger, 1991) necessarily entails the construction of an image of our place in relation to particular communities and possibilities for the future (Wenger, 1998). In my data, imagined communities (and associated imagined identities) are most prominent in their immediate form as related to national identities, with some evidence of the salience of future imagined communities. Pavlenko (2003, p. 252) refers to the imagination as a "terrain of struggle" and this also appears to be mirrored in my data in so far as imagined communities are constructed and drawn on in opposition to other categories. I explore these connections in more detail in Chapter 4. The notion of struggle is of wider relevance to identity co-construction more generally.

2.4.2.3 Struggle

Well-established in applied linguistics (e.g. Norton, 2000, 2013) and sociolinguistics (e.g. van de Mierop & Schnurr, 2017) the concept of struggle is linked to the emphasis on power within poststructural approaches to identity. It is well recognised that the co-construction of identity does not involve a smooth, harmonious journey toward shared understanding (Pomerantz, 2008); (Norton & McKinney, 2011) and that the resources accessed to index particular social identities rarely flow seamlessly from one community to another (e.g. Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2001). Drawing on Bakhtin's (1992) emphasis on the social and historical world as characterised by heteroglossia and 'conflicted voices', Menard-Warwick (2014) foregrounds the important notion of discursive struggle in her useful metaphor of 'discursive faultlines':

Aside from literal faultlines, there are metaphoric faultlines, where tensions, stresses and collisions occur between discourses, which can be defined as competing ways of referring to and evaluating particular topics, such as sexuality, celebrity and the legal system (Menard-Warwick, 2014, pp. 1–2).

This idea of tension between Discourses is mirrored in van de Mierop & Schnurr (2017, p. 448) in their recognition of "competition between different norms and expectations" as an underlying

aspect of identity struggles. Identity negotiation is not without constraining forces or tension. As we have seen, Bakhtin's work underscores the struggle over meaning and legitimacy in 'situated utterances', and emphasises the multiplicity of meaning in these dialogic interactions, while Bourdieu (e.g. 1977a, 1991) notably surrounds his attention to discourse with economic metaphors, including the various forms of 'capital' which are unevenly distributed across social space. Language then, is neither a neutral medium nor an equally available resource to all. Making meaning and negotiating identities involves entering into power-infused Discourses by accessing resources at our disposal, resources which are different for everyone and which have different attachments to societal status (all of which is a dynamic process). This idea of struggle and of 'discursive faultlines' undoubtedly merits attention in my study as participants move to new geographic settings characterised by new Discourses and accompanying norms.

Poststructural framing of identity then is usefully enhanced by concepts of imagined communities, investment, and struggle. These concepts offer a valuable lens through which to analyse guiding factors in identity construction, and are accessible through attention to the crucial role of language. Norton (2010, p. 350) makes the connection clear: "Every time we speak we are negotiating and renegotiating our sense of self in relation to the larger social world and reorganising that relationship across time and space".

2.4.2.4 Sense of Self

In foregrounding the role of language in understandings of identities, Norton draws heavily on the work of Christine Weedon (1997) who centres her feminist poststructuralist theory of subjectivity around the role of language, conceptualising subjectivity as precarious, contradictory, and as continuously and discursively constructed. In the poststructural definition of identity offered by Norton and in the definition of subjectivity given by Weedon, there is a commonality in the emphasis on how people see themselves, their 'sense of' belonging or their 'sense of' self. In differentiating between the terms *identity* and *subjectivity*, Menard-Warwick (2005, p. 257) makes the point that when identity is used as a "cover term" (Ochs, 1993), subjectivity may be viewed as "one aspect of identity" given it is perhaps more inward-looking (i.e. her sense of herself) than definitions of social identities. I see value therefore in using the term 'subjectivity' synonymously for 'sense of self' in this thesis given this inward component. This is undoubtedly a very important part of identity, but, analytically, relies solely on participant reflection and self-understandings, and simultaneously relegates the etic perspective. My study pushes these boundaries further by shifting the focus to an emergent approach to social identities and by using language (discourse) as a

conduit to explore the processes by which they become salient. Directly asking participants to comment on their sense of self or social identities can yield interesting insights, but as my analyses will show, they are not the only ways to access that which becomes important for participants. Combining emic and etic approaches is an important part of my methodological and analytical approaches (outlined further in Chapter 3).

2.4.2.5 Beyond the Individual

Ties to multilingualism and transnationalism are emphasised in Patricia Duff's (2015) rigorous exploration of identity in globalised contexts, which aligns with my study's overarching parameters. She draws on Block (2007a) and Norton (2013) to define identity as:

how people see or imagine themselves, how they relate to the social world, and how they are seen and positioned by others in their various social, cultural, and linguistic settings, and thus their sense of belonging to and legitimacy within particular social groups near and far (Duff, 2015, p. 61)

Importantly, Duff's definition goes beyond the level of the individual by incorporating the dual nature of identity co-construction. The concept of *positioning* (Davies & Harré, 1990) moves us towards an appreciation of identity as intersubjective (a concept I explore in more depth below), and as something that is always in flux. In other words, interactions involve speakers vying for and claiming identities, and at the same time assigning identities to their interlocutors, a process which is dynamic and constantly (re)negotiated. In this study, I use the term *reflexive positioning* for the claiming of identities by the individual speaker and *interactive positioning* when identities are assigned to them (Menard-Warwick, 2009, p. 38). This idea of constant negotiation leads to the utility of treating *identities* as emergent and intersubjective phenomena, a perspective which aligns with the poststructural emphasis on discursive construction (though is not always afforded deep linguistic analysis). Discursive approaches to identity have paid close attention to the role of language in the emergence of identities as they unfold in interaction, using various forms of discourse analysis to show both the ways in which meaning is negotiated moment-by-moment and how these are impacted by wider sociocultural Discourses. These discursive approaches add valuable linguistic scaffolding to poststructural understandings and are detailed in the following section.

2.4.3 Discursive Approaches to Identity

An important part of discursive approaches to identity is that they tend to make their relationship with social constructionism more explicit than poststructural treatments (e.g. Bamberg, De Fina, & Schifffrin, 2011; Cameron & Kulick, 2003; De Fina, 2011a; Holmes et al., 2011; Holmes & Stubbe, 2015). This means that there is more attention to the dynamism involved in creating meaning and social identities, and that investigations emphasise linguistic choices (conscious and unconscious) as ways to access this. Spoken interactional data is therefore privileged for the insights it provides. The commitment to interactional data has epistemological repercussions for interpreting and analysing identity, moving away from a reliance on participants' understandings of identities through interviews and focus groups (see Cameron, 2009). Rather than rely solely on the *what* - the content directly related to the phenomenon under investigation - many linguists who follow this approach focus on *how* things are being said or negotiated in their data, and how these call forth contextual presuppositions or relate indexically to identities (e.g. Angouri & Marra, 2011; Bamberg et al., 2011; Holmes, 2006; Ochs, 1993). As an example, rather than ask somebody how they enact (or *do*) gender or leadership, for example, instantiations will *emerge* in the data. Janet Holmes (2007, p. 54) explains that “sociolinguists who adopt a social constructionist approach simply do not accept that categories need to be observably and explicitly salient for participants in order to be considered relevant in their analyses”, an observation which speaks directly to my aims of avoiding a priori identity assumptions.

Discursive approaches also foreground *identities* in the plural, and there is an explicit focus on social identities such as ethnicity (e.g. De Fina, 2007; Holmes et al., 2011), leadership (e.g. Holmes et al., 2011; Vine, Holmes, Marra, Pfeifer, & Jackson, 2008), and gender (e.g. Coates, 2013; Holmes, 2006; Pichler & Eppler, 2009). To be clear, these identity categories may be chosen as an overarching research focus at the outset, but their analytical salience depends on how these categories emerge in the data. To some, this usage of categories appears ‘contradictory’ in light of the poststructural and social constructionist emphasis on rejecting binaries and destabilising categories. I return to this point in Chapter 5 in my discussion of gender and sexuality categories, but for now it is enough to say that I align with Holmes (2007) in seeing the value of a “strategic essentialism” (Boyne, 1990, p. 170). In practice, this means that use of broad identity categories such as ‘woman’ or ‘man’ is not intended to essentialise but rather to throw light on power relations and address wider social issues of who has done what to whom over the ages.

2.4.3.1 Social Categories

As emphasised throughout this chapter, categories which inform identities are not “simply existent or natural” (Schneider, 2010, p. 651) from social constructionist and poststructural lenses. Social categories taken as ‘givens’ such as gender or ethnicity are dynamic and *performed* (Butler, 1990) into existence (through language and other mechanisms such as dress and gesture), and it is through this *doing* and repeated performances of identities that categories are (re)produced and maintained, hence masquerading as fixed and essential, producing the effect of an internal core (see Benwell & Stokoe, 2006). Butler’s notion of performativity sees identity, and in particular, gender, as discursively produced and as such, this concept coheres well with the idea of co-construction.

This leads to the social and historical embeddedness of identity categories. What it ‘means’ to be a woman, or to be ‘French’ is an ongoing process, manifesting in different ways in different places and in different times. What is available in terms of identification depends on what has become normalised at any point in time (cf. the Foucauldian arguments outlined above). To borrow an example from Deborah Cameron and Don Kulick (2003, p. 3), Western women ‘have to’ learn not to sit with their legs apart; while this a constructed act which is imbued with power relations, it has now become normalised to the point that it serves as an index of (a marker of) ‘femininity’, as a resource available for the instantiation of a gendered identity. Doing the ‘heavy lifting’ in conversations too, through provision of verbal support and facilitation (see Fishman’s (1983) study on heterosexual couple talk), has also come to take on meaning whereby these verbal mechanisms now avail themselves to the construction of gendered identity positions. Both these examples emphasise that identity construction and available resources which aid the process of identification do not happen in a vacuum. These behaviours, verbal and otherwise, are not innate; rather they circulate within established, yet dynamic Discourses and ideologies which are related to societal power struggles.

2.4.3.2 Intersectionality

There is a recognition of the *intersectional* nature of categories; in other words, within a specific social category (and identity) there is an acknowledgement of the plurality of experience and of overlapping identities. All women do not experience ‘being women’ in the same way, for example. As Chapter 1 outlines, the term was coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989), and served as black feminist critique to portrayals of feminism which used white middle class women as the benchmark. Race, class, gender and sexuality (among other categories) intersect to impact on how

the category ‘woman’ is understood and negotiated, as well as highlighting various levels of oppression. Anya’s (2016) study brings this crucial intersectional lens to a study abroad context in her exploration of participants’ experiences in Salvador, an Afro-Brazilian city. Findings showed her African American participants negotiating multiple identities including race, gender, and class during their exchange in Salvador, and shed light on how their investments influenced their overall language learning of Portuguese. An intersectional focus therefore complicates notions of ‘group identity’, and is an important part of the poststructural and social constructionist framings of this study.

2.4.3.3 Intersubjectivity

Intersubjectivity is a central tenet of social constructionist approaches to identity. The concept is reflected in the terms co-construction and negotiation, which imply going beyond the individual level, and call forth notions of multivocality (Chapelle & Duff, 2003; Duff, 2014). As Taylor (1989, p. 36) states, “One cannot be a self on one’s own”, a sentiment echoed widely in discursive approaches. Mary Bucholtz & Kira Hall draw on insights from queer, feminist and sociolinguistic theories to argue that research on identity “is most productive when the concept is understood as the outcome of intersubjectively negotiated practices and ideologies” (2004, p. 469). In so far as identities are always ‘works-in-progress’ from a social constructionist perspective, there is “always implicitly or explicitly some ‘other’” (De Fina, 2011b, p. 34), required for negotiation to occur and identities to become socially salient. This calls forth Bakhtin’s dialogic framework in which the self becomes a subject only through participating in dialogue (Vitanova, 2016, p. 273), a point Bucholtz & Hall (2005) emphasise in the key notions of *emergence* and *relationality* in their influential discussion on principles of identity (explored further below).

Additionally, Bucholtz & Hall’s framework includes three other principles, namely *positionality*, *partialness* and *indexicality* (the latter of which will be covered in the following section). And while all five principles are helpful analytically, those of *emergence* and *relationality* fit best here in terms of their emphasis on intersubjectivity. The principle of *emergence* acknowledges the importance of one’s sense of self, yet emphasises the crucial role of discourse as a conduit for these self-conceptions to enter the social world and gain meaning, aligning with notions of ‘doing’ and ‘performing’ identities (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 588). The principle of *relationality* brings the idea of emergence to the locus of interaction, emphasising the point that social meaning can only ever be given to identities by seeking the connections between “other available identity positions and other social actors” (p. 598). In other words, identities cannot be extricated as

autonomous entities, bound up as they are in various sets of overlapping relations (including discursive constructions of similarity/difference, genuineness/artifice, and authority/delegitimacy), which all play a role in intersubjective identity construction.

Specifically, Bucholtz & Hall argue for the analytic value of approaching identity as “a relational and sociocultural phenomenon that emerges and circulates in local discourse contexts of interaction rather than as a stable structure located primarily in the individual psyche or in fixed social categories” (2005, pp. 585–586). Identities are therefore intersubjective in that they are constructed within conversations with interlocutors, and also within wider sociocultural Discourses which at once shape and constrain subjectivity and identities. I turn now to a consideration of the role of D/discourse, given its importance in the above conceptualisations.

2.4.4 Discourse and Identity

Cameron and Kulick’s (2003, p. 16) explanation of the dual focus of ‘discourse’ is a valuable starting point:

For linguists, ‘discourse’ is ‘language in use’ - a discourse analyst differs from a syntactician or a formal semanticist in studying not the internal workings of some language system (e.g. ‘English’ or ‘Arabic’) but the way meaning is produced when a language is used in particular contexts for particular purposes. For critical theorists, on the other hand, ‘discourses’ are sets of propositions in circulation about a particular phenomenon, which constitute what people take to be the reality of that phenomenon.

This latter definition calls to mind the work of Foucault and the aforementioned ‘discursive production of the subject’, with discourses themselves defined as “practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak” (Foucault, 1972, p. 149). As mentioned earlier, through repetition and normalisation such categories come to concretise and eventually assume for many the ontological ‘reality’ of which Cameron and Kulick speak. James Paul Gee (1990, 2015) mirrors this distinction in his conceptualisation of Big ‘D’, little ‘d’ discourses where Discourses with a capital ‘D’ are sociocultural, institutionalised ways of doing things and interacting (e.g. political Discourse or third wave feminist Discourse) and discourses with a small ‘d’ are instantiated through everyday (often mundane) talk (see e.g. Marra, 2012b). It is therefore not difficult to see how these two definitions work together in identity construction, in that in order for the latter sense of discourse to take hold, they must do so through the linguists’ sense of ‘language in use’,

or little d discourses; conversely ‘language in use’ is always socially situated, placing great importance on the circulation of Discourses in the critical theorists’ sense. The two types are mutually implicated in the process of identity negotiation, and these connections will be foregrounded in my analyses. It is worth turning at this point to a further layer of abstraction, ideology, which I contend scaffolds both these senses of D/discourse.

2.4.5 Ideologies

Despite a certain definitional elusiveness (see Gee, 2015), scholars agree that many ideologies involve the perpetuation of power through establishing and spreading roots in belief systems over time. For this reason, many researchers who focus on ideology start from an explicitly critical standpoint (e.g. Heller, 1995; Wodak et al., 2009). While ideologies are not the same everywhere and they change over time (see Darwin & Norton, 2015), many ideologies are also shared (e.g. a belief in capitalism, religion, or in the ‘essence’ of patriarchy). For the purposes of this thesis, I find value in Julia Menard-Warwick’s (2014) definition, which builds on the work of van Dijk (1998), Fairclough (1992), and Bakhtin (1986, 1992). In her words, she uses ideology to “refer to beliefs and perceptions linked to power relations between social groups - which may or may not be expressed explicitly as discourses, but often become apparent in taken-for-granted practices” (Menard-Warwick, 2014, p. 2). Menard-Warwick’s link between ideology and D/discourses is especially pertinent for my study where study abroad contexts are characterised by globalisation, mobility and connectedness, all of which impacts on the ubiquity and permeability of large-scale ideologies. Darwin & Norton (2015, p. 44) take up this idea in their operationalisation of *ideologies* as “porous and polythitic” (i.e. non-static and therefore congruent with ideas of fluidity and mobility). In line with Menard-Warwick, their definition is also helpful in terms of the attention paid to the workings of power. For Darwin and Norton “ideologies are dominant ways of thinking that organise and stabilise societies while simultaneously determining modes of inclusion and exclusion, and the privileging and marginalisation of ideas, people, and relations” (Darwin & Norton, 2015, p. 44). In study abroad literature which investigates identities and learner beliefs, ideologies have sometimes been included as part of analyses, though there is room for deeper exploration of how these connect to interactions at ‘ground level’ (e.g. Kinginger, 2004, 2016; Surtees, 2016; Wilkinson, 1998; Wolcott, 2013, 2016).

From an analytic perspective, there is potential to consider the ‘hidden’ aspects of identity construction which provide powerful parameters to both identity categories and the resources available to instantiate these. Stuart Hall sums up the strength of this power in his argument that

ideology and hegemonic practices impose an “order and stability upon the indeterminate play of signifiers in the discursive field” (cited in Benwell & Stokoe, p.29), acting as a regulatory fiction to produce the semblance of a ‘core’ identity in place of what he argues are really points of temporary attachment (Hall, 2000). Due to the process of societal normalisation, ideologies are not generally readily accessible in our thought processes as we speak or reflect on interactions. They function rather, to guide, constrain, or provide something to ‘push back against’ for those who have come to question the ‘taken for granted’ aspect of the grand narratives that symbolically dominate our social lives (Bourdieu, 1977a, 1991). There is clear analytical interest then in unveiling the processes by which ideologies form part of a participant’s identity negotiations and ways in which these are given voice through D/discourse. An interest in the structuring properties of ideologies also brings to bear on questions of agency and structure, a foundational (yet contentious) part of conceptualising the workings of identity negotiations. I turn now to a discussion of this relationship, given the likely relevance in my study and the potential for being theoretically generative. I show how agency and structure cannot be disentangled from identity, again emphasising the theme of conceptual connections that runs through this thesis.

2.5 Structure and Agency

Despite being recognised as "one of the most deep-seated problems in social sciences" (Bakewell, 2010, p. 1689), David Block (2013a) notes the paucity of discussions about the interrelationship between personal agency and social structure in language and identity research. He also notes a tendency towards an ‘over-agentive’ tone in applied linguistics/SLA research over the past twenty or so years (citing his own 2006 work as a case in point), adding that while many scholars acknowledge the role of structure, they do not explore it in any depth. Earlier, I addressed the overall philosophical space I occupy in this argument, but given the important place of this debate in theorising identity, I return to it here in some detail.

For Butler (1993), it is our constituted character which forms the precondition of agency. For constitution to occur, and for subjectivity to be formed, individuals are, from birth, in a constant process of socialisation into various ways of doing and being, a process which involves introduction to and interaction with structures (ideological or institutional). Traditionally, in many Western societies including New Zealand, for example, little boys are praised for physical risk-taking and not expressing emotion from an early age (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2013, p. 24), nurturing the existing Discourse around what it ‘means’ to be masculine. Little boys learn that part of enacting a socially acceptable masculinity is through physicality and the suppression of

emotional responses, all of which contributes to sustaining the existing ideological structure of gender (differences). These experiences contribute to the development of one's habitus, a central concept for Bourdieu in breaking down what he termed the false dichotomies of the individual and society as well as agency and structure. Bakhtinian notions of intertextuality too provide a useful middle ground between structure and agency in that everything we say can be seen to build on, alter, and contribute to unending chains of meaning. In identity co-construction and acts of agency, then, we can certainly appropriate the use of certain features and claim them as 'our own' but it is important to realise the historically and socially constructed thread of both the micro-level features used to index certain identities and the macro level Discourses and ideologies which constrain these acts and with which we engage (see Vitanova, 2010).

Understandings can be strengthened if we engage with the connections between concepts, seeing them as a living 'whole' rather than separate entities. The fact that structures contribute to the constitution of the subject (and their habitus), which in turn shapes individual agency, means that structures are in effect, inescapable in identity negotiations. Natalie Schilling (2013, p. 342) makes a similar point from a variationist sociolinguistic angle in emphasising the ease with which researchers can "get caught up in the interactional moment and forget that, as much as we want to celebrate speaker agentivity and creativity, we are all bound by structures and norms, and we cannot create meaningful style out of nothing", a point which aligns with Bakhtinian dialogism. Stanton Wortham (2004, p. 167) draws on Bakhtin in emphasising the structuring properties of identity categories, arguing that "individuals and groups do not create unique categories *de novo*, but must instead 'rent' categories from the society in order to make sense of themselves and others". Similarly, the "rigid regulatory frame", an important aspect of Judith Butler's performativity framework (1990), has been given far less analytical attention than the agency which is seen to be at the forefront of identity construction. In referencing Butler, Susan Ehrlich (2008a) makes the point that more attention should be given to what this regulatory frame entails, to what actually constrains and limits the agency we can deploy interactionally, if we are to advance our understandings of identity construction in all its social complexity. All of these points echo Stuart Hall's argument about the regulatory fiction that results from ideologies gaining traction.

There has also been a lack of attention to describing what structure actually is (Block, 2013a). Definitions such as a "powerful metonymic device" and a "founding epistemic metaphor" for the social sciences (Bakewell, 2010, p. 1695) exemplify Block's point in their emphasis on generality, yet provide a useful platform despite their opacity. In conceptualising structure for the purposes

of my study, I draw on Bourdieu (1977a, 1991) who classifies structures as both *objective* (in the sense of existing externally) and *subjective*. Examples of objective structures may be institutional, for example the established ways of doing things at a New Zealand or French university; or political, for example the institutionalised racial segregation system of Apartheid in South Africa between 1948 - 1991, or women not having the right to vote, or the illegality of homosexuality in many countries still today. Bourdieu sees these divisions, which exist as concrete, as law even, as being subsumed by social actors as ‘principles of division’, in other words as becoming part of a ‘natural’ order (the *doxa*, in Bourdieu’s terminology) and ‘common sense’. They then become *subjective* or *mental* structures which inform our habitus as we, as social actors, move about the different fields in which we interact. In this sense, ideologies which inform identity categories such as gender, sexual orientation, race, or class are all examples of this type of constituted mental structure, which through social sedimentation take on appearances of fixity. As a result, they are experienced as real, despite being dynamic and constantly yet imperceptibly changing.

In terms of agency, definitions such as the commonly cited offering by Laura Ahearn (2001, p. 112) - “the socioculturally mediated capacity to act” - are usefully concise yet also leave room for exploration. Duff’s (2012, p.414) definition of agency expands on this: “Agency [...] refers to people's ability to make choices, take control, self-regulate, and thereby pursue their goals as individuals leading, potentially, to personal or social transformation”¹². This leads to questions of what the precursors are for this *capacity* or *ability* to manifest. Without going too far into the psychological realm, it is necessary to return to the philosophical argument I presented at the beginning of this chapter which outlined an ontological and epistemological commitment to constructionism (within a realist stance) and a rejection of humanist notions of complete autonomy and ‘free will’ of the subject. The concepts of habitus and intertextuality are valuable in understanding the “sociocultural mediation” to which Ahearn (2001) refers in the ‘middle ground’ they occupy between structure and agency (as mentioned above in relation to Bourdieu and Bakhtin).

Examining the role of habitus leads to a questioning of the extent to which individuals are conscious of their social embeddedness. While Bourdieu sees a conscious reflection by agents on their socially formed habitus as a possibility, he gives more prominence to the unconscious reproduction of social order through processes of normalisation and the associated complicity that

¹² I would add here that this idea of ‘transformation’ is quite extreme given the fact that personal and social transformation is a lengthy process. I return to this idea in Chapter 6.

arises¹³. Rather than use the word ‘agency’, Bourdieu posits that social actors act ‘strategically’, guided by their habitus, within fields where they have developed a ‘feel for the game’ (Bourdieu, 1977a, 1984, 1991).

So far, then, I see value in the following conceptualisations of agency. I see human subjects as never completely free to act on society because of the fact that our agency is both constituted and constrained by structure and mediated by habitus and intertextuality. Much like poststructural definitions of identity, I would conceptualise agency as dynamic and context-dependent, and as co-constructed, which leads to a consideration of what ‘counts’ analytically-speaking as agency. Is agency only to be conceptualised as acting on one’s environment in the sense of ‘pushing back’ (either through overt or covert practices) against hegemonic structures? Or might it be also seen as ‘choosing’ to adhere? Ahearn’s and Duff’s definitions are broad enough to encompass both possibilities. As an example, a woman who chooses to prioritise a career and decides not to marry or have children and a woman who decides to marry, have children, and not pursue a career outside the home may both see these choices as acts of agency in so far as the former may see herself as making a conscious choice despite the societal/familial pressure she feels, and the latter may see her choice as completely self-governed and devoid of societal pressure. On the contrary, she may see her choice as ‘pushing back’ against societal discourses which encourage women to pursue a career at the same time as raising children. To return to the theoretical potential I mentioned in the previous section, my own data calls for a nuanced approach to agency in the many ways it appears to be instantiated. There are clear examples of participants pushing back against hegemonic structures of gender and sexuality, as well as seemingly unconscious reproduction of ideologically-laden Discourses (often to do with standard language ideologies). In so far as participants in each case are ‘acting on their environment’, their linguistic behaviour can be deemed agentive. Accessing and conceptualising agency in my participants’ identity negotiations relies heavily on my ethnographic perspective, the importance of understanding sociocultural contexts, and on the value of combining emic and etic perspectives.

Having conceptualised identity, and explored the connections with ideologies, D/discourses, structure and agency, I move towards an operationalisation of the concept with a view towards how it can be analytically accessed in interaction. Within this intersubjective focus, there is clear scope to explore the unfolding of identity as it occurs, and use of further sociolinguistic concepts

¹³ Giddens’ Structuration Theory (1991) also focuses on the reproduction of social structures and provides an alternative approach to that of Bourdieu.

can add analytic purchase. The following sections detail the benefits offered by the concepts of indexicality (e.g. Ochs, 1993; Silverstein, 2003) and stance (Du Bois, 2007; Jaffe, 2009).

2.6 Accessing Identity

2.6.1 Indexicality

The *indexicality principle* is, as mentioned above, the third principle in Bucholtz & Hall's (2005) model and the first step in exploring how identity is achieved as opposed to its ontological status as intersubjective and emergent. Indexicality has taken a prominent place in sociolinguistic theory (Eckert, 2008; Ochs, 1992, 1996; Silverstein, 2003) and is being given significant attention in more recent works seeking to expand sociolinguistic theory (see Coupland, 2016). Broadly, an *index* can be defined as any feature (linguistic or otherwise) that depends on its interactional context for meaning. In this sense, indexes function as valuable *contextualisation cues* (e.g. Gumperz, 1982b, 2001) in understanding the unfolding speaker and hearer orientations in interactions. Elinor Ochs' definition of *index* offers useful specificity as regards the linguistic dimension:

A linguistic index is usually a structure (e.g. sentential voice, emphatic stress, diminutive affix) that is used variably from one situation to another and becomes conventionally associated with particular situational dimensions such that when the structure is used, the form invokes those situational dimensions (Ochs, 1996, p. 411)

Given the parameters of my study, I focus mainly on linguistic indexes, though at times I look at the indexical features of non-linguistic elements, as they relate to social identities. As a brief example, in chapter 5, I engage with the symbolic value of red lipstick when it arises as an important part of a reflective discussion between Persephone and Athena about their experiences of sexual harassment on the Paris metro. Ideological structures play a leading part in indexicality (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p.594) and in this respect, Silverstein's (2003) notion of the *indexical order* looks at the layers of meaning that may be peeled from these linguistic forms revealing the connections with ideologies, all of which are relevant in moving from the *red lipstick* in the above example to the ideology of the gender order. Indexicality in the first order, for example, is where the relationship between language and identity is overt and does not require a great deal of inferential work on the behalf of the interlocutor. For example, if a woman mentions her children in conversation, she can be seen to be indexing in the first order her identity as a mother given that relationship between the linguistic form and the social identity is direct. However, indexing the

identity of mother may also fall further down the abstract continuum of *ordered indexicalities*, relying more heavily on constructed understandings of what it means to be a mother in a particular sociocultural setting. If both interlocutors share these intertextual understandings then this relationship can still be understood despite the cognitive work required in establishing these “chains of association” (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2013, p. 251). For example, the ‘mother’ identity may well be indexed by forms which feed into ideas of mothers as nurturing or selfless (in places where these associations have taken hold).

Elinor Ochs’ 1993 paper *Indexing Gender* was instrumental in exploring these processes of indexicality and in seeking answers as to how linguistic forms come to attach themselves to particular meanings and identities. Her distinction between *direct* and *indirect* indexicality, for instance, is extremely valuable in accessing identity in interaction. Direct indexicality encompasses referential lexical items such as ‘she’, ‘he’, or ‘Mrs’, and indirect indexicality refers to particular ways of speaking which come to be indexicalised with specific gendered meaning at particular points in time. Cameron & Kulick’s (2003) explanation of how this process occurs is particularly useful. They emphasise at the outset that for the most part, the relationship between language and gender is indirect, mediated by something else:

Ways of speaking are associated in the first instance with particular roles, activities and personality traits (e.g. ‘motherhood’, ‘gossiping’, ‘modesty’, and to the extent that these roles, activities and traits are culturally coded as gendered (the ones just cited, for instance, are coded as feminine), the ways of speaking associated with them become indices of gender (2003, p. 57)

As Janet Holmes (2007) notes, we bring this cultural ‘knowledge’ (acquired through ongoing language socialisation) along with us to interactions and deploy it to make sense of linguistic behaviour. Specific forms come to be associated with specific sociocultural contexts (Barrett, 2017, p. 11) in a process called *enregisterment* (Agha, 2003), but linguistic features may well index multiple identities and meanings (Eckert, 2008; Holmes, 1997) such is their contingent nature. The notion of the *indexical field* (Eckert, 2008) is helpful in this respect, with any index seen to have “a constellation of ideologically-related meanings, any one of which can be activated” (Eckert, 2008, p. 453) in situated usages. Whether or not the indexical meanings are felicitous in identity negotiations where they are deployed depends on interlocutors having shared understandings of indexical features (see Barrett, 2017). Importantly, linguistic features come to firstly accrue

meaning through the process of enregisterment, then avail themselves to speakers as “symbolically or ideologically-laden linguistic resources” (Cameron & Kulick, 2003, p. 91) in constructing identities.

Meaning does not map simply to an identity category, however, and may fall in any space in the indexical field. Cameron & Kulick’s (2003) example of men drawing on caring and empathetic language with customers in the service industry is pertinent. While this type of language has come to be associated with women, hence indexical to the gender category, the men in this instance are argued to not be directly indexing membership of this particular category, but rather their “membership of the occupational category of ‘server’” (2003, p. 57). The authors rightly point out that the speech style linked to notions of ‘serving’ is heavily associated with constructions of femininity, a relationship entirely beyond coincidence. Similarly, use of the discourse marker ‘like’ does not map unproblematically onto a ‘young person’ identity, but its significance may be situated elsewhere in the particular indexical field, perhaps conveying a stance of ‘coolness’ or acting to distance oneself from a more formal identity. Nevertheless, people often utilise features to index aspects of identity in a given context, uptake of which depends on the shared knowledge between interlocutors and the interactional unfolding.

From my study’s perspective, these understandings are much more helpful in uncovering complexity than merely seeing particular features as providing a description of how particular groups use language. The concepts of direct and indirect indexicality, indexical order, and the indexical field all reinforce the analytic importance of careful and thorough attention to contexts, as well as to emic interpretations of the interaction. As a way to access the emergence of identities for my participants, the concept of indexicality holds analytical promise in the connections it can uncover. Linked to indexicality is the sociolinguistic concept of stance, to which I now turn.

2.6.2 Stance

Stance has been defined as “a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field” (Du Bois, 2007, p. 163). The concept of stance has clear links with positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1990) and is indexically related to identity construction, analytically accessible through attention to indexical orders and the relationships between the immediate context of the interaction and outer layers, moving towards ideologies at the most abstract end of the continuum.

The emphasis on the dialogic and on the socially-embedded properties of stance sit well within the overall theoretical perspectives of this study, as does the conceptualisation of stance as emergent in interaction (Jaffe, 2009). This is where the relationship between stance and indexicality comes into play in that stancetaking acts are not transparent or easily mapped to meaning (Du Bois, 2007; Jaffe, 2009). To make sense of the connections between stance as a resource and identity construction necessitates a focus on indexical contextualisation (e.g. Gumperz, 2001; Silverstein, 2003).

As regards my study, the concepts of affective and epistemic stance are particularly useful (and both are subsumed by the term positioning). Affective stances are defined by Jaffe (2009, p. 8) as representing “emotional states of the speaker”, and can act as resources in laying claim to identities and evaluating claims made by others. Du Bois (2007 p. 142) notes that evaluation, in particular, is the most widely recognised form of stancetaking in the literature. Epistemic stances (Biber & Finnegan, 1989), for their part, work to convey “speakers' degrees of certainty about their propositions” and establish the relative authority of interactants within a wider sociocultural field (Jaffe, 2009, p.8), thereby often interacting with claims to capital. Much of my exchange students' data showed evidence of stancetaking acts (which involve interactive and reflexive positioning) in the form of epistemic (the ‘value’ of a particular accent, for example), and affective stances (e.g. Victoria's disbelief at not having her Pacific identity easily ratified in her New Zealand university context). The two types also function simultaneously at times, as I indicate in the analysis. Positioning, stance, and indexicality are therefore connected in identity co-construction and together, provide a valuable resource for accessing the processes involved in identity work in study abroad contexts, and in particular revealing connections between micro and macro aspects.

2.7 Summary

This chapter has explored, and brought together, many aspects of identity which frame the approach I take to this foundational concept in my study. I began by showing how intellectual understandings have shifted from ideas of fixed and essential notions of identity to poststructural and social constructionist conceptualisations of *identities* as socially embedded, discursively constructed, and crucially, as dynamic sites of struggle. I explained the value of the poststructural concepts of investment and imagined communities, and argued for the importance of the linguistic depth offered by discursive approaches in accessing many of these more abstract concepts. In emphasising the discursive element of identities, I foregrounded the key concepts of emergence and intersubjectivity and explored the dual meanings of D/discourse, connecting these to

ideologies. Framing ideology as a form of structure likely to hold relevance in my study led to a preliminary consideration of the structure and agency relationship. An ongoing discussion in the social sciences, this relationship is of particular importance in identity scholarship where a poststructural foregrounding of human agency has tended to relegate the role of structure. After establishing the ontological characteristics of identity (and related concepts), I discussed the concepts of indexicality and stance (as connected to positioning), which I argue have analytic value in my study, allowing access to the unfolding of identity as negotiations occur.

I finish the chapter with a clarification of the particular form of my identity focus. I have touched on the idea that identities can be personal or social, yet I emphasise the interconnectedness of identities. One is not a ‘different’ person when they are enacting a ‘mother’ identity and a ‘professional’ identity, and we draw on our many identities to achieve the interactional task at hand. One’s personal identity (which has links to the idea of ‘core’ identity, and is related to one’s sense of self and ideas of ‘individuality’) can be viewed in effect as a dynamic combination of all social identities which are themselves moulded by collective categories available to us for identity construction at any point in time (e.g. Cameron, 2009; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, 2013; Holmes et al., 2011). My study’s focus on social identities, therefore, does not negate the element of ‘personal identity’ in so far as they are inseparable. In exploring the social identities and categories salient for my participants, I look specifically at how these identities are foregrounded, with clear attention to (relevant) intersectional layers (Victoria’s national identity as Caledonian, for example, overlaps with her Vietnamese ethnicity and ties to the French culture). As I outline later in the thesis, the shapes of these identities are indeed very different for each participant, yet what is similar are the encountered ideologies of gender, sexuality, nationality and language which have gained traction in society and provide the “ideological map” (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, p. 87) within which identity navigations occur.

The binary opposition between the individual and social is an unhelpful one, and discursive approaches to identity are an excellent portal to better understanding the complexity of the connections between language, society, and identity. In looking at an individual’s identity work, the social is everywhere. It is in the constitution of the subject herself (recall the discussion of structure and agency), it is in the interlocutor(s) with whom one interacts, it is in the local norms within which we operate, and it is in the wider sociocultural Discourses and increasingly global ideologies that frame these ground level interactions. Similarly, social identities are not the same for everybody. (To risk stating the obvious, not all New Zealanders highlight their national

identities in the same way, despite shared beliefs of what it ‘means’ to be from New Zealand.) While the parameters just mentioned provide ‘guidelines’ of sorts, individual instantiations of social identities are always in flux and depend on one’s ongoing (intersectional) experiences, thus giving ‘individual’ shape to social identities. This connection between the individual and the social is emphasised throughout the thesis. Given the complexity of identity as an academic construct, there is much more that could have been written. The conceptual stage is set, however, having brought together the concepts I see as crucial for a rigorous and nuanced investigation of identity in study abroad contexts. In light of my exploratory aims and desire to avoid assigning identities at the outset (despite the likelihood of certain identities coming to the forefront in these research contexts, such as nationality), I therefore frame my investigation with two guiding questions:

What social identities become salient for exchange students in Wellington and Paris, and how does this salience occur?

How do exchange students negotiate identities in study abroad contexts?

I see these necessarily broad questions as being useful gateways to the particular issues and areas that emerge during the research process, and envisage that many of the considerations made in this chapter will be important contributors in this respect. The next chapter operationalises this chapter’s theoretical platform and guiding research questions by detailing the methodological journey of my study. Most importantly, I introduce my participants and the crucial role they played in my research.

Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter builds on the theoretical understandings and literature outlined in Chapter 2. In particular, the emphasis on socially constructed categories within a social realist approach has direct bearing on my methodological design and data collection decisions. This chapter tells the methodological story of my research, firstly by providing a rationale for the stance I take, which can be characterised as a participant-focused, ethnographic approach with a critical lens. I draw parallels with Interactional Sociolinguistics (IS), the analytic framework I employ, and describe the particular tools I see most value in. In line with an ethnographic approach, I situate myself squarely within the research by reflexively examining my own subjectivities. The chapter then provides an overview of participant recruitment, the research contexts, and data collection decisions and processes, which lead in turn to a discussion of the various data sources used to operationalise my research questions. The final section explains the processes involved in data analysis.

3.1 Methodological Stance

3.1.1 Relationship with Participants

The need for meaningful interaction between researchers and participants is cogent (Cameron et al., 1993). We inhabit the same social worlds and, as researchers, we cannot extricate ourselves from our participants' worlds, which, thanks to their generosity, become part of our worlds and our research contexts. Standing back and taking an 'outsider' position (advocated by a positivist tradition) does not sit well with my own understandings of what is ethically responsible, and nor would it bode well for rich and revealing discourse analysis (see e.g. King, 2014). My methodological stance developed around these considerations and a crucial underpinning factor - relationships with participants. Relational considerations had to be at the forefront of all decisions, at the beginning of the process, throughout, and afterwards. I was aware of some of the potential challenges my exchange student participants would face on exchange in New Zealand and in France. They would not only be geographically distant from home, but also surrounded by (potentially) different attitudes, values, expectations, and linguistic and sociocultural norms. Within these new contexts, it stands to reason that support in its various forms has been found to contribute strongly to the overall SA experience (Ramsay, Jones, & Barker, 2007). As a researcher and as a human being, I see my role as aiding this process in any way possible (see e.g. Kidner, 2015). People will always come first.

3.1.2 Ethnographic Approach

An ethnographic approach offered me the chance to enact this people first ethos. Such an approach encourages researchers to become part of the community and research *with* their participants rather than conduct research *on* them (Cameron et al., 1993). The original conceptualisation of ethnography, as used in Anthropology, of immersing oneself in an unknown community to develop an insider perspective (see e.g. Swann & Maybin, 2008) is now commonly extended to a type of “reporting out” on the close-at-hand (Scollon & Scollon, 2007, p. 612). This latter conceptualisation avoids the ethnographic ‘othering’ that was an unfortunate occurrence of early ethnography and calls back the importance Bourdieu placed on knowing research contexts and developing ‘joint understandings of the logic of the game’ (Blommaert, 2005, p. 226). Rather than working from assumptions of the privileged position of the ‘outside’ etic position, there is a recognition of the value that an insider (or emic) perspective can bring in terms of enhancing analysis. Taking every opportunity to immerse oneself in research contexts rejects the Levi-Straussian dictum of ‘strangeness’ and ‘need’ for absence of shared understanding between researcher and participants (e.g. Levi-Strauss, 1963). This distance between researcher and ‘subjects’ was perceived as allowing the ‘truth’ to reveal itself, and as emphasised in Chapter 2, is opposite to the ontological stance in which I ground this study. To this end, I situate myself squarely in the research contexts and account for my presence through commitment to reflexivity¹⁴.

In my study, an ethnographically-informed data collection (Blommaert & Jie, 2010; Rampton, 2007a) provided valuable contextual cushioning of the linguistic data, allowing for deeper understandings of participants’ “lived stuff” (Rampton, 2007b, p. 596). This methodological choice chimed well with my people first ethos, anchoring all linguistic analysis in “thick description” (Geertz, 1973) of participants’ histories and contexts. In other words, it foregrounded a very real human element in the linguistic focus. This approach is fundamental to Interactional Sociolinguistics (IS) - the discourse analytic framework I employ, and is particularly well-suited to my study which focuses predominantly on conversational interactions yet is firmly cemented in

¹⁴ It is worth noting that this ethnographic stance channels logically into Linguistic Ethnography (LE) as a methodological framework (see Copland & Creese, 2015; Rampton, 2007a). An interpretive approach which studies the local and immediate actions of actors, LE takes into account their points of view and considers “how these interactions are embedded in wider social contexts and structures” (Copland & Creese, 2015, p. 13). As the name implies, this framework meshes the two areas of linguistics and ethnography. Rampton (2007b, p. 596) puts it well when he notes that “ethnography opens linguistics up” and “linguistics (and linguistically sensitive discourse analysis) ties ethnography down”, a combination well-suited to guiding my approach to data collection.

the sociocultural contexts of my participants.

3.1.3 Interactional Sociolinguistics

I draw analytical inspirations from Interactional Sociolinguistics (IS), associated mainly with the influential work of linguist John Gumperz (1982a, 1982b, 1996) and sociologist Erving Goffman (1963, 1974). This approach to discourse analysis provided the tools to tease out the specifics in the interactional data, and underscores the importance of understanding wider sociocultural contexts in interpreting what people convey in actual communication. It is, in other words, an ethnographically-oriented approach which studies actual language use in specific contexts (see Holmes et al., 2011; Marra, 2012; Schiffrrin, 1997 for overviews). Rampton (2007b, p. 596) describes IS as the “empirical reconciliation of linguistics and ethnography”.

Gumperz was instrumental in laying the explanatory groundwork for miscommunication between speakers from different backgrounds, and I would argue that his view of this type of communication as the norm is highly prescient and relevant in light of increased globalisation characterised by transnationalism and multilingualism. He posited that as people are socialised into the practices of different speech communities, they come to accrue a set of conversational presuppositions which guide inferential practices (Heller, 2013, p. 192). Importantly, these practices differ across cultures, and communities of practice within these (a more current conceptual framework used in sociolinguistics), placing the analytic onus on understanding the dynamic norms of the particular community being investigated. An IS approach to discourse, then, emphasises much more than surface forms. Meaningful communication is not a given, and people deploy their repertoire of sense making practices in order to disambiguate these constantly shifting meanings (see Jaspers, 2012). These practices, in turn, furnish the analyst with useful tools with which to explore the intricacies of interactional encounters.

In terms of my data, *contextualisation cues* (Gumperz, 1982b, 1982a, 1996, 2001) are valuable in operationalising processes of inference and meaning-making in that they provide clues as to how the communicative moment at hand is being oriented to. In practical terms, these cues can be accessed through attention to a variety of linguistic components including content, narrative structure, and prosody as well the linguistic fine grain such as turn-taking, discourse markers, and pronoun use (see Holmes et al., 2011). In the focus on wider social contexts, there are clear links to Bakhtin’s (1992) notion of intertextuality (also see Seals, 2019a) in that both our utterances and inferences are anchored in established practices as well as feeding forward into future deployments.

Situating these contextualisation cues within their wider sociocultural context entails an analytical commitment to historicity and capital (cf. Bourdieu, 1977a, 1986), as succinctly summarised by Heller (2013, p. 196):

Such a widening of scope from the details of specific interactions requires some kind of understanding of interactions as situated in webs or fields which operate both across time and across space (Giddens 1984) as well as incorporating the problem of who and what has value - concerns also captured in Bourdieu's (1982) notion of linguistic markets and symbolic fields of activity

Interactional sociolinguistics then focuses on how people make communicative meaning 'in the now' whilst acknowledging the crucial interconnectedness with sociocultural and sociohistorical contexts, and casting an eye on power relations within these (and as manifest in the interactions themselves). In relation to my study, and the focus on exchange students' identity negotiations in new geographical settings, IS was suited to handle the complexity of my data.

3.1.4 Critical Lens

I see commitment to ethnography as going beyond "thick description" (Geertz, 1973), however, and as entailing a continual problematisation and questioning of how language is embedded in power relations. Although power or investigating social injustice was not the starting point in my analysis (cf. Heller et al., 2018), it quickly became clear that it was inextricably linked to the social categories which assumed salience for my participants. Given that these were large social categories of gender, sexuality, nationality, and ethnicity, a critical lens became necessary from the beginning of my research. It is impossible to analyse ideological structures of gender or heteronormativity, for example, without casting a critical eye toward power in the form of societal control (Foucault, 1972, 1976). Importantly, a critical lens also acknowledges "the complex relationships between social structures and human agency" (Starfield, 2010, p. 55), a theoretical point I harness in Chapter 6.

The concept of multivocality (e.g. Chapelle & Duff, 2003; Duff, 2014) fits logically within this critical stance, and played an important role in conceptualising and enacting the data collection process. The participants' experiences (and how they enacted or narrated these) still hold centre stage, but I incorporate the voices of others where possible, namely language buddies, friends, and tutors and of course my own researcher perspective. This is particularly important in the

interactional data, where identities are co-constructed with a face-to face interlocutor. The idea of many voices is paramount to Bakhtin's theories of discourse, seen in the English-translated terms such as dialogism, heteroglossia, double-voicing, and intertextuality. This merging of multiple voices reflects the idea that the language we use and the identities we construct are never 'new' but reflective of an engagement with 'past voices' and 'authoritative discourses' (Bakhtin, 1992). As well as interactions between different interlocutors in specific times and spaces, "discourses, or worldviews, as Bakhtin phrased it, can also come into contact" (Vitanova, 2016, p. 273). I operationalise multivocality through a rigorous discourse analysis which incorporates these multiple perspectives, including real people, and Discourses and ideologies. All these decisions were taken in line with my ontological stance of acknowledging multiple realities.

3.1.5 Reflexivity

The particular methodological stance I adopt (participant-focused, ethnographic approach with a critical lens) necessarily entails researcher reflexivity (Sarangi & Candlin, 2003) through careful and ongoing accountability. Reflexivity is a key feature of an ethnographic approach and can be defined as "directing one's gaze at one's own experience" (Foley, 2002, p. 473). Academic researchers are whole people too (Coleman, 2013), and we bring our own identities, beliefs, histories, and emotions to both the data collection process and analysis. As social beings, we are all embedded in the social world; adopting a researcher position does not equate with a miraculous ability to operate within a vacuum. When establishing relationships with participants and when engaging in ethnographic interviews, for example, I was not locking myself into the researcher role (though it was certainly prominent at the outset), just as my participants were not solely ensconced within their exchange student participant roles. We oriented to each other from different subject positions, which in turn changed and grew along with our relationships. I do not hold that the resultant data will be 'skewed' due to my involvement, as many followers of the positivist paradigm have been wont to label the researcher's presence since Labov's (1972) coining of the term 'Observer's Paradox'. Rather, I align epistemologically with scholars such as Schilling (2013), Denzin & Lincoln (2008, p. 4), and Talmy & Richards (2011), who embrace the presence of the researcher and see researcher neutrality as "an impossible aim" (De Fina, 2011, p. 35).

With this in mind, I acknowledge that any attempts to 'decentre' myself - "the process of moving away from the researcher's perspective so that more equal weight is given to various cultural perspectives from the analysis" (Spencer-Oatey, 2008, p. 328) - will be futile as an embodied social being. In other words, and in line with my theoretical stance, I do not seek to 'hide' my presence

behind a mask of objectivity. Cameron et al (1993, p. 23) argue that interaction can enhance research and that attempts at remaining neutral (and hence ‘objective’) are “philosophically naive”. My aim throughout the analysis, therefore, will be to account for my presence and make analytical room for any tensions which arise (see Sarangi & Candlin, 2003), practising the *epistemological vigilance* for which Bourdieu strongly advocated.

As part of this aim and commitment to transparency, acknowledging my own subjectivities and biographies (Norton & Early, 2011) is important. I take the opportunity at this point to describe some of my subjectivities which clearly impact on the data collection process and analysis. As a white, cisgender woman in my forties I share some social categories with some of my participants, but bring my own ongoing intersectional experiences to the research process (also see Chapter 1). While many of my own experiences overlap with those of my participants (participating in exchanges, living in Paris, negotiating national identity as a New Zealander in Paris, language learning and teaching, sexual harassment on the Paris metro, and navigating the constraints of the gender order as a woman in general), I make no claims to understanding the marginalisation experienced by my participants who experience life outside the normative majority - as ethnic minorities within Anglo-dominant societies (e.g. Persephone and Victoria), or as gay (Hugo).

My own experiences and viewpoints impact the story I choose to tell in this thesis. The rich data from this research lent itself to many different potential angles in terms of its telling, yet I chose this particular version, a version that, for me, held the strongest merit. This decision was underpinned by my theoretical stance outlined in Chapter 2, my feminist perspective and commitment to social equality, and my belief that study abroad is much more than a language learning experience. It is also grounded in my ethnographic approach in that decisions were taken in accordance with what became salient for participants. This chapter models the approach I take to the thesis whereby I insert reflexive considerations as they merit attention. I do so to underscore my continued and evolving presence in the research process, something which could not be captured by a single self-disclosure. The thinking and decisions involved in arriving at these points of methodological departure had clear implications for data collection decisions and processes, all of which are detailed in the following section.

3.2 Data Collection Processes

3.2.1 Participant Recruitment

My participant-focused approach encompasses a clear concern and respect for ethical procedures,

particularly around the respect and care of participants, values which form the basis of Victoria University's Human Ethics Policy. Ethics approval (approval number 22516) for my study was granted on 18th December, 2015, after which I began the participant recruitment stage (see Appendix B). To ensure a clear and informed consent process, I provided information sheets and consent forms in both French and English. I was fortunate to be aided in the English to French translation process by a colleague with valuable translation experience at my university and a previous colleague in France with extensive experience in translation from French to English and English to French. For both phases of my study, information sheets and consent forms were provided not only for key participants, but also for teachers/tutors, language buddies/friends, and class members who were involved (in the sense that their voice may or may not have been captured) in audio recordings in tutorial settings. The level of information was adjusted for each group to ensure full and adequate information (see appendices C.1 - C.8 for phase 1 and appendices D.1 - D.8 for phase 2). In addition to these forms, I used a poster for each phase (phase 1 in Wellington, New Zealand, and phase 2 in Paris, France) (see appendices E.1 and E.2).

As detailed in Chapter 1, my study involved a bidirectional element, a methodological decision taken in accordance with my own French language proficiency (i.e. I was able to use my advanced French language skills to conduct the research). Participant recruitment was structured around the two (non-linear) phases of my study, where phase 1 took place at a New Zealand University and involved recruiting French/Francophone participants and phase 2 involved recruiting participants from a New Zealand institution who intended to study in a French-speaking environment. The following diagram gives an indication of the overlap of these phases (and simultaneously shows which participants completed a one semester exchange and those who undertook the full year option¹⁵):

¹⁵ Note that Athena signed consent in July 2016, but was participating in a year-long exchange in Paris (as indicated by the shading).

Figure 1 - Research phases

As a first step to recruitment, I investigated which French universities had existing agreements with the particular New Zealand university I was working with, and which ones were popular for exchange. This preliminary research resulted in a narrowing down to 5 French institutions and 1 in New Caledonia. I was fortunate during this time to have the invaluable help of a colleague from a separate department within my institution, who was the Exchange Coordinator for students of French. This meant that I was able to mention her name in my first email to the contacts she recommended from two of the five institutions. These contacts then passed on my information, poster, and accompanying ethics forms to the students coming to New Zealand. In both these cases, uptake was favourable, with one student from each university (Hanna from France and Victoria from New Caledonia) expressing interest in my project. And so began the participant/researcher dialogue. The early emails we exchanged were indispensable in getting to know my phase 1 participants prior to their arrival in February 2016 and helped establish a solid rapport before I met them separately at the airport upon arrival in New Zealand.

As well as emailing my colleague's contacts, I searched for key people at the remaining four French

institutions and sent the same query. Pleasingly, I received responses from two of the universities, with a successful outcome from one, a prestigious institution in Paris. Again, this followed the same pattern with the person in charge forwarding my information and details on to the future exchange participants who made contact if they were interested. One student (Hugo) amongst the four coming to New Zealand followed up my email almost immediately, leading to regular communication before his arrival. I am extremely grateful for Hugo's help in engaging the interest of his three colleagues (Pierre, Félix and Jules) in my research, leading to their decision to also participate.

This early communication and consent process prioritised transparency and communication. I made clear my willingness to help in any way and was able to answer queries before my participants' arrivals. In so doing, I was reinforcing other aspects of my identity from the outset, lest I was to be solely positioned as a 'researcher', something I was keen to avoid in the interests of building rapport. It was made equally clear, however, that any questions on the nature of the research were welcomed. One such question was particularly useful as it resulted in a clarified statement in my consent forms. The email query from Victoria on the 22nd February 2016 centred on the meaning of the word "access" in the following statement:

I agree to give the researcher access to one social media account for the duration of my study abroad period.

I was able to clarify that "access" meant being friends on Facebook, for example, rather than having access to any type of sensitive password information, and subsequently added this Facebook example to the relevant consent form. (It should be noted, too, that participants had the option of not allowing access to an account.) I provide more detail on the various data sources used in section 3.2.4 below.

In terms of phase two recruitment (students travelling from Wellington to France or French-speaking countries), I started by putting up posters around the university. My colleague was again willing to help as was a colleague from another school in the university who knew of a student applying for exchange in France. As it turns out, both colleagues were talking about the same student, Persephone (who was taking papers in both their disciplines). By the time they spoke with her, Persephone had already seen my poster and contacted me expressing her interest. Upon meeting with my colleagues she was also informed about my research, something which can only

be seen as helpful in cementing her interest. I met with Persephone for the first time in early March 2016, and our regular meet-ups following this gave us ample time to get to know each other before her departure for Paris in August that year.

Despite having secured Persephone's consent, by the end of April there had not been any other interest expressed. At this point, I spoke with the organisation that promotes and oversees exchange programmes at the university. They kindly agreed to send out my details and an explanation of my study to all those going to France (no one was going to another French-speaking country), as well as to put a copy of my poster in their office. The number of students applying to France was relatively small for this particular exchange period, attributable perhaps to the Paris terror attacks in November 2015 (applications were due in December 2015). The very next day, however, I received a positive response from Viv, a Law student who was intending to finish her Bachelor's degree at a university in Paris. This was methodologically expedient given that Persephone was also enrolled at this same university; my data collection in phase 2 now had a geographic boundary which would undoubtedly facilitate the process. What was even more fortuitous was the fact that 4 of my French participants were also studying at this university (Hugo, Jules, Pierre and Félix) which meant that they were able to meet with Viv and Persephone pre-departure and offer advice on both Paris in general, and the institution in which they would be studying in particular. I met with Viv on several occasions before she left. I was able to answer some of her questions about living in Paris, offer language-related advice (Viv did not speak French bar the basics), and I shared her excitement in the lead up to departure.

My final participant to sign consent for phase two was a friend of Persephone's who was already in France (doing a one year exchange rather than one semester). Upon being asked by Persephone, Athena agreed to participate in July 2016. While I was not privy to the beginning stages of her exchange, Athena's participation was very much valued, and I met her on the day of Persephone's arrival in Paris where I also stayed for six weeks for data collection (detailed in the next section). Nine participants in total allowed for a thorough qualitative exploration of participants' identity experiences in new settings. It certainly gave rise to the ambiguity and inelegance characteristic of complex qualitative data (Leung, Harris, & Rampton, 2004), yet at the same time provided a rich and revealing data set, something I will forever be grateful to my participants for.

As mentioned in chapter 1, in line with my aims of accessing analytical depth I took the considered decision to focus on four *core* participants (a decision also affected by the amount of data that

each participant amassed). In practice, this means that Hanna, Victoria, Persephone, and Hugo (in order of analytical appearance) are foregrounded. Given the thematic overlap, I also include analysis of Athena's and Viv's interactional data. The experiences of all participants, however, were extremely important in increasing my understandings of the study abroad experience from different perspectives, and provided valuable support for interpretations. Appendix A provides further information about participants and the following diagram represents the focus of each participant's role in the thesis:

Figure 2 - Participants

3.2.2 Case Studies

Telling this story through case studies aligns with many of my perspectives. First and foremost, it foregrounds participants' situated experiences. It also aligns with my epistemological stance in that the goal of case study is not to universalise but to seek particularities to then find insights of potentially wider relevance and theoretical significance (Duff, 2014). This significance is societal rather than statistical (Burawoy, 1998) developing from "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) and flexibility in the reporting of findings. In line with issues emerging from my research focus, case studies avail themselves to considerations of participants' "agency and constraints as well as their multifaceted identities in different settings" (Duff, 2015, p. 63). In this thesis, I operationalise the

case study slightly differently according to the analytical focus of each chapter. In Chapter 4, I explore national identities through the experiences of three different participants - Hanna, Victoria, and Persephone. In each case study I use a variety of connected social concepts to shed light on these experiences, and make connections between the three cases. In Chapter 5, I divide the analysis and discussion of gender and sexuality into 'Paris' and 'Wellington'. The Paris section harnesses the theme of sexual harassment as the starting point and investigates the experiences of Persephone, as well as those of Athena and Viv. The Wellington section returns to an overarching participant focus. In Hanna's case study I bring a strong intersectional lens to explore her experience of sexual harassment in Wellington, and Hugo's case study serves as a rich example of the connections between gender and sexuality on the one hand and agency and structure on the other. In short, combining data from multiple channels resulted in highly contextualised case studies which spoke to participants' identity experiences whilst on study abroad.

3.2.3 Research contexts: Wellington and Paris

Before turning to a discussion of data sources, I situate myself reflexively in both research contexts of Wellington and Paris. At the time of beginning my study (July 2015), I had lived in Wellington, New Zealand, (the setting for phase 1) for over two years and had taught and studied at the host institution of my phase 1 participants (and from where I recruited my phase 2 participants) for approximately the same amount of time. As a result I had a clear understanding of university systems, and what was seen (or not seen) as 'currency' in Wellington (and the collective Wellingtonian identity) in general. Having grown up in New Zealand, my role as insider was well established (see e.g. Barrett, 2017; Heller, 1995, 2011; King, 2011) in general terms yet I cannot claim to have 'insider status' in all the various specific communities my participants became part of.

Having lived in France previously (including an extended period in Paris) and being proficient in French meant that the phase 2 research context was not new for me. There was no 'strangeness' to speak of that characterises an 'outsider' position – no "absence of shared understanding between observer and observed" (Blommaert, 2005, p. 226). I had insider knowledge of Paris, a city I had visited as a tourist, completed professional development in as a French teacher, and lived and worked in as an English teacher. I have lifelong French friends who call Paris home and I had a strong sense of belonging when I last lived there. The understandings I accumulated were indeed fortuitous as regards the importance of Paris in my study. So while I cannot claim to have a 'French' or 'Parisian' understanding of context, my 'outsider' position has been significantly

mitigated by these prior experiences. I have also spent time in New Caledonia, on exchanges (both as a high school and university student - as noted in chapter 1), and as a tourist. As such, I have developed an appreciation for the history and cultures of this Pacific island, understandings which came in useful during conversations with Victoria, my only Caledonian participant.

This insider position was valuable too in terms of being able to provide support to participants. For example, in Wellington I collected both Victoria and Hanna from the airport and spent some time with them upon arrival before taking them to their accommodation. I was able to offer course advice to all my French and Caledonian participants and offer my version of a New Zealand interpretation to some cultural elements they found confusing (the bus system, the 'lack of' heating in houses, coffee terminology, the 'thick' Kiwi accent, etc.). I often found myself in the position of 'expert', explaining New Zealand's history and the significance of the Māori culture, for example. In Paris, too, I met Viv at the airport (Persephone was being met by Athena, and I met them both at Persephone's accommodation), and was able to provide useful support in response to their questions about administrative procedures (purchasing public transport cards and opening bank accounts, for example). Drawing on my time spent as a French teacher (in New Zealand and England) and my time spent living in France, I was also able to provide help with the French language and offer perspectives on 'cultural norms' when my participants came to me with questions. I found these discussions had an important function in that collectively, we were able to problematise categories (such as being 'French') and cast a critical lens on cultural or language elements that may have appeared quite static. These moments provided a platform from which to continually reflect, adding a valuable critical edge to my ethnographic grounding.

3.3 Data Sources

In line with the theoretical underpinnings (outlined in chapter 2) and my desire to engage with the complexities involved in using language to construct identities, I chose a layered methodology. The incorporation of diverse data sources is also relevant given that researchers are increasingly "being challenged to provide a warrant for their interpretations" (Marra, 2012, p. 5). This layered methodological design not only provides valuable support for interpretations, but captures the participants' journeys within a framework of multivocality. I begin by detailing the linguistic elements of the data collection, then those that fall under the ethnographic umbrella, though there is of course significant overlap.

3.3.1 Naturally-Occurring Interactional Data

To capture the intricate processes of emergent identities in study abroad settings, there is a need to analyse what participants actually do with their language, rather than rely solely on what they say they do, a practice seen as ‘dangerous’ given the reliance on compiling inner thoughts as ‘evidence’ (see e.g. Morgan & Clarke, 2011, p. 830). That is not to say that there is no place for ‘inner thoughts’ or reflection, but rather that we can enhance the value of such reflections with other sources of data. Recordings and transcription of naturalistic interactions with a focus on the unfolding, dynamic properties of identity negotiations enable us to ‘freeze’ certain moments in the interaction, zoom in for depth, and accordingly draw insights.

To this end, naturally occurring interactional data are an integral part of the linguistic data collection for both phases of my study (e.g. Meadows, 2009, 2010; Menard–Warwick, 2009b; Menard-Warwick, 2014; Pomerantz, 2008). Going beyond the researcher/participant interview and reliance on participants’ perspectives has, as already outlined in chapter 1, been strongly recommended to add rigour to qualitative study abroad research (see Kinginger, 2013). In this vein, I collected data in interactional contexts that include other people of significance for participants (to be detailed below), allowing for a better understanding of the dynamic, co-construction of identities across contexts. In this methodological choice I align with Block's (2015) call for this type of data as a way to enrich understandings of the dialectic relationship between identity and second language acquisition (which I would extend to ‘language’ in general).

Collection of this naturally occurring data was entirely participant-led and in line with my commitment to “research with” (Roberts, 2003) my participants. In this sense, I followed the successful and influential data collection processes pioneered by the Language in the Workplace team in New Zealand (see Holmes & Stubbe, 2015 for an overview), which meant that the collection of the recordings was in the hands of participants themselves; they had complete control over the decisions around recording - who to record with, what and how often to record, and indeed when to delete should they so wish. This meant that data collection of naturally occurring interactions was different in each case, with some participants making many recordings and others only one or two. In each case, I was grateful to receive their recordings which they passed on to me via secure email.

To facilitate this process and minimise intrusion on participants’ lives, it was decided to use audio, rather than video recordings. Video recordings have been used with much success in contexts such

as workplace meetings (see Holmes et al., 2011; Holmes & Stubbe, 2003, 2015), where it is possible to leave equipment set up in the same position for a number of days. Logistically, however, there would have been difficulties in my research contexts. Setting up video equipment in tutorial settings and then promptly taking it down before the next class not only presented practical difficulties, but also conflicted with my decision to remove myself from these recording contexts so as to avoid a perceived power imbalance coming into play. Other contexts selected by participants (such as university cafes or libraries) would also not have been conducive to video recording, both for logistical and ethical reasons, given the possibility of recording others who had not expressly given consent. These concerns around confidentiality and anonymity (see Yakura, 2004) and the relative ease of audio recording meant that ultimately this latter method was selected. In sum, I wanted to hand over ‘creative control’ to the participants with the least amount of disruption possible. Most participants decided to use their own phones to record with rather than the recording device I had offered them. The following excerpt is taken from field notes on March 3rd, 2016 and refers to the interactions recorded between one of my key participants, Victoria, and her friend Penny.

Penny also suggested that they use their phones to record as they are used to having their phones with them all the time and would perhaps make it easier to ‘forget’ they are recording themselves. Great idea!

Participants invariably commented on the ease of use and also, importantly, on the non-intrusive nature of this choice. As they remarked, having a phone with you or on the table in front of you is now common practice and, as such, lessens the occurrence of any potential conversational ‘awkwardness’ arising from recording. While the beginnings (and sometimes the ends) of recordings were at times marked by an explicit recognition of being recorded (usually through a direct greeting to me), this awareness appeared to disappear in all cases after a few minutes, a finding common to sociolinguistic studies using audio or video recording (Holmes et al., 2011; Holmes & Stubbe, 2015; Holmes & Woodhams, 2013; Stubbe & Ingle, 1999).

Originally, the idea of capturing naturally occurring interactions was intended to gather information on participants’ interactions with a ‘language buddy’¹⁶ and in a tutorial setting (i.e.

¹⁶ The language buddy programme is a type of language exchange (at the New Zealand university with which my study affiliates) where two university students spend time together having conversations in each other’s languages. Language practice, friendship, and cultural understandings are the main aims.

small group classroom) of the participant's choice. Similar contexts had proven important in terms of identity sites for the foreign government official participants in my Masters study (see Dawson, 2014), providing a useful platform on which to build. However, as the research design process advanced, it became clear that while a focus on interactions with language buddies and with classmates in tutorials did indeed provide rich and interesting sources of data, it was at the same time precluding other contexts of significance for participants. In other words, and in line with my commitment to participant empowerment, there was value in participants also selecting recording contexts (and interlocutors) of significance for them. In line with the role of co-researcher that my participants took on, they were also all well-versed in ethics procedures. Once they had selected somebody with whom they wanted to make recordings, and even in cases where consent had already been given, I made contact with this person (face to face or by email) to ensure that understandings were clear. I outline the different recording contexts in the following sections.

3.3.1.1 Tutorial Contexts

As mentioned above, the tutorial setting was selected at the outset of the data collection process, given existing applied linguistic research on the classroom as a key site for identity work (e.g. Norton & Toohey, 2001; Pomerantz, 2008). In terms of study abroad, literature has often been connected to the classroom (generally with a language acquisition focus, rather than social identity), but not necessarily anchored there. John Plews and Kim Misfeldt (2018) argue that the repeated call to investigate interactions outside of the classroom wrongly assumes we know what is going on inside the classroom. From a second language study abroad perspective, they insist rather that this is exactly the area that needs investigating. While this study's aims are not anchored in SLA, I agree that classroom identity negotiations have been underexplored in research, despite being a fruitful site (see e.g. Thomas, forthcoming, and her research into translanguaging practices in Tanzanian SA classrooms). I would emphasise, though, that the classroom is one of a range of settings in SA, and not the only place where identity work will happen. Given the exploratory nature of my study, I was interested in capturing interactions both inside and outside of the classroom, with a view to seeing what themes emerged. In terms of access, entrance to university classrooms had to be carefully negotiated, a process I summarise in the next sections.

In phase 1, the negotiation of recording in classrooms depended heavily on each participant, as well as my 'insider' status in this New Zealand university setting. I firstly asked each participant to choose a tutorial class they were enjoying. In the New Zealand university setting, tutorials generally occur once a week, as a supplement to the main lecture. They involve small groups of students

and aim to provide an opportunity for clarification and sometimes extension of lecture material, all reasons for which they were selected as a potential research site. In practice, this meant waiting until the participants had attended all of their tutorials (sometimes twice) before they knew their feelings about them. Upon selection, I made contact with the Course Coordinator and Tutor and scheduled a meeting to talk about my research and gauge the possibility of making small group recordings in class. In all cases, the ensuing discussion was valuable, and the recordings were agreed to in principle before the actual signing of forms a couple of days later (for which I thank the generosity of academic spirit that exists across Faculties at this institution). This step was followed by visiting tutorials and informing students about my research, ensuring that they were fully informed before deciding whether to participate. In line with the participant-led approach, the data collected in this particular setting differed in each case, with some participants recording more than others, and three participants preferring to opt out of this context. Tutorials selected included courses from Pacific Studies, Religious Studies, Sociology, Anthropology and Statistics.

Accessing classroom data in phase 2 (Paris) provided a different array of challenges, not least because I was coming from an ‘outsider’ position attempting to gain access to a prominent Paris university. While I was not deterred at potentially not having access to this setting (given the amount of other data that my phase 2 participants were providing me with), I was determined to try every avenue. Persephone selected her French language class (level B2 on the European framework) as a potential recording context in her Paris university setting. She felt as though she was going to learn a lot in this environment yet was often baffled by the teaching approach, which was much more traditional and teacher-centred than what she was used to in Wellington (see Excerpt 4.1). Practically speaking, however, the practices of the French language classroom did not involve small group work, and, as such, opportunities for recording were not readily available. In concrete terms, Persephone was able to make one recording in this setting, which involved giving an ‘exposé’ (a presentation) with a partner in French. My other key participants in Paris, Viv and Athena, chose not to select a classroom context for the same reasons (i.e. because of the paucity of group work).

Persephone was indispensable as a co-researcher in terms of gaining consent to record, and although the final amount of actual recorded data in this setting was minimal, the process itself was revealing in terms of the importance placed on formal processes, and the ‘closed’ space of the French classroom. The naturally occurring interactions in phase 2 then, mainly consist of discussions between my participants and their friends, language buddies, or acquaintances.

3.3.1.2 Recordings with Friends, Language Buddies, and Acquaintances

In line with my aims of going beyond a language learning lens in exploring identity experiences during study abroad, this context was crucial. The rationale for this context is strengthened by the fact that very little Study Abroad research systematically incorporates the perspectives of the people with whom the SA students interact (Kinging, 2013). The choice of recording with a language buddy, friend, or acquaintance was dependent on each participant. Again, the data collected varied per participant (in type and in amount¹⁷), with one participant making recordings with a language buddy, existing friends and new acquaintances, others making group ‘dinner’ recordings, one with a friend only, and three with a language buddy. Participants were asked to talk about whatever was ‘normal’ for them in that particular context, a deliberately broad starting point given the study’s aims. Recordings were made in a variety of places, again all decisions taken by participants. Specifically, recordings took place in cafés, in shared spaces at universities, at workplaces, at public parks, in friends’ homes, on trains, and in cars, and generally lasted between 20 minutes to an hour.

Interactional data on its own, however, is not enough to provide strong warrants for interpretations (see Holmes & Hazen, 2014; Marra, 2012 for approaches to warranting). Some scholars in SA also posit that use of such recordings necessitates a selectiveness in analysis of interactions, which misses out on breadth and totality of learners’ interactions (e.g. Bown, Dewey, & Kirk Belnap, 2015). In response, I argue that carefully selected interactions are revelatory for identity work (to reiterate my point made above), offering linguistic access to a social depth which cannot be gained through an approach focused on breadth. Further, in handing over full control to participants of what was recorded, this was an accepted bias from the outset. Provided that such episodes are justified in a rigorous manner, interactional snippets can indeed stand alone for analytical purposes, yet they are valuably strengthened by ethnographic support which allows analyses to be confidently situated. I describe below the components which made up this ethnographic approach in my study.

3.3.2 Ethnographic Interviews

As well as conducting interviews with key participants, I also interviewed tutors and language buddies where possible to capture other perspectives and to provide warrants for interpretations. In concrete terms, this involved talking to two of my participants’ tutors and two of their language

¹⁷ The total amount of interactional data was 17 hours

buddies. These interviews provided valuable ethnographic support and I refer to them in the analyses chapters where appropriate. Because of their support function, they are not, however, subject to the same detailed analyses as those interviews with key participants.

Theorising the interview is an important methodological consideration (e.g. Talmy & Richards, 2011) and I emphasise at the outset my conceptualisation of the research interview as “a legitimate interactional encounter” (De Fina & Perrino, 2011, p. 1). It is a co-constructed, discursive achievement (e.g. Blommaert & Jie, 2010; Talmy & Richards, 2011) between my participants and me, rather than a conduit to the ‘truth’, a perspective in line with my ontological and epistemological understandings. In the interests of accessing this co-construction of identity, I afforded analytic attention to the *hows* of the interview (Talmy & Richards, 2011, p.2), alongside the *whats*. I also conceptualise my interview style as *semi-structured*, in that I started with topic prompts and the freedom to explore certain lines of discussion as they arose or became salient for my participants (Corbin & Morse, 2003). Given the exploratory nature of my research (i.e. no a priori categories of interest established at the outset), there was a need for flexibility and to be able to ‘think on my feet’ within this loose structure, two important characteristics of ethnographic interviews (Heller et al., 2018, p. 91). Other core characteristics of ethnographic interviews I aligned with included an emphasis on listening well and with respect, developing an ethical engagement with participants at all stages and acknowledging dialogue as a site of discovery (Heyl, 2001), all aspects of which fed into my participant-focused approach.

These interview parameters provided useful methodological guidelines with room for movement. Flexibility was paramount given the differences in participants’ experiences, not to mention the different relationships and norms that were developed with each participant. The practical application of these guidelines was dynamic, and as such, merits some reflexive attention. As the rapport between my participants and me grew, the term ‘semi-structured interview’, and even ‘interview’ itself, began to feel inappropriate. I found myself implicitly acknowledging this in the scare quotes I used around ‘interview’ when arranging meetings with participants, and more generally, preferring the more informal term ‘chats’, as this is the shape they began to take. This is resonant of Blommaert & Jie’s (2010, p. 49) notion of interviews as *conversation*. I found myself (unintentionally at the time) heeding Blommaert & Jie’s (2010, p. 44) warning that behaving “like an interviewer” will encourage people to “behave like interviewees” and thus limit our ability to inspire naturally occurring conversation. Often, especially with participants with whom I had developed a particularly strong rapport, interviews moved squarely into the realm of naturally

occurring data, in that topics were often selected and developed by participants. My contributions were indicative of an active and engaged conversational participant, offering advice at times and reciprocal anecdotes of my own (cf. accommodation theory), which are perhaps not traditionally seen as having a place in semi-structured interviews yet pleasingly resulted in a more collaborative version of power relations (Cummins, 2000).

This approach allowed me to strike a comfortable balance between my converging roles as researcher, local ‘expert’, confidante, and friend. It privileged *authenticity* (Coupland, 2007, 2014) in that our recorded and non-recorded chats were very similar, which perhaps contributed to my participants’ willingness to openly engage in this part of the research process¹⁸. I am not saying that they told me every detail about their experience, or that I told them everything for that matter (and indeed this was not the point), but that our contributions were still full and frank within the contextual constraints and ‘limits of sincerity’ (de Beauvoir, 2011[1949]) within which we operate as social agents. So, while I will continue to use the general term ‘interview’ to talk about this data set, it is with the above caveats and crossovers in mind.

A final note on the key participant interview data involves language choice, a decision taken by participants in each case. Of the six French-speaking participants, only one, Hanna, preferred to speak in French, which had interesting implications in itself for the potential power asymmetry I was so keen to avoid whereby participants may feel they have reduced power. In other words, using my L2 gave me insights into how it might feel for a participant to have less control of the situation. Despite the linguistic challenges involved in conducting these interviews in French, there were also clear benefits. In my field notes from the 11th April 2016, I attempt to explore and reconcile this division:

¹⁸ The interview data set exceeded 25 hours

This situation seems to have pros and cons. While it is a constant reminder of my less-than-proficient language commands, I think it also allows her the freedom to express herself with the most clarity and to get at meaning that she wouldn't have otherwise been able to. Power relations are therefore more collaborative (Cummins, 2000) in that I affirm and encourage her choice of self-expression. There is also the added support of the recording device, which means that I'll be able to explore the parts I didn't grasp fully during the conversation. Importantly, it also mitigates the potential power discord in that my linguistic 'power' is clearly reduced when I am speaking French. In this way, she is able to draw on her 'French teacher' identity not only when telling me stories about her experiences but also when she corrects me. However, these moments of 'reduced power' from my end are indeed empowering for my participant, which appears to have importance for her identity projections at this point.

There are clear benefits in raising researcher awareness of this feeling of reduced power, leading as it does to greater participant understanding and appreciation. In moving so far from my linguistic comfort zone and deferring to Hanna's position as a language authority (Chen, 2011, p. 119), power dynamics were effectively flipped. I was now in the position of second language learner (cf. Revis, 2015), which allowed Hanna more freedom to lay claim to certain identities and to foreground her own embodied cultural capital (explored further in Chapters 4 and 5). This discussion of language choice connects to the areas of translation and transcription, both important methodological considerations.

3.3.2.1 Transcription and Translation

In terms of transcription, I used the established conventions of the Language and the Workplace Project (LWP) in New Zealand (see appendix F), which allowed for attention to the 'communicative how' in the level of attention accorded to micro features. The act of transcription is political in itself (Bucholtz, 2000) in that what I ultimately select to transcribe already contains my own biases (and recall my reflexive considerations in this respect). Elinor Ochs' (1979) argument of *transcription as theory* is also pertinent. It highlights transcription as a *representation* of the actual interaction, influenced by the researcher's thematic focus and the features chosen to represent this. Transcription is therefore the gateway to potentially many different 'realities'. Further, Celia Roberts (1997, p. 170) argues that transcribing interactions consists really of "transcribing people", a point which rang true in light of my participant-focused ethos. These points guided the selection and transcription process, reminding me to approach the selection

process with a reflexive eye and to carefully consider the data at hand (e.g. De Fina & Georgakopoulou, 2008). Making judicious decisions regarding the representation of my participants was at the forefront of these considerations, especially in view of the second language element of their exchanges (all analysis of discourse features was done on the original language). To this end, I follow Theresa Lillis and Mary Jane Curry (2010, p. 178) in maintaining as respectful an approach to transcription as possible and avoiding any conventions that may inadvertently stigmatise my participants. Where pronunciation/use of the L2 was viewed as socially marked in its original context, I decided to add this paralinguistic information in square brackets, often using a phrase I saw as non-judgemental such as ‘non-standard pronunciation’ or ‘grammatically non-standard’. Often, these non-standard usages did not have a noticeable effect on the interactional unfolding, and in such cases I chose not to include the paralinguistic information.

In the case of my data in French, the paralinguistic information is included in the French transcription and the English translation “accompanies the superior text, the transcript; it does not pretend it could replace it” (Belczyk-Kohl, 2016). While transcription translation is under-problematised in discourse analysis (see Belczyk-Kohl, 2016 for a discussion), there were certain decisions which resonated with my overall research aims. I choose to include ‘idiomatic’ (often termed ‘interpretation’) rather than literal (word-by-word) translations so as to emphasise the social and pragmatic meaning of my participants’ identity work, to foreground language at the interactional rather than structural level (Jenks, 2011). In the interest of consistency, I aim to give a sense of some non-standard aspects in the translation. Acknowledging the difficulty of this idiomatically-focused translation task and my newcomer status to the area of translation, transcript translations were checked by my French contact in Paris who has extensive experience in this area. Once transcribed (and translated where necessary), the transcripts were reviewed multiple times and compared with field notes and the general summary document I made at the outset.

3.3.3 Ethnographic Observations (‘Deep Hanging Out’)

I first heard the term *deep hanging out* used by Anthropology professor Brigitte Bönisch-Brednich in a seminar titled ‘What to do with stories’ at my university in May 2016. I thought it particularly apt in that it captured the manner in which I spent time with my participants. Initially, I had termed this ethnographic aspect ‘informal observation’, or ‘participant observation’ (Scollon, 1998), but I was doing more than observing. Spending time with participants involves an active and engaged commitment to developing relationships, a ‘deep’ engagement in their lives and experiences. It involves a lot of talking, asking, sharing stories, and crucially, support. In the initial stages of my

participants' stays in New Zealand and in France, I was able to help out with practicalities (such as opening bank accounts in Paris and explaining coffee terminology in Wellington, as mentioned earlier) and was an available ear when participants needed to talk. To give some other examples of the shape of this deep hanging out, as already mentioned I collected participants from airports (and Persephone actually dropped me at the airport to go to France, where I arrived two days before her), we had game nights and movie nights, we visited museums and other tourist attractions, I was invited to some of their parties, and we drank a lot of coffee together in cafés. While our difference in age undoubtedly affected the relationship, it is equally clear that we developed trust and confidence in one another. Most importantly, we enjoyed spending time together, and this was evidenced by the shared norm we developed of checking in on each other and suggesting regular catch ups. Friendships between participants also burgeoned and continued to deepen over the exchange periods, which was a pleasing side-effect of my research. They invited each other to parties, to an election get-together, and our brunch and coffee meet-ups regularly occurred in a group of four or five participants in the Wellington context (where French and New Zealand participants had cemented a particularly strong bond).

Roles began to overlap; while our relationships had started within clear roles of researcher/participant, friendships soon developed. At times, I almost forgot about my role as researcher, and at others, something would pique my academic interest and I would make a mental note to include this later in my field notes. These notes were useful in documenting and reflecting on the times we spent together, serving to track the development of relationships, as well as explore points of interest in each participant's trajectory. Participants and I also discussed these overlapping roles (as friends and as researcher/participant) and they were aware that 'hanging out' with them was indeed useful as regarded my overall appreciation of their experiences, but that, at the same time, these meetings did not constitute direct 'data'¹⁹. My experience leads me to agree wholeheartedly that research is an ongoing social relationship (Garner, Raschka, & Sercombe, 2006) and I would add that *deep hanging out* can enhance these social relationships so that they continue even after the research element has passed.

3.3.4 Tutorial Observations

Where possible, I also observed participants' tutorials in the Wellington setting (see reasons discussed above as regards the Paris setting). Again, this depended on participants' willingness to have me in their classroom, and also on the goodwill of the tutor/lecturer and the rest of the class.

¹⁹ Also, see Chapter 6 (section 6.3) where I return to this discussion.

In practical terms this meant that I was able to observe three of my six participants in their selected tutorial setting in Wellington. Observing the Religious Studies, Pacific Studies, and Sociology tutorials was a beneficial exercise; I was able to see how the classes ran, what form the tutor/student relationship took, and how the small group work element fitted into the overall session. As a non-participating observer (Adler & Adler, 2001) I was free to take notes on these aspects, as well as appreciating in each case the interesting content and the engaging delivery of the tutors. It was of particular interest to see the way my participants related to the content, their tutor, and their classmates. Observations such as this fed into my understandings of their identity experiences and allowed for valuable contextual cushioning not only for data collected in these contexts, but also for data collected in different settings.

3.3.5 Social Media: Facebook

The choice to include social media as part of data collection was made with its ubiquitous nature in mind (in developed countries at least). Social media and technology use in general has changed the nature of the SA experience in that SA students can now remain connected to home throughout their stays, making the most of multiple ways to communicate (Coleman & Chafer, 2010; Dressler & Dressler, 2016; Kinginger, 2010). They are no longer isolated from previous communities which had meaning for them, which has direct implications for notions of ‘immersion’ and whether students decide to embrace this idea (see e.g. Coleman & Chafer, 2010). An SLA perspective paints this as negative, as an ‘electronic umbilical cord’ (Kinger, 2010, 2011) preventing active engagement with host communities (and Persephone, in Chapter 4, provides interesting reflections on this). From a dynamic identity perspective, however, I conceptualise social media posts and interactions as crucial sites for identity work and positioning, rather than as an impediment to L2 learning.

Collecting data from social media has its own set of ethical considerations. Issues of privacy and consent were forefront when I took the decision to ask for access to view one social media account during participants’ time abroad, and to limit this request to an existing social media account (so as not to place any unnecessary demands on participants). This data collection channel was also conceptualised as supporting in that its purpose was to exemplify, scaffold, or provide contrast to the recorded interactional data. Only posts that fulfilled these requirements and had analytic salience were included in the thesis. I would regularly view participants’ Facebook posts and, where analytic interest was piqued, I added the post and the date to the particular participant’s ‘notes’ document where I collated information and reflections on each participant’s experiences. I also

made clear through use of labelling (e.g. nationality) how the post appeared to relate thematically to other data. For privacy reasons, I chose not to incorporate photos (though see Compiègne, 2017 for an excellent study using Facebook and Instagram photographs as the main data collection method) and to only include participants' posts as evidence of identity construction and positioning, rather than also include comments.

All of my participants are 'digital natives' (Prensky, 2001) and use a mix of platforms regularly. Interestingly, they all selected Facebook as the research platform of choice, which is not surprising given its ubiquity. 'Friending' me as per my request was beneficial in that I was also able to view their experience from another lens (and, indeed, they were able to view mine). Their posts allowed for glimpses into participants' self-positionings, into what they 'performed' and deemed important for their online audience at various times during their exchange (cf. Compiègne, 2017; Dressler & Dressler, 2016). The agentic aspect of this Facebook performance is intriguing and points to the differences in affordances and constraints when identity is constructed from a social media platform as opposed to 'on-the-ground' in interaction. Also in the realm of technology, some of my participants consented to my using email data (from emails between them and me), which provides both a valuable contrast and depth to interactional data.

3.3.6 Field Notes

Blommaert & Jie (2010, p. 1) note that "the 'field' is a chaotic, hugely complex place". One way in which I attempted to make sense of this complexity was to write regular field notes²⁰, drawing together the various elements of my data collection and writing in a more informal style which combined academic and non-academic elements. I explored my own emotions as the ethnographic data collection progressed, expressing frustration, joy, surprise and confusion at different points. I made these notes regularly throughout both phases of my study, detailing aspects which seemed analytically promising, concepts to explore, different interpretations, and links to relevant literature. Importantly, my field notes were a useful site for unfettered exploration, serving at the time the dual purpose of valuable outlet and recorded document of my own "journey through knowledge" (Blommaert & Jie, 2010, p.10). This journey was particularly evident in regular revisitings of my field notes during analysis when I was able to compare my thoughts at the data collection stage with their current form. As such, they were an indispensable part of my overall commitment to ethnography.

²⁰ In concrete terms, I wrote regular field notes for each participant and had a separate document entitled Researcher Musings. Field notes differed in length; as examples, Persephone's are 64 pages long and Hugo's are 35 pages.

All of these data channels inform the layered methodology, yielding an extremely rich data collection which provides excellent evidence of how identities are co-constructed in different spaces and with different interlocutors for my participants during their time abroad. Emerging identities are captured in interactions between my participants and a variety of interlocutors, including myself. These interactions allow access to both the linguistic fine-grain and the wider Discourses and ideologies which are part of the process of identity construction. Themes are able to be explored across contexts and across participants, including understandings of each participant's unique intersectional identity experiences. Because of the sheer bulk of data, the process of noting emerging themes and the accompanying selection of data has been paramount. Although it is impossible to use all of the data in my thesis, what I have selected is highly relevant to my participants' experiences and to my academic aim of advancing and problematising the study of identity in study abroad settings (as I outline below). Just how these many channels were explored and analysed is detailed in the following section.

3.4 Process of Analysis

3.4.1 A Note on Transitions

Most of the data analysed is from the first half (and sometimes the first few weeks) of students' exchanges. This is not entirely surprising given that these early stages have been found to result in the most identity struggles (e.g. Hechanova-Alampay, Beehr, Christiansen, & Horn, 2002; Patron, 2007). Capturing these *transitions* (cf. Angouri, Marra, & Holmes, 2017) to the new settings was initially a key methodological consideration and indeed fed into my decision to be in Paris for the first six weeks of participants' exchanges. However, precisely because of the continued connectivity experienced by SA participants today, and the strong participant focus of my study, I remained in close contact with all participants throughout the duration of their exchanges. In some cases, they also continued to send me data after they 'needed' to. On top of this, I had final interviews with all participants in phase 1 in Wellington and interviews with Viv and Persephone upon their return to New Zealand (as well as ongoing regular catch ups). While I was in France collecting data for phase 2, I was also fortunate to spend time with Hanna (from phase 1) at her family home while she was on holiday from university. This resulted in a holistic picture of my participants' experiences, providing valuable warrants for interpretations. It also meant that I was able to access some of this data to make comparisons (where analytically relevant), without portraying my participants' identity journeys in a neat, linear line. To this end, the concept of *transitions* appeared too static in the assumption of moving from one point to another and the

realisation that ‘transition periods’ were indeed ongoing, dynamic, and different for all participants. For these reasons, the concept remains on the periphery in my analysis, and at the same time, remains an exciting avenue for future research and concept building.

3.4.2 Data Selection

Such an abundant data set entails decisions around selection and choice of thematic avenues to pursue. Here, the epistemic process as described by Blommaert & Jie (2010) of writing field notes was invaluable; as I read and re-read my field notes, obscurity turned into potential threads for preliminary analyses. I was interested in capturing “rich points” (Agar, 1996; Blommaert & Jie, 2010), or rather elements of surprise and promise to be used as portals to access the underlying workings of identity negotiations. At times, these rich points leapt off the page, and at others, the significance only revealed itself after rigorous reflection. Hypotheses were formed, elaborated on, and sometimes discarded; yet slowly, and at times unexpectedly, a picture of identity co-construction in all its complex fluidity emerged.

The staggered nature of my data collection meant that I was able to listen several times to the recordings as they came in. Participants would send their recordings to me and I would listen immediately, asking any questions if I needed clarification. I filed the recordings securely and summarised each recording as an initial step, noting themes and interesting points in a master document (which also included details such as dates, times, places, length of recordings). As well as being a wise investment of time (Blommaert & Jie, 2010, p. 68), this served as a reminder as to what to transcribe in more depth later on, and meant that I was able to see patterns occurring across my wider participant pool. The labels I added included particular social identities which appeared salient, as well as concepts such as *capital* and *affective stance*. For the most part, items were coded to multiple labels, which I bolded for ease of reading, allowing for relatively quick scanning when it came to choosing particular episodes for further transcription and analysis. Analysis itself was recursive (Bazeley & Jackson, 2013; Copland & Creese, 2015), reflective, and highly immersive, proceeding from general to specific (e.g. Creswell & Miller, 2000; Silverman, 2011).

I would emphasise that ‘relevance’ was never conceptualised as static; what counted as relevant changed as I grew into my researcher role and accumulated more conceptual, theoretical, and analytical understanding, fitting the iterative approach to analysis itself (e.g. Copland & Creese, 2015). Importantly, it also changed as my relationship with participants grew. With this in mind, I

aimed at finding a balance between what seemed of relevance to my participants and what seemed relevant to my analyst's eye (and my own researcher subjectivities, as mentioned above). In this sense, there was a blending of the emic and etic even at this early stage in that I stayed close to the participant perspective but drew on my role as analyst at the same time. This constant navigation between the two perspectives enriched the selection and analysis processes in that they allowed me to capture not only complexity but sometimes contradictions (cf. Victoria, 2011).

Some decisions were difficult to make. It was difficult not to feature some of my participants as much as others, yet in the interests of cohesion and establishing thematic connections, this was a necessary decision. I do, however, draw on their experience to provide comparison where appropriate (e.g. Viv's and Athena's experiences of sexual harassment in Paris (chapter 5) provides an interesting comparison to that of Persephone, and I draw on the experiences of Jules, Pierre and Félix to contrast with Hugo's experience (chapter 5) and to provide support to Hanna's focus on 'correct' French (chapter 4). Ultimately, though, in opting for depth rather than breadth came the realisation that I would never be able to include all of my data²¹.

While participants were negotiating many salient identities on exchange, the significance of nationality, ethnicity, gender and sexuality became clear from the beginning (and I acknowledge my own feminist stance and commitment to social justice here), and continued to demonstrate salience throughout the data collection. Once these themes were established, I was able to search through data for evidence of the ways in which these were being negotiated. The layered methodology was extremely useful, both in terms of warranting interpretations and in furnishing the case studies with richness and depth. In this sense, I was able to zoom in on interactional episodes without losing sight of the real people at the heart of them and the social processes they were part of.

3.5 Summary

The overall methodological stance I take in my study places participants at the forefront of all considerations. I adopted an ethnographic approach throughout the data collection process and employed a critical lens (in terms of reflexivity and awareness of power differences) to add depth.

²¹ I remain extremely grateful to all my participants, even those who do not feature prominently in analysis. Getting to know them certainly enhanced my overall data collection and understanding of the various ways one can experience study abroad. Their stories are very much worth telling, and I look forward to turning my analytic gaze to this in the near future in the ongoing dissemination of my findings beyond this thesis.

My approach is operationalised in analysis through IS, and I describe myself reflexively in my two research contexts of Wellington and Paris. I detailed the processes involved in participant recruitment and discussed the various components of the layered methodology which made up my data collection and provided valuable support. Within this, I paid particular attention to detailing participant/researcher relationships given these were a crucial element of my ethnographic approach. Attention was also given to the important components of translation and transcription, both of which can be viewed as political, and have ramifications for the portrayal of my participants. In moving now to the analysis chapters, I show how these methodological and analytical decisions play out in practical terms, bringing an empirical focus to the fore.

Chapter 4: Nationality and Ethnicity

This chapter explores the identity categories of nationality and ethnicity through the experiences of Hanna, Victoria, and Persephone. National identity was a salient social identity for all of my participants during their exchanges and was more or less marked at different points. As an example, *Frenchness* was foregrounded strongly for Hugo, Pierre, Jules, and Félix during the 14th July Nice terror attacks in 2016; these events were felt keenly by all and their feelings were no doubt exacerbated by being away from their friends and families in a time of national mourning. They dealt with this in different ways, yet what was clear was that their Frenchness and common beliefs served as prominent identity markers and enhanced a much-needed feeling of solidarity during this time. The French elections too, in 2017, were another occasion when these participants foregrounded their overlapping French and political identities, arguing passionately about the merits of the political candidates and their visions for France. On a few occasions, Persephone (who laid claim to her own informed political identity) and I were with the four boys drinking coffee when these conversations ignited. If we had begun in English, this topic change was a sure trigger for rapid French to occur, something that both Persephone and I found captivating and challenging to our language skills at the same time. Hugo, Pierre, Félix, and Jules drew on their shared knowledge, and their shared French experiences as politically engaged young people. Frenchness – while experienced differently by each of them – was key in their bonding. There are many instances in my data where nationality is directly indexed in ways such as this. This chapter focuses on the experiences of Hanna, Victoria, and Persephone as mentioned above. Their data is very different yet there are connecting threads, as I make clear throughout this chapter. Importantly, their data extends the scope of discussions on nationality and ethnicity in the existing SA literature by including a focus on ideologies and the connected concept of cultural capital. I begin the chapter with a brief review of study abroad literature, showing how nationality has been treated, and using this as a platform from which to explore further.

4.1 Nationality in Study Abroad Literature

Perhaps unsurprisingly, nationality is firmly established in the literature as a salient identity category during study abroad. As for anyone transitioning into new national contexts and encountering different sociocultural norms, study abroad students often face struggle and it is unsurprising that “national identity emerges as a subject position trumping all others when a student’s sense of self is thrown into crisis” (Block, 2007a, p. 170). In his book on second language identities David Block

(2007a) devotes a chapter to the study abroad context, noting common themes across the literature. These include the rarity of the ‘negotiation of difference’ (between the sociocultural norms and Discourses encountered in the host setting and those the students bring with them) in study abroad contexts, which Block claims is necessary for the emergence of foreign language-mediated identities. It is argued that, in the face of ‘threats’ to their habitus and preferred identities (through exposure to unfamiliar practices or beliefs), students recoil into discourses of national superiority rather than reflecting on their own identity constitution and unproblematic orientation to preferred Discourses (see e.g. Block, 2007a; Kinginger, 2013). The heightened relevance of national identity in the SA literature is often linked to students’ gender identities and exposure to norms they struggle to make sense of (Isabelli-Garcia, 2006; Kinginger, 2008; Kinginger & Farrell-Whitworth, 2005; Polyani, 1995; Talburt & Stewart, 1999; Twombly, 1995). As an example, Christina Isabelli-Garcia (2006) qualifies some of her participants’ reported negative attitudes in her Argentine-based study as instantiating a default ‘superior’ American national identity, one which she describes as ‘patronising’ and ‘hegemonic’ in nature. Problematising these findings somewhat, Celeste Kinginger’s (2004, 2008) rich case study of Alice outlines her non-linear and dynamic trajectory whilst on exchange in France, which involved the powerful pull of an imagined community (being ‘French’), and a reinvention of herself as cosmopolitan and multilingual. We also gain insights into the importance of intersectional qualities in Alice’s journey, with the interstices of gender, class and age being foregrounded. The analysis highlights that not all North American students retreat into and remain in these discourses of national superiority.

While the literature has focused disproportionately on the experiences of North American students (e.g. Block, 2007a; Kinginger, 2004, 2008; Shively, 2011; Wilkinson, 1998), this tendency towards feelings of superiority is by no means their sole preserve (see Kinginger, 2013). This is exemplified by Patron’s (2007) study of French exchange students in Australia, who see the practices they encounter in their Australian contexts as ‘deficient’ in view of their ingrained French habitus and expectations around ‘flirtation’. Elizabeth Murphy-Lejeune’s (2002, pp. 184–188) longitudinal European study investigated the experiences of three groups of mobile students (taking part in ERASMUS, assistantships, and a business school programme) and found that there was a common tendency to come together in country groups, particularly in the early stages of the period abroad. Jane Jackson’s (2010) study, involving Hong Kong Chinese exchange students in Britain similarly demonstrates a propensity for participants to access Discourses of national superiority. This finding was particularly marked in the initial stages of the short-term sojourn (also see Murphy-Lejeune, 2002). Jackson notes, however, that upon return to their home environment, reflections

from her four focus participants were all different; some expressed their even stronger feelings of being Chinese or a Chinese Hong Konger while another “embraced hybridity and change” (Jackson, 2010, p. 189). This is a useful finding in terms of the emphasis on heterogeneity of experience and there are clear implications for models which propose ‘standard’ stages of (intercultural or identity) development during study abroad. It is clear that categories leak.

What much of this literature has in common is the assumption that language learning is the main aim of all study abroad students and that movement towards and ‘immersion’ in the host culture is a concomitant expectation (see e.g. Wolcott, 2013). Viewed from a sociolinguistics of globalisation (Blommaert, 2010) these assumptions immediately raise questions in their treatment firstly of culture as a monolithic entity and secondly in the idea that immersion remains an unproblematic, feasible option (see Jackson, 2010). As Coleman (2013b) has shown, the overall study abroad experience involves significantly more than language learning (though this is still one of the main aims of the majority of students), and access to the revered ‘immersion experience’ is becoming much less achievable (as outlined in chapter 1). Another area of commonality is the reliance on data of a reflective nature. Diary entries and interviews play an important role in accessing participants’ feelings and accounts of self-and other-positioning experienced whilst on study abroad. At the same time, there is enticing room to engage with more complexity around national identity during study abroad.

This chapter harnesses this potential by including participants’ reflections, without relying on them alone. By combining interview data with interactional data between participants and friends, as well as Facebook posts and an ethnographic approach in general, a more complex picture begins to emerge, one which problematises the tendency to essentialise students as uniform representatives of their countries. We see the struggle involved in having desired identities ratified and the effects of both reflexive and interactive positioning in these struggles. For some, making a claim to a national identity involves navigating one’s inscribed ‘ethnic’ identity and their dynamic relationship to this aspect. Negotiations are imbued with surrounding Discourses and ideologies as well as cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1977a, 1986, 1991) and habitus (Bourdieu, 1977a, 1991), all complex social concepts which add analytical depth. This chapter therefore builds on study abroad literature in the area of national identity by offering a more nuanced and multivocal approach, one which embraces discursive complexity and dialogic properties as part of dynamic identity co-construction.

To acknowledge this conceptual depth, I first discuss the construct of national identity before empirically exploring this through Hanna's case study. I then build on the concept of national identity by introducing the relevance of ethnic identity as a construct, explored through the experiences of Victoria in Wellington and Persephone in Paris. I pay particular attention to the role of habitus as well as the wider Discourses and associated ideologies that structure my participants' identity negotiations in their study abroad contexts. At the end of the chapter I show how cultural capital is tightly woven into the fabric of ideologies around nationhood in particular and how it functions as an important part of the positioning process. I also argue that, for Persephone and Victoria, the experience of being an ethnic minority member of predominantly white country groups (New Zealand and New Caledonia, respectively) adds an extra level of complexity and reflexivity to negotiations.

4.2 Nationality and National Identities

As explained in chapter 3, identities from a poststructural lens are co-constructed and performed in different contexts, informed by existing discursive frameworks yet always dynamic and in flux. John Plews (2015) emphasises that poststructural conceptualisations go against popular opinions of identity which view identities as more fixed, noting that "one such apparently stable label is national identity, which is indexed to an ethnic bloodline, place of birth and socialisation, geopolitical borders, a standard language, a flag and figurehead, a single historical trajectory and so on" (pp.281-282). A useful middle ground is found in Ruth Wodak et al's (1999, p. 28) conceptualisation of national identity as a type of Bourdieusian habitus, "a complex of common or similar *beliefs* or *opinions* internalised in the course of socialisation ... and of common or similar *emotional attitudes* as well as common or similar *behavioural dispositions*". As discussed in Chapter 2, the ongoing constitution of habitus lends itself to durability. Thus, it is often perceived as static and fixed, especially when there are commonalities and similarities across large populations, as is the case with national identities. In New Zealand, for example, 'defining' characteristics of egalitarianism and ingenuity are widely cited in public and the media (see e.g. Holmes et al., 2017; Woodhams, 2015) and in France notions of being refined and being part of a global elite are seen as defining characteristics of a typical French person (see e.g. Kinginger, 2016). Yet, as our experiences accumulate, our habitus has the potential to change, affecting the resources (linguistic and otherwise) we have at our disposal to enact identities. A national identity does not 'exist' but is, rather, "generated and reproduced through discourse" (Wodak et al, 1999, pp.186-187), a conceptualisation echoed by Billig (1995, p. 96) who terms national identity "an ongoing project" reproduced in banal interaction.

The concept of nations as *imagined* adds theoretical weight to this discussion. One's national identity can take the form of an (immediate or future) imagined community to move towards or discursively draw on in identity construction (Anderson, 1991; Meadows, 2010; Norton, 2000, 2001; Wenger, 1998). As described in Chapter 2, the term *imagined community* was originally coined by Anderson (1991) and referred to nationhood as an abstract concept that exists only in our imaginations (different for everybody despite shared experience). The concept has had rigorous uptake in applied linguistics, notably in Bonnie Norton's work on immigrant language learners in Canada. Norton's conceptualisation goes beyond the construct of nation to include any "desired community that offers possibilities for an enhanced range of identity options in the future" (Norton, 2010, p. 355). The idea of aspiring to become part of a less tangible community allows for more nuanced understandings of identity and language learning (Kanno & Norton, 2003), and is highly applicable to study abroad (as in the above example of Alice in Kinginger's 2004 study). In terms of national identities, however, my data shows evidence of the salience of the immediate form of imagined communities. Rather than seek to "expand [their] range of possible selves" (Kanno & Norton, 2003, p. 246) through movement towards their imagined host nations, I show how my participants mobilise the Discourses and understandings associated with both their 'imagined' home countries and their 'imagined' host countries. These Discourses and understandings act as resources and serve to generally advance their bids for identity ratification or to provide support for reflections on their experiences.

Globalisation affects the construction of (imagined) national identities, emphasising our connections across borders. National and transnational identity constructions gain complexity in a globalised world, a concept investigated in depth in Wodak (2012) as well as Jackson's (2010) work on 'residence abroad' and intercultural journeys. Jackson emphasises the cultural dimension of globalisation as a powerful force shaping the world today, and adopts Inda & Rosaldo's (2008, p. 9) depiction of globalisation as:

spatial-temporal processes, operating on a global scale that rapidly cut across national boundaries, drawing more and more of the world into webs of interconnection, integrating and stretching cultures and communities across space and time, and compressing our spatial and temporal horizons

As described in Chapter 1, traditional assumptions about study abroad can no longer capture transnational, multilingual individuals in a globalised world (see e.g. Duff, 2015). The effects of globalisation are also tied to the World Wide Web, and Coleman (2015, p. 40) argues that the *dépaysement* which used to characterise the immersion experience is “far less sharp for today’s sojourners, amidst global brands”. It is important, therefore, to acknowledge that national identities do not exist in neatly bounded packages cut off from all external influence, however sedimented in cultural consciousness they may have become. I turn now to my participants, whose data provides a bridge from the above theoretical considerations to how these play out in practice. Examining participants’ experiences of negotiating nationality shines light on the many ways in which this comes to be a prioritised category in study abroad, adding valuable nuance to existing SA findings.

4.2.1 Case study 1: Hanna in Wellington – ‘French Teacher’ Identity

I begin with Hanna, whose instantiations of national identity were salient in her interactions throughout her exchange. As I demonstrate, she aligns with the existing literature in that Discourses of national superiority were often foregrounded in her interactions, though not in any conscious way. From the beginning, Hanna’s national identity as French emerged as central through a discursive commitment to a French teacher identity, particularly in sessions with her language buddy Michael. It is also of note that she amassed several language buddies quickly, pointing to the recognised status French has as a world language (cf. Revis, 2015). I found this intriguing in my role as researcher and made the following comment in my field notes on the 11th April 2016, accompanied by a margin comment about the role of ideologies infiltrating Hanna’s micro instantiations:

I find it very interesting that her ‘French teacher’ identity crosses over into so many of her interactions, and recounting of experiences – with me, Michael, her new boyfriend, with her Kiwi friend in France, with Victoria even. She enacts this identity differently in each of these contexts but the objective appears to remain the same.

Data provides compelling evidence of Hanna using the French language and other aspects of Frenchness in her interactions as a way to position herself and gain interactional footing. I should also note at this point that Hanna’s trajectory over one trimester involved a progressive distancing from what she perceived to be the New Zealand culture, spurred it would seem by the break up

with her Kiwi boyfriend (further explored in Chapter 5). A strong thread that ran throughout Hanna's musings on the differences between New Zealand and France was that France had 'real' social problems and people were socially engaged and aware (exemplified by Hanna in the number of manifestations (protests) in France). For her, this stood in direct contrast to New Zealand, which she came to characterise negatively as a place where nothing ever happened. While her (imagined) national identity as French is rarely directly indexed, it emerges in the ideologies and Discourses that informed her identity work. Through this, her commitment to 'Frenchness' and the French language is clearly 'heard'. Her data allows insights into the many ways national identity emerges and is co-constructed as salient whilst on study abroad. The following extracts explore a particularly powerful way this happened for Hanna – through her commitment to a 'French teacher' identity.

Hanna and Michael – Conversational data

Week 6 Wellington

As language buddies, Hanna and Michael would meet regularly in a popular open space for students on the university campus where Hanna would 'teach' Michael French. Their interactions show evidence of a developing brother-sister type of rapport in the amount of teasing and laughing (generally when they are speaking in English), which is tempered with a power imbalance when interactions are primarily in French²². The recording from which excerpt 1 is taken is one hour and eleven minutes long, typical of the length of their sessions. Michael told me in an interview separately that he found these language buddy sessions more draining when Hanna was in "correction mode", which as the data shows, was often. He felt more at ease when they talked about "real life" topics such as Hanna's break-up with her boyfriend, where he felt he could offer support (and move into the use of English without repercussions). Despite his frustration, he would still heavily co-construct her teacher identity by bringing along his French journal to their meetings and asking for explicit correction. In the context of such correcting, this particular excerpt occurs immediately after Michael reads aloud a sentence from his journal: *Je suis allée boire du vodka* (*I went to drink vodka*) with an extra 'e' in *allée* (indicating a feminine subject).

²² It is important to note, however, that there was significant evidence of translanguaging during the interactions whereby both Hanna and Michael made the most of their full linguistic repertoires in order to achieve meaning.

Excerpt 1

19.13 – 19.41

1. Hanna: et non non [admonishing tone]: mais t'es une fille ou t'es un garçon:
and no no [admonishing tone]: but are you a girl or a boy:
2. Michael: mm? sorry err
3. Hanna: il y a pas de 'e' il y a pas de 'e' pas de deuxième 'e' + il faut voilà
there's no 'e' there's no 'e' no second 'e' + you have to there we go
4. comme ça c'est + [annoyed tone]: il faut que tu réfléchisses
like that it's + [annoyed tone]: you have to think about it
5. à chaque fois qu'il y a un verbe il y a un truc qui commence
each time there's a verb there's a thing that starts
6. qui finit par 'é' réfléchis + est-ce que c'est pluriel
that ends in 'e' think about it + is it plural
7. est-ce qu'il y a un verbe 'être' est-ce qu'il y a un verbe 'avoir'
that ends in 'e' think about it + is it plural is there the verb 'être' is there the verb 'avoir'
8. est-ce que c'est pluriel est-ce que c'est féminin +
is it plural is it feminine +
9. à chaque fois c'est comme ça ++
each time it's like that ++
10. si tu ne réfléchis pas ça ne fonctionne pas le français:
if you don't think about it French doesn't work:

Like many of the interactions between Hanna and Michael, Hanna immediately assumes the role of teacher, drawing on ideologies common in France about what constitutes a 'good' teacher (also captured in Persephone's data). Hanna responds immediately to Michael's 'mistake'; he has read his entry aloud while she is simultaneously reading the page. Her direct question - *et non non mais t'es une fille ou t'es un garçon/and no no but are you a girl or a boy* - (line 1), is almost latched to Michael's preceding utterance. The speed of the utterance combined with an admonishing tone serves to immediately lay claim to a relative position of power through the instantiation of this particular version of a teacher identity. Hanna's utterance is replete with ideological associations, which have attached themselves to common-sense understandings of the French language including the notion that mastering the grammar of the language is indexical to intelligence or sophistication (and I elaborate on this throughout the chapter). The fact that one's gender identity cannot be disentangled from the written form has interesting overlaps with ideologies of gender

and the enforcement of the male/female dichotomy (treated in depth in Chapter 5). For Michael, the illocutionary effect may involve not only feelings of linguistic deficiency but also of having his masculinity questioned, an aspect of his identity which he often foregrounded. His switch to English on line 2 -*mm? sorry err* - relays his confusion, the tone also hinting at his comprehension that he is being admonished.

Hanna's ensuing long turn (accompanied by an exasperated tone) continues her admonishment in detail, outlining prescriptive considerations to take into account when one uses a past participle which may need to be gendered or pluralised. The idea of 'reflecting' (*réfléchir*, used on lines 4, 6, and 10) is emphasised as an important part of the process of using the French language 'correctly'. Her final assertion on line 10 - *si tu ne réfléchis pas ça ne fonctionne pas le français/if you don't think about it French doesn't work* - makes this point explicitly, endowing the French language with a status which serves to accentuate the embodied cultural capital she brings to this encounter (an idea I return to in the Discussion). Hanna exercises her epistemic rights (Heritage & Raymond, 2005) as a French person by emphasising the grammatical intricacies one 'must' consider, giving examples of the constant reflection required (lines 5-10). French is thus emphatically portrayed as requiring ongoing thought and analysis, not as something to be used purely for communicative purposes, but rather to master. In so doing, one will presumably gain the status associated with speaking and writing French 'properly', and thereby increase the likelihood of being 'heard' in interactions, with the implied result being a useful symbolic capital for future deployment.

The general aim of the language buddy programme is to practise communicating in both partners' languages, and while Michael and Hanna spoke in both English and French, they created a clear linguistic divide in the respective interactional norms. Hanna's reflexive positioning as 'French teacher' is discursively accepted by Michael yet never mirrored by him when they speak in English (which in general shows more attention to relational aspects of communication, and the 'knowing' or 'mastery' of English is not accorded importance). This seems to point to the cultural and historical differences in understandings of what constitutes 'good' language teaching. Hanna's identity as 'French teacher' is not a solitary performance and other data from Hanna and Michael's earlier interactions demonstrate the importance of co-construction. Their intersubjective achievement is not without a level of struggle, however, especially for Michael who appears torn by competing Discourses. The following excerpts illustrate his discursive 'buy in' to this rule-focused method of learning French and his simultaneous affective stances which indicate a level of subtle questioning. All excerpts occur in the same recording from week 2 of Hanna's exchange.

Hanna and Michael – Conversational Data

Week 2 Wellington

This recording lasted for just over 53 minutes and was made in the same popular open space for university students on campus. One of Hanna's classmates, Ashley, joins the conversation at times, much to the chagrin of Hanna, arguably because it takes the language back to English and undermines her efforts to maintain the use of French in the interaction. Much of the recording involves Hanna performing her 'French teacher' identity and explaining grammar rules to Michael which he has described as *very useful* whilst at the same time making clear how tired he is feeling as a result. This mention of tiredness may well be intended as a move to end the teaching component of their session yet is not taken up by Hanna who continues with a lengthy (and at times exasperated) grammatical explanation (intended to provide a foolproof way to decide whether or not one should use the infinitive or past participle for 'er' verbs). Hanna has just asked Michael to say the following phrase on line 1 as part of the teaching of this 'rule':

Excerpt 2

36.20 – 36.46

1.	Michael:	Jacques va vendre une voiture + oui
Jacques is going to sell a car + yes
2.	Hanna:	ça se dit
can we say this
3.	Michael:	Jacques va vendu + une voiture + non
Jacques is going to sold + a car + no
4.	Hanna:	d'accord donc tu mets
okay so you put
5.	Michael:	parce que that would mean that would be past
because that would mean that would be past
6.		+ and that doesn't work
7.	Hanna:	donc tu mets ++ comment tu accordes
so you put ++ how do you make the verb agree
8.	Michael:	++ 'er'
9.	Hanna:	++ super
10.	Michael:	[surprised]: oh: + merci

Hanna's commitment to a traditional version of a French teacher identity is immediately evident in this excerpt. Her instantiations build on much of what comes earlier in the interaction where the 'rule' of whether to use the 'er' infinitive or the 'é' past participle is elaborated on in much detail and reproaches to Michael are regular (both for his language transgressions to English when he speaks to Ashley, and for his grammatical mistakes and lack of understanding). At this point, Michael provides evidence of uptake to Hanna's explanations through his acknowledgement of the correct version of the sentence on line 1 - *Jacques va vendre une voiture + oui* - and accompanying acknowledgement of the incorrect version on line 3 - *Jacques va vendu + une voiture + non*. Although Michael gives correct assessments of grammaticality, Hanna's habitus seemingly leads her to seek specificity. In other words, and in line with traditional methods of teaching French, the learner should not only be able to speak and write correctly but they should be able to understand (and articulate) their choices using specific grammatical vocabulary (cf. Estival & Pennycook, 2011). This appears to be what Hanna is eliciting through her questions - *ça se dit/can we say this* (line 2), *donc tu mets/so you put* (lines 4 and 7) and *comment tu accordes/how do you make the verb agree* (line 7). Michael's answer on line 8 - ++ 'er' - is offered after a two second pause, indicating perhaps his confusion (likely amplified by the fact that the 'rule' in question is related to 'er' verbs but the grammatical help involves using 'vendre', an 're' verb). Hanna's positive assessment of Michael's answer (*super* - line 9), is met with a surprised *oh: + merci/thank you* (line 10) by Michael, given that positive praise such as this was a rare occurrence in the data.

It is interesting to note that Hanna praises Michael at this particular point, given his more meta engagement with grammatical parameters earlier in the excerpt (see lines 5 and 6 where Michael extends his reasoning (aided by a switch to English) to include reference to tense, which arguably shows a deeper level of reasoning). It is only when Michael provides the exact answer, however, that praise is offered. This desire for specificity appears to be part of Hanna's commitment to 'black and white' and 'right and wrong', all regularly instantiated in her teacher identity with Michael (as well as occurring throughout other interactional and ethnographic data) through strong epistemological stances which foregrounded the supposed value of 'knowing' things. In this sense, Hanna's identity work begins to show the connections between embodied cultural capital and ideologies of what constitute 'proper' French. Interactionally, Michael plays an active role in co-constructing Hanna's French teacher identity. As we have just seen, he thanks her for her praise, and across all recorded interactions, he regularly asks her to check his journal and asks and answers decontextualised questions about grammar and vocabulary. As previously mentioned, this was not

without a level of struggle on his part. While Michael appeared to ratify this particular version of a French teacher identity, discursively buying into the rule-focused approach to learning French (acknowledging perhaps the symbolic capital it will accrue), the data equally reveals Michael's struggle as he negotiates his sense of self with being constantly interactively positioned by Hanna as 'learner'. The following two excerpts provide evidence. At this point in the recording, Michael has just made a comment in relation to the name of the website Hanna has been trying to find for him on line. It is called 'Français Facile' (easy French), and he has just said that French is not easy at all (in a grammatically non-standard utterance - *français n'est facile pas*).

Excerpt 3

50.08 – 50.39

1. Hanna: pardon
2. Michael: français? + le français ++ fuck
French? + French ++ fuck
3. Hanna: // [laughs loudly] \
4. Michael: / [joking tone]: shut up: \ \
5. Hanna: [laughing; high pitch]: on commence: ++ le français
[laughing; high pitch]: let's start: ++ French
6. Michael: [resigned tone; non-standard]: le français ne facile:
[resigned tone; non-standard]: French isn't easy:
7. Hanna: non
no
8. Michael: pas + (oui)
not + (yes)
9. Hanna: + facile c'est pas un verbe
+ easy isn't a verb
10. Michael: + oh (3) le + le français n'est pas facile // ah voilà
+ oh (3) F- + French isn't easy // ah there we go
11. merci beaucoup \ ++ [loud sigh]
thanks a lot \ ++ [loud sigh]
12. Hanna: / [applauds] \ \

Michael's attempt at relationality by admitting his difficulty with French is immediately questioned by Hanna, and not for the meaning of the utterance. The quick and pointed tone of her 'pardon' (line 1) provides a contextualisation cue to Michael who swiftly moves to correction mode by

adding the required article *le* before the noun *français*. After a pause (indicating perhaps his realisation of ungrammaticality), Michael makes a clear affective stance of frustration in his use of *fuck* (line 2). Hanna's emphatic laughter at this point can perhaps be attributed to Michael's use of this word as symbolic of his frustration, an occasioning Michael pushes back against through his overlapped reply - *shut up* - (line 4). While the tone is soft, his recourse to this phrase may be seen to be hinting towards his feelings towards the unflinching focus on 'correctness' at the expense of relationality, and perhaps his difficulty with the power imbalance resulting from Hanna's reflexive and interactive positioning²³.

Hanna's animated *on commence* (line 5) makes clear the expectation of a correctly produced grammatical sentence, which Michael supports through his ensuing attempt, though not without some resignation. Again, the focus on correctness and language as purely a system to be mastered is paramount, with Hanna uttering *non* (line 7) even before the end of Michael's first attempt (he is yet to add the *pas* element of the negative construction) and then highlighting the parts of speech which affect the syntactical arrangement of the sentence - *facile c'est pas un verbe/ easy isn't a verb* - (line 9). It is also interesting in line 9 that despite her discursive commitment to grammatical correctness, Hanna omits the *ne* component of her own sentence, using a construction which is sociolinguistically competent yet grammatically 'incorrect' from a traditional prescriptivist perspective. Michael's response is evidence of his own French-learning habitus in that Hanna's statement effects a correct production (signalled by the beginning of Hanna's applause). While Michael thanks Hanna (line 11), thus co-constructing her teacher identity, the loud sigh that follows alludes to the relief he experiences upon making it through yet another correction hoop. The following final excerpt makes this point in very clear terms.

At the very end stages of the recording, Hanna tells Michael that she is going to buy some sushi before going to her class which is due to start. As she leaves she says to Michael in English "just try" in reference to the exercises she has found on the 'Français Facile' website, to which Michael responds "okay" in an affirmative yet less than enthusiastic manner.

²³ It is also worth noting that while the phrase *shut up* could be considered problematic from a gender lens, this is the only time it is used across the buddy recordings and in this interaction has the primary effect of indexing frustration.

Excerpt 4

52.39 – 52.56

1. Michael: okay (3) godammit (3) [emphatic]: fucking nazi that girl:
2. [laughing tone]: jesus christ:
3. Ashley: [laughing]: yeah: ++ yep
4. Michael: but I will learn let's be honest here
5. Ashley: yeah [laughs]

With Hanna presumably out of earshot (after the first 3 second pause), Michael gives his frustration full expression. The mild expletive *godammit* (line 1) is followed by another 3 second pause, feasibly designed to ascertain Ashley's level of alignment with his frustration given that she has been part of the interaction (yet often talking to others as well). An emphatic expression of disbelief then follows, as he positions Hanna in a less than positive light as a *fucking nazi that girl* (line 1) before softening somewhat into an affective stance of disbelief - *Jesus Christ* - (line 2), mitigating the previous statement through the level drop in expletive and accompanying laughing tone which Ashley mirrors in her alignment (line 3). Michael then moves beyond his own emotional responses to a more pragmatic stance in his utterance - *but I will learn let's be honest here* - (line 4), pointing to his own struggle in reconciling Discourses which he is, for the most part, actively perpetuating in his co-construction. In other words, he discursively aligns with Hanna's understandings of what teaching and learning French entails, which includes a discursive commitment (at this point) to the prioritising of the transactional over the relational for the greater good of 'learning'. In accepting Hanna's French teacher identity (for all intents and purposes) he is actively contributing not only to her identity construction but to the wider Discourses that elevate French as a system to be mastered through constant reflection and attention to grammatical detail (cf. Estival & Pennycook, 2011). These Discourses leave no room for error; the more one can master 'proper' French and demonstrate such understandings, the higher the status to be societally conferred (in contexts where such dominant Discourses have taken hold).

Hanna's French teacher instantiations also follow the pattern in the wider data set which contains much evidence of Frenchness used as cultural capital in her New Zealand exchange context. She would often speak French, for example, when her interlocutors did not understand the language, making prominent her embodied cultural capital by foregrounding the prestige carried by her standard version of the French language. Not only was this evidenced in the two Religious Studies tutorial interactions she recorded for me but was also remarked upon by Victoria who was regularly

privity to this occurrence in their mutual friend circle. One of the tutorial interactions in particular provides evidence of this embodied state of cultural capital as well as the objectified state by foregrounding the Frenchness of a particular object of interest in her group discussion - a French computer keyboard. After her classmate mentions that he *kinda wants the computer*, Hanna states (firstly in French) that it is a French one before repeating (twice) the same information in English and eliciting continued admiration from her classmate, leading to a description of the particularities of the keyboard in question. In foregrounding the Frenchness of the keyboard, it is noticeable that Hanna holds the floor for longer than usual in these tutorial interactions and there is a common recognition of the prestige attached to French in the ratification by her interlocutors. The objectified state of capital functions to elevate Hanna's position within her tutorial group, giving her a fleeting status (cf. Meadows, 2009) which she struggles to attain elsewhere in this data set. In fact, in these tutorial encounters, her 'lesser' conversational standing is noticeably marked, in direct contrast to the position she assumes in her encounters with Michael. The main language of use in each context (as well as the roles and status of interlocutors) is clearly a factor, with the fast-paced English and the equal status of the tutees resulting in more apparent struggle for Hanna to "impose reception" (Bourdieu, 1991).

The analysis above has detailed the co-construction of Hanna's French teacher identity and argued that through this her national identity is made salient. To deepen understandings of *how* this identity is negotiated, I now make some preliminary connections between Hanna's interactions and the wider Discourses and ideologies which affect their shape. As we have seen, an important feature of the Discourses Hanna draws on in instantiating this identity is the dichotomy between 'correct' and 'incorrect' French. As I explore further in Chapter 5, the maintenance of dichotomies does ideological work, in this case perpetuating the perception that there is only one way to speak French, and promoting a deficiency perspective for anything that does not meet this standard. Michael's addition of a rogue 'e' in Excerpt 1 serves as an example of what is not acceptable.

These Discourses have ideological underpinnings and are not the sole reflection of Hanna's unique perspective. In instantiating her French teacher identity, Hanna rather draws on Discourses as a resource (cf. Wernicke, 2016). Attention to such mistakes appear to be linked to ideas of linguistic purity in which notions of 'Frenchness' are at stake. For Hanna, this commitment to a traditional French teacher identity is entirely appropriate if Michael is to reap the rewards in terms of the symbolic capital associated with the French language (an assumption which he does not problematise in their interactions). These Discourses are themselves imbued with capital and

notions of prestige (Martel & Cagolet-Laganière, 1995), a point I return to in section 4.4.1, and as a result, laying claim to such ‘status’ is a relatively straightforward process. By virtue of speaking the ‘right kind of French’ and foregrounding her ‘ability’ in this area through her French teacher identity she is able to benefit from the years and years of historical ideological sedimentation (see e.g. Blommaert & Verschueren, 1998; Milroy, 2001) which scaffolded her primary socialisation into not only the French language but into Discourses of Frenchness. She and Michael, then, contribute to the discursive co-construction of the very concept of language (see e.g. Gal & Irvine, 1995; Makoni & Pennycook, 2006), perpetuating ‘essentialist ontologies’ which treat languages (in this case the French language) as decontextualised bounded entities (Ortega, 2018).

While some SA studies have shown that the teacher role is sometimes assumed by homestay parents who interactively position their exchange students as language learners (see e.g. Shively, 2015; Wilkinson, 2002), it is rare to see the script being flipped to the extent we see with Hanna. In her study abroad context, having access to these resources is undoubtedly useful given that linguistically or otherwise, many study abroad students experience reduced power in some form. What it does not do, however, is allow for a reflexive problematisation of the fundamentally arbitrary nature of such categories. While Hanna’s data provides evidence of a blanket acceptance of the ontological status of such Discourses, it is interesting to see the very same Discourses (and ideologies) problematised in both Victoria’s and Persephone’s data. We turn now to Victoria, whose trimester spent in Wellington reveals further complexity in the analysis of national identity. As a Caledonian, Victoria has the French language in common with Hanna but their relationship to France and standard French are entirely different. For Victoria, the positioning (reflexive and interactive) that occurred around her national identity was closely bound up with the construct of ethnicity, which I briefly outline in the following section.

4.3 Ethnicity and Ethnic Identities

The role of ethnicity or race has been infrequently visited in the literature on language learning in study abroad (Kinger, 2013, p.351), despite its ‘resilient’ status in applied linguistics in general and continued relevance in education (Norton & De Costa, 2018). Attention to the emergence of ethnicity or race as social identities is limited but the few studies that exist are enticing in their findings. Susan Talburt and Melissa Stewart’s (1999) study explores the experiences of Mishiela, the only African American participant in a cohort of Americans in Spain whose ‘hypervisibility’ was argued to contribute to the emphasis that was placed on race and sexuality and the many unwanted sexual advances she experienced when interacting with local people. Uju Anya’s (2016) study, however, paints a different

picture whereby her African American participants were able to feel part of the Afro-Brazilian city they were studying in precisely because they did not stand out. In very recent work, Jamie Thomas (forthcoming) invites the reader into a Tanzanian SA classroom where Swahili is being learnt as a second language. The focus is on the translanguaging experiences of Ghanaian learners in the classroom, and Thomas argues that African multilingualism is a valuable resource in the formal teaching of an African language to other speakers of African languages. While the overall focus is on SLA, analytical attention is given to how race and ethnicity are made prominent in the teacher-student interactions, and the relationship to identity and pan-African goals. These studies are beginning to shine much needed light on diversity of experience and the role of ethnicity and race in the overall study abroad experience, opening up exciting space for a dynamic identity perspective.

Before turning to the data, I provide some definitional considerations. Ethnicity, as well as its relationship to race, is notoriously difficult to define despite its ubiquity in the social sciences (Fought, 2006). Many scholars agree, however, that ethnicity (like nationality and other macro categories) is socially constructed. A useful way of approaching this definitional slipperiness is through interactional data and analysis of how people ‘do’ ethnic identities within a dynamic framework (see e.g. De Fina, 2007; Fought, 2006; Holmes et al., 2011). Anya (2016, p. 2) explains that just as race is a human categorisation that has come to be linked to phenotypic characteristics (e.g. skin colour, facial features, hair texture), the construction of ethnicity hinges on “membership in group(s) sharing common kinship ties, history, nationality, language, culture, with the most important characteristic of the group(s) being a belief in their very existence as a group (Waters, 1990)”. In this sense, ethnicity too can be viewed as a type of imagined community one feels a part of or aspires to be part of (or not part of). In terms of how this category becomes important in my study, the data contains interesting examples of how ethnicity is imposed as a salient category on participants by interlocutors, reinforcing the importance of interactional positioning in identity negotiations.

In line with the above discussion on national identity, ideas of what constitute ethnic categories become so established in society (feeding into ideas of imagined communities) they assume a social reality. This is an argument I reiterate in Chapter 5 with regard to gender and sexuality categories. Pertinent to Persephone’s experience, being ‘Indian’ is one such category to have cemented itself in the New Zealand context; similarly, for Victoria, in the New Caledonian context, being ‘Vietnamese’ is an easily recognisable ethnic category. That these categories are also identifiable in their exchange settings reinforces Guanglun Mu’s (2016, p. 295) statement that colour and race are “inscribed and ascribed identities that stay durable and irrevocable”. Mu draws on Allan Luke

(2009, p. 288) to argue that bodily representation including phenotype and physical appearance “are readable and interpretable elements of habitus”, and that these aspects can become particularly prominent in crossing cultures. For Persephone and Victoria, then, carrying with them their ‘minority’ ethnicities (as well as their own complex and evolving relationship to this aspect of their identities) added further complexity to identity negotiations in their new settings. For the purposes of this thesis I use the construct of ethnicity to describe the identity negotiations of both Victoria and Persephone (yet acknowledge that the interactive positioning they both experienced was often anchored in racial parameters).

4.3.1 Case study 2: Victoria in Wellington – Negotiating Ethnicity and ‘Frenchness’ as a Caledonian

For Victoria, both national and ethnic identities arose as salient from the beginning of her exchange. In a brief email description of herself on the 6th February 2016 (in the aim of recognising each other at the airport), Victoria described herself as *pure Vietnemiennne/pure Vietnamese* and stated that she did not resemble a French person - *je ne ressemble pas à une Française*. She finished her description by drawing on the wider category of Asian in describing her hair as long, black, and straight – *comme les asiatiques (obviously)/like Asian people (obviously)*. Once in New Zealand, Victoria found (not surprisingly she told me) that she was often positioned as Vietnamese or ‘Asian’ (cf. Meadows, 2009) despite her attempts to foreground her national identity as Caledonian. Adding a further layer was her accent, which was consistently identified as French, leading to erroneous assumptions of nationality. This conflation was not without difficulty for Victoria, given the historically constituted power dynamic between France and New Caledonia. A small country in the Pacific Ocean (just above Australia), New Caledonia is a French territory and while multicultural and with a distinct Kanak culture, it has remained reliant on France primarily in an economic sense. Ideologically, many ‘beliefs’ have infiltrated New Caledonia which place ‘French culture’ and ‘the French spoken in France’ at the pinnacle of hierarchies (linguistic and otherwise) (cf. Martel & Cagolet-Laganière, 1995; Wernicke, 2016), carrying the most ‘legitimate’ forms of cultural capital (which is also interesting in terms of Hanna’s reflexive positioning). For Victoria, positioning herself as Caledonian was not without interactional resistance. Carrying her inscribed habitus in the form of her Vietnamese ethnicity and speaking with a clear French-speaker accent added layers to negotiations in the New Zealand exchange setting. The first extract explores her discursive navigation of these constraints.

Victoria and Shelley – Interview data

Week 4 Wellington

This data was taken from our first interview conducted in a café on campus, which lasted for just under forty minutes. The following excerpt follows from my asking Victoria to recap on a topic she had initiated the week before - that of her identification with her Caledonian identity and the relationship with France and Frenchness. At this point, I have asked her to comment on how she feels about being called French, (already a regular occurrence at her New Zealand University).

Excerpt 1

31.29 - 32.56

1. Victoria: [drawls]: we: don't take it really bad but we don't like it
2. Shelley: mm
3. Victoria: because we consider ourself Caledonian + not French +
4. [drawls]: we: we actually + umm + have a song + er who is called
5. err it's er *the France who's paying?*
6. Shelley: the France who's paying
7. Victoria: who's paying=
8. Shelley: =okay
9. Victoria: for for us actually for everything
10. Shelley: yeah
11. Victoria: everything we have is + France is paying
12. Shelley: mm
13. Victoria: [clarifies pronunciation]: paying: [laughs]
14. Shelley: yeah
15. Victoria: and er + but er we have a kind of mm
16. + [tut] er I don't know how to say that [drawls]: a: ++
17. [drawls]: a: ++ attitude?
18. Shelley: mm hm
19. Victoria: er where we do lots of things different than +
20. French peo//ple\ from France [small laugh]
21. Shelley: /mm hm\
22. Shelley: yeah yep
23. Victoria: and er we don't s- + we don't consider ourself French
24. because we have this errr differences?
25. Shelley: mm
26. Victoria: and er even in + just in the slang you know you can + you can

27. just tell that we're Caledonian we're not French
28. Shelley: yeah right
29. Victoria: and er it's really difficult to us to actually
30. we're really stub- er stubborn
31. Shelley: mm //hm\
32. Victoria: /and\\ er
33. Shelley: you're stubborn or you think New Caledonians //are stubborn\
34. Victoria: /New Caledonians are\\
35. Shelley: okay
36. Victoria: yess er we don't like er when people say you know
37. [accusing tone]: you don't speak proper French: you don't err +
38. it's er you just (go) go back to your island [laughs]

Victoria draws on her wider imagined community of Caledonians from the outset, using *we* as her subject pronoun of choice. Line 1 establishes the idea of Caledonians as reasonable in their dislike of being called French - *[drawls]: we: don't take it really bad but we don't like it*. She then provides useful analytical scaffolding for this perception in her mention of a song - *the France who's paying* - (line 5), a song which appears to be indexically linked to ideology. There is a seeming irreverence and use of humour which characterises the title and what it has come to represent. In other words, Caledonians (Victoria seems to be saying), find themselves in a bind. On the one hand, there is a sense of pride in their culture and history, yet at the same time a recognition of their dependence on France for Caledonian livelihoods. This 'bind' is reflected in my field notes on the 22nd February 2016 where Victoria positions herself as against independence in the 2018 referendum (held on November 4th with the majority voting against independence), citing the value of the protection France offers and giving the example of Vanuatu who gained independence in 1980 and received no aid from France after cyclone Pam devastated the country in 2015. Acknowledging the utility of this protection does not preclude her from drawing divisions between Caledonians and *French people* on lines 19 and 20, stating explicitly on line 23 that *we don't consider ourself French*. This encapsulates the *attitude* she refers to on line 17 through the 'negative identity practices' (Seals, 2019b) of identifying herself by what she is not.

Featuring strongly in this ideological division is the French language itself and what 'counts' as 'proper' French (cf. Heller, 1995; Wernicke, 2016). As we have seen with Hanna, standard forms of French have currency in that people are more likely to be viewed as "legitimate speakers" (Bourdieu, 1977a, 1991) in mainstream contexts. Victoria enters into these Discourses when she

mentions the relationship between slang and being Caledonian - *just in the slang you know you can + you can just tell that we're Caledonian we're not French* - (lines 26-27). She mentions the 'difficulty' that arises when Caledonian forms of French are devalued due to this ideological division, akin to Heller's (1995) study of delegitimised forms of Canadian French vernacular. On lines 37-38 Victoria uses a dialogic voice to exemplify this accusation - *you don't speak proper French [] just go back to your island [laughs]* - her laughter at the end mitigating somewhat the seriousness of this positioning (cf. Warner-Garcia, 2014) and simultaneously projecting the Caledonian 'stubbornness' to buy into such delegitimising Discourses.

My ethnographic data adds valuable scaffolding to the analysis in that I saw how language ideologies infiltrated other contexts for Victoria. Specifically, I was often privy to instances of 'teasing' between Hanna and Victoria over different forms of slang and expressions. While these exchanges were in jest, there was no escaping the power imbalance inherent in the assumptions of standard French (in vocabulary and in accent) as capital. My field notes from the 19th February 2016 show Victoria pushing back against these assumptions in a discussion with Hanna about French movies (i.e. made in France). I noted that Victoria's clear affective stance of not liking French movies was immediately challenged by Hanna. Rather than soften her position in the face of this challenge, Victoria built on her first stance move by emphasising the reason for her dislike - *their voices*. In referring specifically to 'voices' (and note the problematic homogenisation), Victoria draws on Caledonian stereotyping of French people as arrogant and elitist, making the tenuous indexical link from voices (i.e. variety of language spoken) to personal characteristics (a conflation also made in Hanna's data). Although the connections lack any epistemological sway, it is nonetheless meaningful in terms of her own identity negotiations to see Victoria reverse the narrative and effectively question the assumed status of standard forms of French. In her ready engagement with stereotype, we gain insights into Victoria's dealing with long-established "discursive faultlines" (Menard-Warwick, 2014) that interestingly have been triggered in her New Zealand exchange context. While her response at this point is to meet positioning with positioning, to counter dominant versions of cultural capital with her own culturally and ideologically informed assertions, this acknowledgement of power in itself may well be the starting point for future ontological reflections and part of Victoria's own 'ideological becoming'. At this point, an important part of negotiating a Caledonian identity involves a distancing from France and the perceived associated characteristics.

An (emergent) awareness of this power imbalance does not mean that one is immune to the forces of the Discourses and ideologies which perpetuate this, however. Despite constructing narrative agency in her recounting in excerpt 1, an email soon after her return to New Caledonia shows evidence of the strength of Discourses associated with standard French. This was despite the fact that in Wellington we had once had an in-depth discussion about the French language, the arbitrary nature of standards, and the equal value of all varieties. This topic had arisen after Victoria had apologised for her French (she had used some New Caledonian slang), and I made use of this ‘teachable’ moment to highlight some sociolinguistic concepts which supported my insistence on the fact there was no need to apologise. These ideas appear not to have taken traction, however, as Victoria’s message exemplifies Bourdieu’s (1977a, 1991) notion of symbolic violence in the seeming discursive complicity in ideas of linguistic hierarchies.

Email data

7th July 2016 (1 week after return to New Caledonia)

This email response marked the beginning of our sustained contact after Victoria’s return to New Caledonia. The following excerpt addresses her feelings of speaking French again, highlighting Bourdieu’s notion of symbolic domination as regards the assumed status of standard French.

Excerpt 2

I can hear my strong Caledonian accent again. It's terrible Shelley XD. You would be pretty surprised about how I speak French here, I am sure you think I speak just like Hanna, the proper French and everything but when I am surrounded by Caledonian (my classmates for example) I speak just like them.

By qualifying her Caledonian accent as *terrible*, Victoria falls into counterproductive Discourses around the ‘value’ of accents. This is revealing in light of her earlier comment relaying her dislike for French voices and points to the importance of contextual factors in identity construction. While Victoria chooses to push back against linguistic hegemony at some points (albeit in a superficial way), she does not have the miraculous ability to operate outside of the force of such pervasive ideologies. Conflating Hanna with *the proper French* is directly indexical to such ideologies; Hanna is from France (and not from a region with a delegitimised accent), therefore she speaks French ‘correctly’, unlike Victoria and her Caledonian classmates. In taking an affective

stance of my own, it was disappointing to see Victoria assume my *surprise* in hearing her Caledonian style of French, and even more so to see her express her certainty of my own views on this. While not an accusation, I still felt positioned as complicit in these dominant Discourses, and felt uncomfortable once again with her apologetic tone. Moving out of my own emotional response, a wider lens brings us back to the strength of Discourses and ideologies and what has assumed status over time. As I argue in Chapter 5 *Gender and Sexuality*, the creation and maintenance of boundaries in the form of dichotomies is a strong contributing factor in this perpetuation. For Victoria, her relationship with her Caledonian identity is a complex one; it is something she grappled with during her exchange in New Zealand and something she continued to explore upon her return. What is clear from the data so far is that Victoria's negotiations of her Caledonian identity involve a simultaneous engagement with what it 'means' to be French.

There was also another layer of complexity for Victoria, however. Laying claim to a Caledonian identity, and to a Pacific one more widely, was a continuous challenge during her exchange. Her inscribed ethnic identity was often made salient and formed part of her identity negotiations, as the following excerpt from our first interview exemplifies.

Victoria and Shelley – Interview data

Week 4 Wellington

This excerpt is from the same interview as Excerpt 1. At this point, Victoria is explaining her attachment to her Caledonian identity, emphasising that she was *born and raised over there* as a clear, non-contestable claim to her national identity. This leads to the following mid-sentence recollection of a recent occurrence in her favourite course at her exchange university – Pacific Studies.

Excerpt 3

35.52 – 37.12

1. Victoria: it's er it's er [emphatic]: oh: just like the first class
2. //in\ [names class] and we had to introduce ourself
3. Shelley: /mm\\
4. Shelley: oh ok//ay\
5. Victoria: /and\\ you know you s- you saw the class it's all brown + people?

6. Shelley: yeah²⁴
7. Victoria: and [drawls]: the: they look at me and my first sentence was
8. [higher pitch]: I look Vietnamese but I am I consider myself
9. Pacific Islanders [incredulous; laughing tone]: //and they just look\
10. at me and just laughed + no don't laugh [laughs] it's //true:\ [laughs]
11. Shelley: /[emphatic]: yeah right:\\
12. Shelley: /yeah\\
13. Shelley: [emphatic]: yeah: that's right that would've been
14. //interesting because\ you um [tut] not many people + well
15. New Caledonia is not + so well-known as you were saying
16. the other day not yeah not many people even know where it is
17. Victoria: /[laughs]\\
18. Victoria: no
19. Shelley: yeah + yeah
20. Victoria: but in but in [name of class] class [emphatic]: they know:
21. they do cos they're from the Pacific
22. Shelley: yeah
23. Victoria: but in other classes they're just eh [laughs]

Victoria's tone immediately provides a valuable contextualisation cue in that it changes noticeably to more emphatic, hinting at the importance the upcoming anecdote holds for her. She then proceeds on lines 1-2 to set up her story by describing the first day task of introductions. By referring to the ethnic make-up of the class (and alluding to my own classroom observation as support), Victoria emphasises the potential for solidarity, or at least an expectation of understanding. Yet her higher pitch and pre-empting statement on line 8 - *I look Vietnamese* - belies her own faith in these expectations, accustomed as she is to having to explain both her nationality and ethnicity to people she meets. From our discussions I gleaned that this had become part of her habitus in the New Zealand setting, developed three years ago when she spent a year at an Auckland high school as an international student. The remainder of her sentence - *but I am I consider myself Pacific Islanders* - (lines 8-9) makes a clear bid for acceptance in the class which is mainly populated by Māori, Tongan, Samoan, and Niuean students, all from or descending from the Polynesian realm of the Pacific. Victoria then adopts an incredulous, yet laughing tone (e.g.

²⁴ In the interests of disclosure, my response of 'yeah' was intended to keep Victoria's story going but it seems her upward intonation was functioning to check if this was the right expression, to which I have signalled it is. In hindsight, a more appropriate response would have been 'yeah, Māori and Polynesian'.

Jefferson, 1979) as she describes her classmates' ensuing laughter on line 10 and uses a dialogic voice to construct her own retort. Her own laughter in the retelling appears to soften the potential offence that may have been taken (cf. Warner-Garcia, 2014), given that her claims to a Pacific identity were effectively delegitimised.

Having twice observed this tutorial class, I am confident that the laughter by Victoria's classmates was not spiteful but rather an expression of surprise. Laughter was a common occurrence in this class, and served many functions, none of which were divisive in nature. I had also been struck by the excellence of the tutor, not only in terms of content knowledge but in her ability to build such a supportive and cohesive atmosphere where all responses were welcomed and engaged with. Victoria grew to feel very comfortable as well as academically stimulated in this encouraging environment, though she never had her Pacific identity ratified in any clear way. Her affective stance of disbelief on lines 20-21 - *but in but in [name of class] [emphatic]: they know: they do cos they're from the Pacific* - makes clear her expectations of her classmates' geographical knowledge and the simultaneous expected acceptance as a legitimate member of this imagined community of the Pacific. This emphasises the difficulty involved in establishing a version of one's national identity in an exchange context, in that even in the predictably supportive environment of a Pacific Studies class, identity negotiations are not devoid of struggle. Victoria's inscribed identity as Vietnamese again appears to win out, an identity she strongly rejects any affiliations to. Later in this same interview she mentions that she has only ever been to Vietnam once with her grandmother, saying that she *didn't like it* and that it was *another way of life*, for which she did not possess the necessary cultural or linguistic tools to navigate - *I can't just switch it to Vietnam*. Data from our final interview allows for further insights into the dynamic relationship between understandings of her national identity and her Pacific Studies class.

Victoria and Shelley – Interview data

Week 17 Wellington

Our third and final interview lasted for just under one hour. Victoria had come to my place for a dinner and Trivial Pursuit evening, and her friend joined us after we had finished recording our chat. Victoria reflected on many aspects of her exchange during this enjoyable evening. It was particularly interesting to hear her crystallise some of her thoughts around her Pacific Studies class, given their relevance to her national identity negotiations. At this point, we are discussing the relative invisibility of New Caledonia in the course, and Victoria has just mentioned her “suspicion” that this would be the case at the outset.

Excerpt 4

32.26 – 33.27

1. Victoria: [sniffs] but umm that's why that's why I
2. [laughing tone]: I actually put: on the umm + on the
3. you know the the question //the\
4. Shelley: /oh the\\ um //(the feedback)\
5. Victoria: /(the special form)\\ yeah the feedback
6. yeah cos the main topic of [class] is [upwards intonation]: Polynesia:
7. Shelley: mm hm
8. Victoria: + [tut] and still English part of Polynesia
9. Shelley: yeah
10. Victoria: [drawls]: so: [laughs] I wrote something like this is er +
11. this is called the[slightly apologetic tone]: Pacific Studies
12. and not the Polynesian Studies:
13. Shelley: [strong whisper]: ye//ah yeah:\
14. Victoria: /or something like this\\ and erm er +
15. Shelley: but that's fine cos they want that feedback
16. Victoria: yes //and\ er the tutor er the tutor //Kaleilani\ she said that
17. + they are really aware of that //that\
18. they're tried really tried to err [guesses]: incorporate:
19. Shelley: /yeah\\
20. Shelley: /mm hm\\
21. Shelley: /mm\\
22. Shelley: mm hm
23. Victoria: er Micronesia and Melanesia more
24. Shelley: oh yeah
25. Victoria: but and they tried to do that this year but they only they actually
26. only had one course or two about Micronesia
27. [upward inflection]: I think:
28. Shelley: and not Melanesia
29. Victoria: [tut] [voc] [emphatic; laughing]: a tiny bit //right: [laughs]\
30. Shelley: /yeah\\ yeah

For Victoria, this class came to represent an important site of identity negotiations; it was pertinent at the beginning of her stay (as we have seen in Excerpt 3), remained pertinent throughout in the reflections it spurred on her own sense of a Pacific identity, and had an impact still at the end of

her exchange. This impact is revealed on lines 1-4 where she refers to the end-of-trimester course feedback form, and her unhappiness about the omission of New Caledonia (and Melanesia more generally). She foregrounds a description of her specific (recalled) feedback with a gently sarcastic comment - *yeah cos the main topic of [class] + is [upwards intonation]: Polynesia: -* (line 6), *[tut] and still English part of Polynesia -* (line 7). The emphasis on Polynesia and in the particular the English part captures effectively both the irony and unacceptability as Victoria sees it for a course about the Pacific. Having outlined this unacceptability, she then uses a dialogic voice to reconstruct her actual feedback, uttered in the retelling with a slightly apologetic tone, serving to emphasise her accompanying reticence - *this is called [slightly apologetic tone]: Pacific Studies: and not the Polynesian Studies -* (lines 11-12). Victoria had told me on many occasions about her aversion for conflict and mentioned in one of our interviews that her friends would describe her as shy, characteristics that matched my perceptions, as well as those of the tutor Kaleilani who described her as being *an engaged student but not the most vocal*, and made specific reference to her nerves during a class presentation. For Victoria, then, the act of giving this feedback was considered, and a useful example of how acts of agency can be small, yet meaningful (cf. Holland, Skinner, Lachiotte, & Cain, 1998), in this case, both for the agent and for those for whom the feedback was intended.

While this privileging of the Polynesian realm is understandable given the close ties with New Zealand, Kaleilani agreed with Victoria's assessment, making specific mention in our interview of the need (as she saw it) to expand the course to Melanesia and to non-English speaking countries in general, noting that Victoria's presence and experience were useful reminders in this respect. Kaleilani also mentioned her interest in Victoria's own identity experience – as one who *identified as Caledonian and who was ethnically Vietnamese*. This reflection on claims to 'belonging' was echoed in one of the tutorials I observed, resulting in animated discussion amongst students who drew on their own experience to describe their feelings of identification (e.g. if you were or were not born in the country, if you had lived there or had never visited, if your parents were from different places, if you were a Heritage speaker of the particular language, etc.). Victoria expressed her particular enjoyment of this class, and we spoke about it for quite a while afterwards where she shared with me some of her perspectives that she had been too shy to share with the whole group. It was clear that this class had spurred reflections.²⁵

²⁵ Unfortunately, the two recordings Victoria made in this class (without me) also showed evidence of her shyness in that the majority of the recordings feature Kaleilani talking and the occasional turn from Victoria. The recordings provided useful support, however, to my observations of the class and my chats with Victoria.

In general, Victoria's experience in her Pacific Studies class offered a valuable window for exploration of her own feelings of belonging to the Pacific and to her identity as a Caledonian. As already mentioned, it fast became her favourite class and she would often talk to me about the content. There is also clear evidence on the impact of study abroad on the hosts, as Kaleilani's reflections have shown, pointing to the mutual benefits that can occur when different experiences and perspectives are engaged with in meaningful ways. In sum, Victoria's national identity negotiations go beyond static portrayals of nation and exemplify intersectionality of experience, allowing for valuable exploration of the complexities involved in such negotiations. For Victoria, her study abroad experience in New Zealand provided the impetus for the beginnings of reflection with the intersectional components of her national, ethnic, and regional identities. She was often subject to what Zhu Hua & Li Wei (2016) term national and ethnicity talk (NET), a Discourse which is not benign in that it reproduces banal racism. Despite its inconspicuous nature, this results in the reification of difference, or what has been referred to as Othering (see Hatoss, 2012; Jaworski & Coupland, 2005; Zhu Hua & Li Wei, 2016). Making claims to a Caledonian identity was not a straightforward process as Victoria's reflections and interactions have shown.

I turn now to Persephone, whose national identity experiences also involved considerable negotiation around ethnicity and engagement with ideologies of Frenchness, though in very different ways. Persephone's data is captivating in its depth, and her reflections on the structural constraints she encounters offer further insights into how 'minority' students experience study abroad.

4.3.2 Case study 3: Persephone in Paris – Negotiating Ethnicity and 'Frenchness' as a New Zealander

Persephone consistently foregrounded her identity as a New Zealander, and in particular, as a proud Wellingtonian, even before she left on exchange (a habit which she speculated arose from the 'need' to prove her national identity from a young age in New Zealand). From the beginning of her exchange in Paris, Persephone, like Victoria, was constructing difference by engaging in 'negative identity practices' (Seals, 2019b) by placing a clear discursive boundary between her own sense of national identity and her perception of what it meant to be 'Parisian' (a category which she used more often than 'French'). My field notes from week 1 of Persephone's exchange (21st August 2016) provide an example:

As we were walking, Persephone said more than once – “I’m so not Parisian”, and kept saying that Viv was [Parisian] and that Athena was “next level” Parisian. It was Viv who questioned her more on this, and on her attachments to home. Persephone replied that it wasn’t really a question of family (although she is still homesick and has been Skyping home regularly) but more related to New Zealand itself. She reiterated that she just loves her country and feels so good there.

Persephone’s first week, then, does not fit neatly into the espoused ‘honeymoon period’ which makes up the traditional U-curve of culture shock (Lysgaard, 1955). While this may be partly attributed to her early homesickness, it seems Persephone, at this point, is clinging to her habitus, which provides comfort at this early stage in Paris (see Kinginger, 2013). Her New Zealand-infused habitus entails a commitment to being down to earth and to egalitarianism (see Holmes et al., 2017; Woodhams, 2015), and an avoidance of ostentation. She did not see these norms being mirrored in her new exchange setting, thereby strengthening the perceived dichotomy between Paris and Wellington, and reinforcing her commitment to her national identity. These observations, and in particular, this construction of difference, provide a valuable backdrop as we move to some specific interactional data.

Persephone, Athena, and Shelley – Interview data

Beginning of Week 4 Paris

This interview is composed of three parts, lasting for 1 hour and 48 minutes in total. The following excerpt comes from the first part which lasted one hour and 10 minutes. At this point, Persephone is telling us about her different classes (it is her second week at her university) and giving her impressions of her only French language class (the others are in the area of Politics). She has just mentioned her preconceptions of this being her *funnest and easiest class* and commented on her feelings about the level of correction she is receiving which is having a detrimental effect on her enjoyment.

Excerpt 1

23.38 – 24.30

1. Persephone: and it’s not hard like the material I can understand
2. everything but it’s just really intense like it’s just speak
3. perfect French + every time you say something wrong

4. she'll correct you every time you say a vowel
5. differently she'll correct you and I was talking to
6. Shelley about this but you know how we- see I have a
7. New Zealand accent which is fine and like it comes
8. out in my French but I wonder like yeah I don't think
9. I don't think like you know how they correct you
10. I don't think it should be /o/ not /ø/ or whatever or
11. like /ø/ not/o/ but like I'm saying it I'm saying it /o/
12. but I'm saying it in my accent //so is\ that like + it's not
13. wrong do you know what I mean //it's\ just an accent
14. so like I think and they correct you cos they want you
15. to sound so French but try and correct you and they
16. make you feel like you're wrong //and\ like we were
17. talking about this and I was like I like sort of having
18. an accent when I speak French because it sort of
19. asserts my New Zealand identity and I want people
20. to know I'm a New Zealander
21. Shelley: /yeah\\
22. Shelley and Athena: //yeah\
23. Shelley: /yes\\
24. Shelley: yeah absolutely

This extract shows Persephone engaging with the French language ideologies which also featured in Hanna's and Victoria's data. As we have seen, these ideologies are borne out in Discourses of 'proper', standard French which entail a commitment to 'correct' grammar and pronunciation, a point encapsulated by Persephone in line 3 when she mentions *perfect French*. From discussions with Persephone, it was clear that this attention to 'correctness' conflicted with her previous experiences of learning French in New Zealand, particularly at high school where she spoke of learning the language relatively quickly in relation to her peers (attributing this to her already bilingual status in English and Gujarati). In New Zealand, the approach to teaching foreign languages has become predominantly communicative and task-based (in high schools at least), which again seems to have jarred with this more traditional 'transmission' model of teaching and learning that she encountered in her Paris university class.

Persephone problematises this approach and the associated emphasis on being correct in lines 1-4. While she mentions that *it's not hard like the material I can understand everything* (lines 1-2),

she evaluates the class as *really intense* (line 2). The choice of the adjective *intense* is linked to her perception of unnecessary correction for *every time you say something wrong* (line 3), a position she goes on to summarise rather astutely. It is interesting to note here the effects of Persephone's secondary socialisation at her university in Wellington, and in particular the effects of her recent Sociolinguistics class which (as she told me on many occasions) she thoroughly enjoyed and gained a lot from in terms of sociolinguistic conceptualisations of language issues, the main one of which here is related to accent. By referring to the arbitrary nature of what counts as 'correct' or 'wrong' in terms of accent - *it's not wrong* - (lines 12-13), she deftly draws on this sociolinguistic knowledge to both reinforce her epistemic stance - *it's just an accent* - (line 13) and her claim to a New Zealand identity. To Persephone, therefore, the particular shape of the sound she uses²⁶ (exemplified in her recounting of the vowel sounds) is indexically intentional to her identity as a New Zealander and simultaneously creates distance from a French identity (cf. Zuengler, 1988, p. 34).

Throughout her recounting, Persephone demonstrates narrative agency, adroitly avoiding being drawn into a symbolic domination reliant on the cultural construct of accent as capital. At the same time, she is distancing herself from a French identity (note the common usage of the pronoun *they* throughout) and assumptions of what this 'should' entail in terms of language and pronunciation. This excerpt (which is representative of the many conversations we had about her French language class) is also revelatory in that it highlights the different investments (Norton, 2000, 2013; Norton Peirce, 1995) of the teacher (Sophie) and Persephone. In email correspondence with Sophie, there was a strong emphasis on her identity as an overworked teacher who was bound by curriculum and institutional demands, a positioning often also remarked on by Persephone. These institutional constraints are very real for teachers and need to be borne in mind lest full and unfettered agency be assumed on the part of Sophie. In other words, Sophie's insistence on 'correct' pronunciation is not an innate quality but something which has come to attach itself indexically to socially sanctioned ideas of the role of a French teacher (cf. Wernicke, 2016).

With this caveat in place, the data problematises the assumption that all students 'want' to speak like a native speaker (cf. Ortega's (1999) notion of a 'monolingual norm'). The reinforcement of (standard) French-only in the classroom involves a simultaneous (unintentional) disregard of the different identities students bring with them to this particular Paris classroom. As discussed,

²⁶ I should add that Persephone was aware that changing some sounds can change the intended word to a different word, but this was not what she meant in this case.

Sophie's investment in her own teacher identity is shaped by ingrained cultural and institutional expectations and norms which are themselves rooted in ideologies of the French language (rather than a window into her deepest reflections), yet the Discourses she draws on have a very real effect for Persephone and her own investments and identities. Despite Persephone's investment in improving her French language ('language improvement' is one of her main goals on exchange), she makes it clear in this excerpt (and continues to make clear throughout the ethnographic data collection) that adapting to common Discourses of what it means to be a 'successful' learner of French is not something she is willing to do if it means her New Zealand identity is compromised in any way. Her unwillingness to bend (cf. national superiority), in this respect, cannot feasibly be linked to the construct of motivation, which would leave unacknowledged the "socially and historically constructed relationship between language learner identity and learning commitment" (Darvin & Norton, 2015, p. 37), elements of which are explored further in the analysis of excerpts 3 and 4. Her data therefore makes a valuable contribution to the dearth of research on social reasons for L2 pronunciation from a learner perspective (LeVelle & Levis, 2014, p. 57).

Persephone's strong investment in her imagined national identity is also evidenced in other interactional data. The following excerpt exemplifies how this becomes prominent with two French acquaintances, Florence and Madeleine, and shows how, for Persephone (as with Victoria), the construct of ethnic identity cannot be disentangled from national identity negotiations.

Persephone, Florence, and Madeleine – Conversational data

Week 8 Paris

This conversation took place in Florence's office in central Paris during a lunch break, and lasted for just under one hour. Madeleine and Florence are both good friends of mine and we met when we worked together in a language school in Paris some years ago. They regularly lunch together and were happy to meet Persephone and provide her with some French speaking practice. Florence also has useful skills in accommodating to non-native speakers given her many years of teaching French to speakers of other languages. Both Madeleine and Florence are highly proficient in English. The following excerpt comes just after Florence has been recounting her fond memories of her trip to the South Island of New Zealand 10 years ago.

Excerpt 2

16.47 – 17.53

1. Persephone: oh l'île du sud + moi je suis née à Wellington
oh the South Island I was born in Wellington
2. j'étudie à Wellington et c'est tout [laughs]
I study in Wellington and that's all [laughs]
3. Madeleine: et ta famille vient d'où
and where does your family come from
4. Persephone: ah well mes parents sont nés en Inde
ah well my parents were born in India
5. puis ils sont venus en Nouvelle-Zélande er je sais pas
then they came to New Zealand er I dunno
6. il y a peut-être oh god trente ans je sais pas
perhaps oh god thirty years ago I dunno
7. Madeleine: il y a eu une forte vague d'immigration de l'Inde?
was there a strong wave of immigration from India
8. à cette époque là?
at that time?
9. Persephone: oh non oh je pense un peu
oh no oh I think a bit
10. il y a beaucoup d'Indiens en Nouvelle-Zélande
there are lots of Indians in New Zealand
11. Florence: ah oui je ne savais pas
ah really I didn't know that
12. Persephone: () mais j'adore la Nouvelle-Zélande
() but I love New Zealand
13. [non-standard]: mes amis me posent:
[non-standard]: my friends ask me
14. quel est mon pays préféré
what is my favourite country
15. je dis toujours Nouvelle-Zélande
I always say New Zealand
16. Florence: je suis d'accord moi
I agree

Persephone's reflexive positioning as a New Zealander, and, in particular, as a Wellingtonian begins at the outset. She segues from Florence's description of her holiday in the South Island to her own

unquestionable status as a Wellingtonian - *je suis née à Wellington j'étudie à Wellington et c'est tout/ I was born in Wellington I study in Wellington and that's it* - (lines 1-2). Based on extensive discussions with Persephone, this affiliation to New Zealand and corresponding national identity seems to have been strengthened through Persephone's continual struggle in New Zealand to 'prove' her New Zealand-ness because of her Indian ethnicity. In this sense, Persephone's strong claims to a Wellingtonian identity at the beginning of this conversation may reveal her habitus in action, indicating an awareness of what will likely unfold conversationally, and be intended to mitigate the expected occurrence of some interactive positioning (similar to what we have seen with Victoria). Madeleine's next turn on line 3 fulfils this expectation by asking where her parents are from (cf. Hatoss, 2012). I would hasten to add here that Madeleine's question should not be read as intentionally 'negative'; it expresses an interest in Persephone's history and is likely intended to contribute to the unfolding of the conversation. Identifying as *half French, half Canadian*, Madeleine often expresses interest in people's roots, as does Florence who is passionate about history and family trees in particular. Despite these positive intentions, the social effect can nevertheless be read as questioning Persephone's claims to a New Zealand identity, positioning her as 'foreign' even in her home context of New Zealand by placing more emphasis on her ethnicity. Madeleine's question appears to be a version of the ubiquitous 'Where are you really from', revealing the routinised processes of 'nationality and ethnicity talk' (Zhu Hua & Li Wei, 2016) that contributes (I stress, unintentionally) to Othering (see also Hatoss, 2012; Jaworski & Coupland, 2005), as we have seen with Victoria.

Persephone deploys her usual response (her habitus perhaps contributing to the English *ah well* at the beginning given these responses have been developed in a New Zealand context), mentioning that her parents were born in India (line 4). She adopts an uncertain epistemic stance in relation to when exactly her parents came to New Zealand - *il y a peut-être oh god trente ans je sais pas/ perhaps thirty years ago oh god I don't know* - (line 6), a discursive move not devoid of meaning. The repetition of *je sais pas/ I don't know* (lines 5 and 6), as well as the insertion of the English *oh god* (line 6) likely function as contextualisation cues to downplay the importance of her parents' date of arrival and at the same time emphasise the length of time they have been in New Zealand. For Persephone, the approximate offering of *thirty years* (line 6) is most likely sufficient length of time to cement belonging, and thereby strengthen her claim to a New Zealand identity. Persephone's almost dismissive tone may also be intended to halt the current line of enquiry. Madeleine, however, continues her interactive positioning by asking Persephone about immigration

waves to New Zealand (lines 7 and 8), again foregrounding the assumed importance of Persephone's ethnic identity.

What follows is evidence of Persephone consciously downplaying the importance of her Indian identity in this particular context and rejecting this line of positioning. On line 9, she offers an epistemic stance which foregrounds again her 'lack' of knowledge in this area - *oh non oh je pense un peu/oh no oh I think so a bit* – before gaining a more concrete epistemic footing in her statement on line 10 where she mentions the large number of Indians in New Zealand, a statement which appears to be performing some important identity work. Her choice of the word *Indians* may be read as distancing herself from this category (and laying stronger claim to her New Zealand identity) whilst at the same time augmenting the legitimacy of her claim through choice of the adverb *beaucoup/ a lot* (line 10). Equally, this adverb choice may function to de-exotify her ethnicity in relation to her nationality. Florence, immediately afterwards on line 11, appears to ratify Persephone's stance, stating that she did not know about this immigration wave. This comment, though, may also be read as (unintentionally) questioning somewhat Persephone's claims to a New Zealand identity. In other words, Florence's surprise indicates a lack of alignment with her own version of what a New Zealand identity actually constitutes. While it is understandable that Florence and Madeleine would not have a sound appreciation of the multicultural make-up of New Zealand, the underlying assumption here is that the 'average' New Zealander is a Pākehā²⁷ one, highlighting the strength of colonisation and whiteness in accepted Discourses around who can lay claim to national identity. While this is true in terms of ethnic makeup, Florence's epistemic stance of not knowing may inadvertently diminish the 'validity' of Persephone's claims. Persephone's story is representative in this respect in that many migrants and former refugees who strongly identify with a New Zealand identity have been shown to have to do more 'work' to have these identities viewed as legitimate (e.g. Collie, Kindon, Liu, & Podsiadlowski, 2010; Greenbank, 2019; Greenbank & Marra, forthcoming).

Persephone makes a final claim to her identity as a New Zealander in line 12 - *mais j'adore la Nouvelle-Zélande/but I love New Zealand* - through a strong affective stance. The rest of the excerpt emphasises these feelings and on lines 13-15 Persephone insists that she always names New Zealand as her favourite country when asked by friends, a stance quickly ratified by Florence (as someone who has visited New Zealand and is therefore qualified to respond). Persephone thus

²⁷ The Māori term for New Zealanders of European descent

makes clear to her interlocutors the importance of her imagined community of New Zealanders, ending the conversational focus on ethnicity.

This excerpt clearly shows how one's preferred identities are not necessarily smoothly transferred in interactional episodes during study abroad. It further highlights how ethnicity can be seen to trump national identity when it is inscribed in one's skin colour and features (cf. Mu, 2016). And it bears adding at this point that Persephone's interactional focus on her national identity as a New Zealander does not preclude her Indian ethnicity from assuming importance in her own repertoire of identities. As she mentions in email correspondence - *It's only really in the last couple of years that I've tried to reconnect with my Indian identity too - and I now proudly identify as a Kiwi Indian - I'm growing*. What this highlights, rather, is the clear role of contextual factors in which identities take interactional precedence at any point in time (cf. Menard-Warwick, 2009). For Persephone at this moment, it is likely that several interactional considerations are being made. As well as the clear and consistent strength of affiliation with her New Zealand identity, there are also considerations around language proficiency, and the fact that this is the first time she has met Florence and Madeleine, who are both older than her and friends of mine. In this sense, foregrounding her New Zealand identity may be seen as more interactionally 'desirable'.

Later in the same interaction, Persephone initiates a topic change to the Metro (the underground public transport system in Paris), a topic she equates in a later email as being the equivalent to the weather in the New Zealand context in its conversational 'inclusiveness'. The following excerpt also illustrates the strength of Persephone's national identity and just as excerpt 2 shows ethnic identity 'trumping' national identity in assumed salience (from Florence and Madeleine), here we see a Parisian identity 'winning out' in the assumption of desirability. In both cases, Persephone deploys linguistic strategies which show a strategic and relationally-focused rebuttal of assumptions.

Persephone, Florence, and Madeleine – Conversational data

Week 8 Paris

Persephone has just mentioned how much she loves the efficiency of the Metro system, yet has struggled with experiences of sexual harassment. Despite feeling she has developed strategies to deal with this behaviour, encountering unwanted male attention on a regular basis has been difficult, as Chapter 5 further details. This topic change results in Florence and Madeleine taking on clear roles as experts, giving Persephone advice on how to act on the metro - effectively how to 'pass' for a local Parisian so as to avoid unwanted attention. The excerpt begins just after

Madeleine has mentioned the need for Persephone to *mix in* so that she does not stand out as different, and therefore present as a target.

Excerpt 3

39.33 – 39.54

1. Florence: et aujourd'hui tu (seras) Parisienne
and today you(?ll be) Parisian
2. All: [shared laughter]
3. Persephone: [laughing]: je je pense que je vais: êt- je +
[laughing]: I I think I'm going to: b- I +
4. [non-standard]: je jamais etre Parisienne:
[non-standard]: I'm never going to be Parisian:
5. mais d'accord: // [laughs]\
but okay: // [laughs]\
6. Madeleine: /ah ça ça ça \ \ ça nous ca nous ()
ah that that that that- that- () us
7. ca nous rattr //ape\
that sneaks up on us
8. Persephone: /ah \ \ ouais [laughs loudly]
ah yeah [laughs loudly]
9. Florence: c'est oui c'est normal tu tu suis le + le moule
it's yes it's normal you follow the + the crowd
10. Persephone: ouais ouais [laughs]
yeah yeah [laughs]
11. Florence: le mouvement c'est ça
follow suit that's it
12. Persephone: [conceding-type tone]: ouais peut-être ouais ouais:
[conceding-type tone]: yeah perhaps yeah yeah

The strength of underlying assumptions here is interesting in that 'passing' for a Parisian appears to equate to desirable embodied cultural capital (cf. Cutler, 2014). It is worth noting, however, that Florence makes clear the wider value of employing this strategy when abroad in general. Elsewhere in the conversation, she gives the example of how she *dressed like a New Zealander* so that she could *mix in* during her trip. Florence had often told me of her belief in the transformative properties of travelling; part and parcel of this for her is a complete assimilation to the majority culture and adoption of a standard accent. Whilst living in England for ten years, for example,

Florence would watch the TV news and emulate the accents used. ‘Passing’ has always been a priority. While ‘passing’ is assumed to be a valuable strategy irrespective of place, the notion of becoming Parisian for Persephone is laden with specific symbolic capital that contrasts markedly with her national identity, a point I return to later in the chapter.

Florence simplifies the equation in line 1 where ‘blending in’ equals becoming Parisian - *et aujourd’hui tu seras Parisienne/and today you’ll be Parisian* - resonant perhaps of her own travel experiences where blending in did not present an affront to her sense of self. While this advice is offered with kindness and concern for Persephone’s safety and enjoyment in Paris, it nonetheless simultaneously serves to sweep away Persephone’s socially and historically constructed relationship to her New Zealand identity, in the (perceived) implication that ‘passing’ as Parisian is universally desirable and unproblematic. Hints as to Persephone’s layered engagement with these assumptions are given in her immediate and continued laughter (lines 2 and 3), which appears to index a level of disbelief in this proposition. This is accompanied by her statement that she will never be Parisian, with the adverb *jamais/never* (line 4) uttered more slowly and emphatically than the surrounding words. As I show in excerpt 4 Persephone’s stance here appears to hold a ‘won’t ever’ rather than ‘can’t ever’ orientation. Her addition of *mais d’accord/but okay* - (line 5) can perhaps be seen as an effort to relationally realign with her interlocutors, given they both identify as Parisian. Her continued laughter throughout the interaction seems to ‘soften’ her discursive distancing from the Parisian identity as she sees it, providing further evidence of her attention to relational aspects of the interaction. At this point, this seems to be more important to her, as is the opportunity to practise her language with two native speakers.

Madeleine’s next turn reinforces the presumed ease of becoming Parisian by saying that it *sneaks up on us* (line 7). This contributes to the discursive construction of reduced agency on the part of Persephone, in that ‘Parisian-ness’ is accorded force in the personification of this quality. Whether you want it or not, Madeleine seems to be saying, becoming Parisian just happens. Florence builds on this idea - *c’est normal/ it’s normal* - (line 9) by bringing in a focus on Persephone as actor within these social structures. If you *follow the crowd* (lines 9 and 11), she says, this is bound to happen. Both Florence and Madeleine, then, despite their polished relational work and helpful intentions, can be interpreted as reinforcing notions of assimilation as desirable. Their main aim is to equip Persephone with tools (‘passing’ as Parisian) so as to become part of the crowd and significantly reduce the chances of further sexual harassment. Yet, given the high numbers of

French and Parisian women who experience sexual harassment on public transport, this ‘mixing in’ is no guarantee.

While the interaction is a pleasant one from all parties’ perspectives, these assumptions clearly collide with Persephone’s desire to foreground her New Zealand identity. Her conversational manoeuvring provides evidence of deliberate (yet interactionally appropriate) distancing from a Parisian identity. That she is not ready to enter into a “negotiation of difference” (Block, 2007) appears to hinge on the struggle involved in having her New Zealand identity recognised at this point in Paris. Linked to this, as the excerpts have shown, is the assumed ease with which one can adopt this Parisian identity, a viewpoint which ignores the social and historical dimensions of this construction and the meanings for different people. Persephone’s unwillingness to ‘adapt’ to the behaviour of the majority - in this case Parisian women - must be viewed in light of these social and historical dimensions. Email correspondence further enriches this interpretation.

Email data

6th November 2016 Week 13 Paris

This email exchange was part of our regular communication after I left Paris. At this point, I was interested in whether her self-positioning as ‘so not Parisian’ had changed at all, and I had asked if she might elaborate on this. The email she wrote is evidence of her commitment to participant reflexivity, both in breadth (2293 words) and depth. To say I appreciate these insights is an understatement. In the interests of transparency, I include below Persephone’s ‘disclaimer’ which prefaced this email.

Just a note before I start: this email contains A LOT of stereotyping which I hate myself for and I apologise deeply BUT this is me being honest. I also wrote this email in different parts- adding and deleting in random places as I went (I'm thinking as I type) so I'm sorry if it's incoherent.

With this in mind, the following excerpt from the email throws intriguing light on the discursive reconciliation between Persephone’s national identity and that of being Parisian.

Excerpt 4

Also, how can I identify with somewhere so bougey and beautiful with lots of monuments and designer shops and perfume and wine and expensive housing and just so much richesse when my

mum grew up in a small village in India which used to only get water twice a day and got an arranged marriage at 17 and moved to NZ and struggled for most of her life here? My mum works at McDonalds, and I'm studying and living in Paris - I can't live with myself identifying with a place that is so not representative of who I am and where I have come from. I'm the first one in my family to have gone to Europe - a continent filled with former colonial powers that crippled the very country from which my ancestors (very recent ones too) come. It's so hard to reconcile these two. So while my mum is proud of me because of the obvious difference in her life when she was 20 and mine now, I can't identify on a deep level with a city that is an international symbol of pristineness, perfection and riches. She has taught me (mostly indirectly) the value of hard work, the value of a single dollar and the value of a modest life and while Parisians may work hard, they also spend hard and nothing about Paris is really modest. I don't want to forget where I came from and I don't want to identify with a city of such grandeur when my mum will never experience that sort of grandness in her day-to-day life.

It is important to note that the email's focus on the more 'ostentatious' aspects of Paris does not preclude an awareness of other aspects of Paris. Earlier in the email Persephone mentions explicitly that she is *saddened by the amount of homeless people and children*, and by the *stark dichotomy between the wealthy and the poor*. Nevertheless, it is these more overt displays of 'beauty' which form the basis of Persephone's identity reflections and struggle. It is noteworthy that she engages with the symbolic realm (i.e. what Paris is commonly seen to represent stereotypically) in constructing her argument which is anchored in an idea of irreconcilable differences. Her recollections provide ample evidence of how her habitus has been constituted up until this point in her life, nourished by her experience of growing up in Wellington in a 'modest' household (juxtaposed with the prevalent idea of 'richesse' in Paris) where the value of hard work was instilled. Her mother's experience features strongly in the accounting work that unfolds in the email. Arriving in Wellington at 17 for an arranged marriage, struggling for most of her life and working in McDonalds all contribute to the dichotomy Persephone emphasises between what she is accustomed to and what she is currently encountering.

Widening the scope, Persephone also draws on Discourses of colonialism in relation to her own history - *I'm the first one in my family to have gone to Europe - a continent filled with former colonial powers that crippled the very country from which my ancestors (very recent ones too) come*. The strength of language used in this description (*colonial powers; crippled*) further widens

the discursive chasm - from Paris to Europe and Wellington to India - effectively problematising the 'picture perfect' Paris she has referred to and fleshes out the simplicity of equations she has encountered thus far. Persephone foregrounds her political identity in another excerpt, continuing to create distance:

Excerpt 5

Also just the overall conservativeness I've noticed in French politics & sort of in Paris is something that adds to this. Paris is also very bougey and I'm such a dirty lefty - so I just don't see how I can be at one with a city where you can see so obviously the impacts of the aristocracy, it's just all too beautiful sometimes.

The choice to not *identify with a city of such grandeur* is therefore both a conscious and meaningful act. It can be seen as an act of agency anchored in her current political leanings and in her own history where, as Persephone makes consistently clear, notions of 'grandness' have no place given the oppression that has characterised the life of her own mother as well as her ancestors.

The ideas expressed in this email have interesting repercussions for arguments which centre on the perceived need for study abroad students to engage in 'negotiation of difference' (e.g. Block, 2007a; Kinginger, 2010, 2013). As Persephone's case exemplifies, this negotiation is highly complex and lack of movement towards elements of the host culture does not always imply a deficiency or unwillingness on the part of the student. Rather than 'recoiling' into Discourses of national superiority, the above data is representative of Persephone's continued deep reflection on her exchange experiences as a young Kiwi-Indian woman. In this sense, a large part of her habitus tool kit can be seen to be composed of her socially and historically constructed sense of self, which feeds into negotiations of difference. While Persephone acknowledges that her reflections are replete with stereotype, they nonetheless reveal the importance of power and inequality as factors in this negotiation, pointing to the importance of every student's own intersectional experience (which they bring with them to their exchange setting), and how this interacts with their new experiences and perceptions. In Persephone's case, not wanting to identify as French, or Parisian in particular, is part of a considered reflection which engages with assumptions of power and capital in her new setting, and effectively questions the expectations placed on exchange students to uniformly and unproblematically take on aspects of the host culture (however they may be perceived).

It bears mentioning too that demographically, there is not a large Indian representation in Paris, which may have played a part in Persephone's negotiations around her national/ethnic identity, given that her features were 'marked' even in such a cosmopolitan city. This stood in direct contrast to Athena, who, as a young New Zealand woman of African descent, experienced the movement into Paris and its multicultural makeup (with a large black population) as overwhelmingly positive. During informal chats (unrecorded, but written up in field notes), she mentioned that she found this liberating, and contrasted her new setting with that of the New Zealand city where she grew up, which is predominantly white and has a nominal African presence. Athena's relationship to Paris contrasted directly with Persephone's in this sense; for Athena, blending in allowed her a precious feeling of *anonymity* and a chance to *start over*. It is likely her movement from a marked to unmarked status contributed to the sense of identification and empowerment she discovered during her exchange, very much akin to the feelings of Anya's (2016) African American participants in the Afro-Brazilian city of Salvador.

Facebook data

Facebook, too, provided a useful platform for Persephone to reinforce her national identity as a New Zealander and as a Kiwi Indian. As Dressler & Dressler (2016) make clear, researchers in SA have recognised the utility of social media in understanding participants' experiences, calling for greater analytical focus (e.g. Coleman, 2013b; Kinginger, 2013). As well as the insights that can arise in respect to L2 identities (as in Dressler & Dressler's study), social media also lends itself to an analysis of what other social identities become salient through this particular form of self-positioning, as the following examples show.

17th November Week 15 Paris

Persephone's active Facebook presence increased in the aftermath of the Kaikoura earthquake which struck much of New Zealand on the 14th November 2016 and measured 7.8 on the Richter scale. During this period, Persephone spent many hours awake. She was often 'active' on Facebook messenger until 4 or 5am communicating with family and friends, and keeping them informed by posting up-to-date information and advice. Persephone was particularly worried about her mother, who had refused to move to higher ground initially, despite the very real threat of a tsunami. The following excerpt is representative of her posts at this time, drawing heavily on ideas of her imagined community of New Zealanders and the characteristics she sees as positively associated with this identity.

Excerpt 6

Times like this are when it's especially hard to be away from home. But I can't imagine how horrifying and traumatising this was for the people that experienced this. If I do know something, it's that New Zealanders are the most resilient and kind-hearted people in the world, and I know we can get through this. While this series of disasters has been incredibly devastating, we are fortunate to be this prepared & responsive. Kia kaha, aroha nui.

Persephone makes use of many affective stance moves in constructing the overall tone of this post. She acknowledges the difficulty in being away from home during such a time before quickly shifting the focus to the people who experienced this event, the intensity of which is qualified as *horrifying* and *traumatising*. The force of these adjectives, as well as the sentence initial *but*, act to minimise her own feelings while foregrounding those of the people who experienced the natural disaster. This level of humility has been found to be a key characteristic of many New Zealanders (and a key feature of Persephone's data set), linked to the tall poppy syndrome and associated ideologies of egalitarianism (see Holmes et al., 2017). In this post, it also appears to function as an epistemic foreshadowing in that what occurs afterwards is a direct claim to 'know' what New Zealanders are like, an occasioning which merits a level of mitigation in the New Zealand context where demonstration of knowledge is not always encouraged. Persephone's comment - *I know we can get through this* – creates clear solidarity with her fellow New Zealanders by foregrounding their *resilience* and *kind-hearted[ness]*, qualities which form part of the core of her imagined national community.

Emphasis on being *fortunate* in terms of being prepared and responsive to such an event is also laden with meaning, drawing as it does on her socio-political knowledge of New Zealand's developed status - as opposed to many other countries (as can be seen in the high number of fatalities similar sized earthquakes have resulted in). The pronoun choice of *we* is directly indexical to her own identity as a New Zealander and the use of Te Reo Māori phrases (a regular part of many New Zealanders' daily lexicon; see e.g. Macalister, 2009) likely emphasises her commitment to a multicultural, diverse New Zealand, and perhaps acknowledges the importance of land to Māori. Further, the high frequency of te reo phrases in young New Zealanders' speech in particular has become indexical to what it means to be a progressive New Zealander today, an interpretation very much in line with Persephone's *dirty lefty* reflexive positioning in excerpt 5 (cf. Barr & Seals,

2018). From a normative New Zealand lens then - *Kia kaha - aroha nui/ Stay strong - much love* - adds depth to the message, grounding the meaning in a clear cultural context. Persephone may be in Paris, but Facebook provides an important platform to maintain and emphasise her New Zealand identity, and express solidarity, especially during such difficult circumstances.

Another example of how Persephone used Facebook to foreground her identity as a New Zealander occurs in a post from the 26th November when she attended a France versus All Blacks²⁸ rugby game in Paris.

Excerpt 7

Even though I'm surrounded by blue, I'm always backing Black! #allezlesallblacks NZ

This post is accompanied by a photo of Persephone looking out at the rugby field and the combination of the message and the image (as well as the NZ flag) pithily encapsulates her commitment to her New Zealand identity during her exchange by emphasising her ongoing support for Black (representing the New Zealand rugby team, the All Blacks). This post contains a hashtag in French (it was originally posted on Instagram), hinting perhaps at her investment in the language aspects of her exchange and making the claim that learning a language does not always equate to a weakening of sense of national identity. Translating to *Go (the) All Blacks*, the commonly used sporting phrase ensures she is equally heard and seen by a French audience. She therefore makes use of translanguaging (cf. Li Wei & Zhu Hua, 2013) to create a multilingual, multicultural bridge.

Overall, Persephone's use of Facebook provides an interesting portal into her instantiations of national identity, as well as to the utility of social media for exchange students in general. Kinginger (2010, p. 223) has described Facebook as an "electronic umbilical cord" which hinders development in the additional language and limits opportunities to immerse oneself culturally. Persephone's email reflections (upon my asking her about this aspect of her exchange) offer a useful counter perspective, again adding nuance to broadly painted statements which have the tendency to treat study abroad students as a homogeneous group.

²⁸ The New Zealand men's rugby team is called the All Blacks

Excerpt 8

Facebook as an umbilical cord...in some ways, yes, it was an umbilical cord because I spoke to my friends a lot in English on facebook, saw what they were posting, etc etc - all in English. But in some ways, no. I changed my Facebook to be in french before I left- which was great in giving me some new vocab. I also 'liked' pages such as Le Monde, and other things about France which meant that I was being welcomed with some news in French , etc. And my friends in France - on exchange and otherwise- would 'like' or share things in French and this came up on my news feed so I'd see it and I don't personally post many articles/statuses on Facebook, just photos but a lot of my friends on exchange would share things about France and I'd see them too and I wouldn't have seen them before. So Facebook was definitely an in-between - both good and bad. Twitter and Instagram were more of the umbilical cords in my opinion - you don't write much on either and tend to stick to English. On instagram (where I post more than Facebook) I'd refrain from posting in French because I didn't want to seem snobby/braggy to my friends that I was in France...it was obvious enough from my photos, etc.

For Persephone, then, her reflections on her Facebook use show a 'middle ground' usage. While she used many strategies to enhance her language learning (including changing the language setting and liking French news pages), she would also chat in English with the majority of her friends on Facebook messenger. Persephone's final comment harks back to the importance of humility as indexical to her New Zealand identity. The decision to *refrain from posting in French* can therefore not be painted as 'deficient' but rather a considered decision to minimise perceptions of being *snobby* or *braggy*, both qualities at the opposite end of the humble spectrum (and what she sees as being indexed to the French language, and France, at this point). Affiliation with one's national identity may therefore impact the way social media sites are used during Study Abroad. For Persephone, the strength of identification with her imagined community of New Zealanders (and perceived associated characteristics) has direct repercussions for decisions related to social media use. Persephone's use of strategies to improve her French language and learn about current events in France, and her parallel use of English and avoidance of posting in French reflects more accurately the 'reality' of social media use in globalised societies, painting a complex picture. Persephone's social media choices can thus be seen as strategically agentic in that they are consciously shaped by ideological considerations of national identities.

In sum, nationality emerged as a salient identity category for Persephone during her exchange. The strength of affiliation to her New Zealand identity became important across data channels, including interactional data, emails, and Facebook posts. As I have argued, Persephone's ethnic identity as Indian cannot be disentangled from negotiations of nationality. Her own dynamic reflections of Parisian-ness are equally inextricable from these national identity negotiations and the ideological divide Persephone sees between Paris and Wellington features strongly (not unlike the dichotomies between France and New Caledonia in Victoria's data).

4.4 Discussion

My participants' experiences of national identity are all different because of their individual intersectional experiences. In both Persephone's and Victoria's cases, these are strongly tied to ethnicity. Another connecting feature is that national identity negotiations are inextricably linked to ideology. The following discussion explores this ideological component by delving more deeply into the connected concept of cultural capital. While capital is dynamic and highly context-dependent, I focus here on the indexical connections that have come to attach themselves to notions of Frenchness, and the French language, given that this was a theme that cut across all three cases in different ways. I briefly reiterate the three forms of cultural capital before coming back to my participants and investigating the shape of capital that characterised their identity negotiations.

4.4.1 Cultural Capital

As described in Chapter 2, cultural capital forms part of Bourdieu's suite of capitals (1977a, 1986, 1991), which contribute to his theory of social reproduction. In the *objectified state* (whilst not often 'marked' in my data), cultural capital may come in the form of 'things' recognised as having status in a particular milieu. Typical examples may include an expensive car or home, or perhaps the latest Apple product. With Hanna, as we have seen, a French keyboard serves as an example. Cultural capital also exists in an *institutionalised state*²⁹, which refers to credentials and qualifications such as degrees that symbolise cultural competence. Conferring institutions with higher prestige translate into higher status (provided the institution is understood as such by interlocutors). As well as referring to skills or tastes, the *embodied state* of cultural capital can be exemplified by the language one speaks, how 'well' one speaks it, as well as the particularities of

²⁹ In my study, this form of capital did not play a major role yet still existed on the periphery by virtue of being tied to a university whilst abroad.

accent - a branch known as linguistic capital (see Bourdieu, 1977b). This embodied state is accorded particular importance in French language ideologies in my data where there was consistent evidence of (assumed) capital associated with speaking ‘proper’ French (as we have seen in Hanna’s French teacher identity, Victoria’s dynamic resistance to notions of standard French, and Persephone’s reflections on her own sociohistorically constituted relationship to assumptions of what it means to speak French ‘correctly’ as well as becoming Parisian). Together, the three states of cultural capital function symbolically in identity negotiations.

4.4.2 ‘Proper’ French

It is timely now to engage more deeply with the notions of ‘proper’ and ‘correct’ French that have traversed all three case studies. A brief example from my data usefully clarifies what is commonly believed to constitute ‘proper’ French. During a discussion on accent variety in France, Hanna responded to my question about the French spoken in Brittany (her home region) by saying that she speaks *le français parlé à la télé, sans accent/the French spoken on television, without an accent*, making a (perhaps unconscious) claim to the prestige which has come to be associated with this norm. My own time in France (both in the past and during my ethnographic data collection) has reinforced this point in that the devaluing (and othering) of non-standard accents (within France and Francophone regions) is a regular and unmarked occurrence (in the media and in conversation).

That these notions of ‘proper’ and ‘correct’ French have taken traction in the collective consciousness is usefully exemplary of both Milroy’s (2001) ‘ideology of standardisation’ and the term ‘language ideologies’ itself, which is used to refer to representations through which language is imbued with cultural meaning (see Schieffelin, Woolard, & Kroskrity, 1998). As an example, “nations may represent their national languages as embodying certain qualities or virtues (e.g., French is said to be clear and logical)” (Cameron, 2014, p. 281). Bourdieu (1991, p. 83) notes that through linguistic habitus, class habitus is expressed, a point reiterated by Menard-Warwick (2005, p. 256) who draws on Gal (1989) and Woolard (1985) to argue that “linguistic capital resides in the standardised forms of speech used by dominant social groups, thus legitimising their authority”. Language ideologies then, inform what ‘counts’ as capital in different contexts. For Hanna, Victoria, and Persephone, constructions of ‘proper’ French appear to be oriented to (and contested) as the form par excellence of the embodied state of cultural capital. What has gained prominence, of course, in terms of societal status, is entirely arbitrary and “an accident of history” (Gee, 2015, p. 14).

Accidents though have aftermaths, and in the case of ideologies, these can be extremely long-lasting. This is not to say that everybody orients to the capital attached to ideology in the same way, as I have shown in the analysis where participants and their interlocutors negotiated the symbolic value of what was brought to the table interactionally. This places credence on the fluid nature of what ‘counts’ as capital, and emphasises the idea of capital as social practice and as necessarily contingent (cf. Meadows, 2009) rather than fixed attributes or possessions that are uniformly recognised across time and space. Having said this, there were clear assumptions of the symbolic value of (standard) French and notions of Frenchness and Parisian-ness³⁰ across the exchange settings. In this sense, embodied cultural capital can be conceptualised as something embodied (through habitus), and as something to aspire to embody (calling forth the concept of investment and potential ‘rewards’).

The ideological link between language and nation has been investigated by those with a particular focus on language policy (e.g. Liddicoat, 2008; Lippi-Green, 1997, 2004; Mar-Molinero & Stevenson, 2005), and these studies often address the monolingual ideologies mentioned above, or what has been termed the ‘one language, one nation’ ideology (Ricento, 2005; Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994). Engaging with these ideological links reveals more layers in considerations of capital. Language ideologies have emerged in France over long periods and have gained strength through “processes of state formation and education” (Estival & Pennycook, 2011, p. 331). In other words, the “accident of history” Gee (2015) refers to was very carefully orchestrated. The French language serves as a strong symbol of French identity (Ager, 1996, p. 194), and those varieties recognised by nation-states are “imbued with linguistic capital (Bourdieu, 1977a) and maintained through standard language ideologies” (Meadows, 2014, p. 340). As far back as 1635 the statutes of the Académie Française make clear the ideological connection between nation and language:

La principale fonction de l’Académie sera de travailler avec tout le soin et la diligence possible à donner des règles à notre langue et à la rendre pure, éloquente et capable de traiter les arts et les sciences/The main role of the Academy will be to work with all possible care and diligence to give our language rules and to make it pure, eloquent and capable of dealing with all arts and science (as cited in Estival & Pennycook, 2011, p. 336).

³⁰ I would argue that this ‘passing’ as Parisian can be seen to involve both the embodied and objectified states of cultural capital.

In connecting French language rules with *purity* and *eloquence*, there is a concomitant idea that people speaking or writing it will embody these qualities if the rules are followed (drawing on the idea of the nation as an imagined community). Foregrounding *arts and science* elevates the French language to academic and intellectual fields, placing status on these realms (and stripping it from others) which extends to the people that populate them. A written and spoken ‘command’ of the French language has long been indexical to notions of high culture and the intellectual elite, characteristics which now infuse notions of Frenchness. The Discourses Hanna draws on allow insights into her habitus as it has been formed in such a French context, and in particular, how her own experiences of learning French have been normalised (mastering the mechanics of French as a system is prioritised in the French education system). Hanna’s habitus has been formed by France’s long tradition of condemning faults and errors (Ager, 1999), and as such, her version of a French teacher identity is immediately recognisable for many, echoing traditional pedagogical values popular in France.

Native French speakers and non-native speakers alike are bound up in these Discourses, being made to feel inadequate or even ridiculed for ‘mistakes’, or needing extra tuition. The fact that many of the people to whom I spoke during data collection (including French native speakers) still saw their incomplete mastery of French grammar as a personal ‘deficiency’ points to the strength of these Discourses and the fact they have been institutionalised by the State and the education system in France and French territories (see Ager, 1999). This focus on correction and associated ‘purity’ was evidenced too in the discourse of my other French participants (Hugo, Jules, Pierre, and less so Félix), who all insisted on being corrected immediately during our conversations in English. This request (which I had heard countless times before by French students) jarred with my own teaching experience and philosophy.

Interestingly, and perhaps in line with her strategy of distancing herself from a French identity, Victoria was the only participant who did not make this request of me. For my other French participants, however, direct and instant correction was viewed as a highly effective learning tool, and they lamented the fact on more than one occasion that most New Zealanders they met were *too polite* to do this. From this angle, Hanna’s commitment to a French teacher identity (of which correction and knowledge are valuable components) can therefore be seen as part of a highly ingrained ideology of what it means to learn, and perhaps what it means to help people learn.

Such Discourses, however, have not remained unproblematised in the academic realm. Rosina Lippi-Green's (1997) powerful volume on standard English ideologies in the United States, for example, calls to question the accepted relationship between 'good' ('correct') English and the assumption that those who speak it are highly educated and have 'no accent'. Importantly, she emphasises how these ideologies empower some and marginalise others (and see Showstack, 2017 for an investigation of Spanish heritage language learners). Those who do not speak this valued 'standard' form of English therefore do not have this form of linguistic capital at their disposal, which restricts their ability to claim identities. It is this very juxtaposition that we see reflected in my study abroad data.

For Hanna, the French language and other forms of Frenchness can be seen as capital affordances which she deploys through investment in her French teacher identity by way of laying claim to status in her interactions. Victoria's identity negotiations, as a French speaker from New Caledonia, are also imbued with the powerful symbolism of France and Frenchness. In laying claim to a Caledonian identity and to a regional Pacific identity more widely, her discursive distancing from standard French and notions of Frenchness plays a central role in her self-positioning and reflections. While she often resists the 'inherent' capital in these ideologies, this is not a straightforward process as we can see in excerpt 2 when she seemingly illustrates Bourdieu's notion of symbolic domination by falling into Discourses of standard French as cultural capital.

Persephone's data provides intriguing insights into how she both negotiates and reflects on her national identity whilst on exchange, and we see consistent evidence of her resisting the assumption of capital associated with standard French and being Parisian. As the analysis has shown, laying claim to a New Zealand identity took interactional precedence for Persephone, especially during the first half of her exchange as she made sense of her new surroundings and her place in them. Intersectionality was again crucial. Her New Zealand infused habitus was developed in conjunction with her sociohistorically-constituted sense of self, which resulted in a growing critical engagement with ideological constraints. While she readily acknowledged her recourse to stereotype, her reflections problematise expectations for exchange students to unproblematically assimilate to or move towards elements of the 'host culture'. I return to these points in Chapter 6.

4.5 Concluding Remarks

Negotiating national identity whilst on exchange is clearly a complex process. It is co-constructed in interaction as well as with (imagined) audiences on social media such as Facebook. This co-

construction involves imagined national communities, ethnic identities, ideologies, and the capital which underpins these. The analysis throws much needed light on the ‘negotiation of difference’ (Block, 2007a; Kinginger, 2013) deemed desirable for students on study abroad. Rather than showing evidence of ambivalence - “the uncertainty of feeling a part and feeling apart” (Block, 2007a, p. 21), Hanna, Victoria and Persephone all foreground their national identities in various ways, making clear through their narrative and interactional positioning that complete assimilation to the ‘host culture’ was not their priority at this point in their exchanges (despite their stated aims of language improvement and learning about the countries they were in).

The role of ideologies (and connections to cultural capital) has been explored as the common thread in the national and ethnic identity negotiations of Hanna, Victoria, and Persephone. The next chapter explores this macro constraint in more depth as I investigate participants’ gender and sexuality identity negotiations. Alongside nationality and ethnicity, the social constructs of gender and sexuality became extremely salient for several of my participants, leading to intriguing insights into identity negotiations in study abroad settings. While the salience of national identity is often linked to students’ experiences of sexual harassment (to return to a common finding in the SA literature), my data shows that the explanation of ‘cross-cultural’ differences and the associated ideas of ‘misunderstanding’ are not sufficient in seeking analytical depth and understanding of such entrenched practices. For this reason, I believe it is important to go beyond an investigation of “local meanings of practices” (Kinger, 2013, p. 348) and enter into the ideological realm which connects to and permeates locally specific Discourses and norms. Importantly, this perspective is also consistent with my social realist stance (and avoids interpretations of participants as somehow being in the wrong through ‘lack’ of cultural understanding). The next chapter embraces this challenge.

Chapter 5: Gender and Sexuality

The previous chapter explored the different ways in which nationality and ethnicity became prominent for my participants during their exchanges in Paris and Wellington, highlighting the important role of co-construction, lived experience, and ideologies in identity negotiations. This chapter builds on these foundations and introduces gender and sexuality as overlapping and extremely salient identities for my participants in their study abroad contexts. Data shows the connections between nationality and gender/sexuality in that participants' conceptualisations and enactment of their identities as women and men were bound up in the socialisation of their home contexts. While gender is omnirelevant in terms of identity, thus analytically difficult to 'pin down' (e.g. Cameron, 2009; Holmes, 1995), it was foregrounded as a salient identity, category, and ideology for participants during their exchanges. Gender and sexuality became important in different ways in their new sociocultural contexts, providing both affordances and constraints for identity work and giving rise to rich opportunities for analytical exploration. Data illuminates how a participant's habitus was sometimes 'triggered' by norms and Discourses in the new sociocultural settings, which led to different levels of reflection. This chapter is separated into two sections - Persephone, Athena, and Viv in Paris, and Hanna and Hugo in Wellington. To provide strong foundations for analysis, I begin the chapter with a brief review of pertinent literature before returning to the concept of gender as socially constructed, with a particular focus on the ideological structure of the 'gender order' (Connell, 1987; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, p. 32). I then introduce the concept of sexuality through the same constructionist lens, and underscore the connections between the constructs of gender and sexuality, emphasising the ideology of heteronormativity as the main link between the two.

5.1 Gendered Identities in the Literature

In terms of the SA literature, identity categories of gender have often been accessed through the prism of sexual harassment (as well as linked to the category of nationality, as we saw in the previous chapter). As outlined in Chapter 1, many SA studies have investigated the occurrence of sexual harassment (in a variety of countries) and the repercussions for students' sense of self and language learning opportunities. Particular studies which inspire my aim of accessing analytical depth in this chapter are those which accord importance to intersectionality, sociocultural Discourses, and ideologies. These include Susan Talburt & Melissa Stewart's (1999) study which, as noted in Chapter 4, explored the plight of Mishieela and her racialised experiences of sexual

harassment whilst on Study Abroad in Spain. Uju Anya (2016) too, while not focusing on sexual harassment per se, offers a rigorous intersectional exploration of the connections between the gendered, racialised, and socially-classed experience of Leti in one of her case studies of African American students in Salvador, Brazil. Anya also sheds light on the underexplored category of sexuality in SA. By investigating Discourses of homophobia (firmly tethered to the ideology of heteronormativity) as experienced by another participant, Didier, she provides insights into the extreme difficulties some students face in new contexts where more progressive ideologies regarding sexuality are slower to gain acceptance.

Studies with an explicit focus on ideologies include that of Meryl Siegal (1996) who explores the notion of ‘conflicting femininities’. She focuses specifically on the experiences of Mary, a New Zealand high school teacher of Japanese in Japan for professional development purposes, who struggles to reconcile different sociocultural Discourses with her identity as a professional woman. Celeste Kinginger & Kathleen Farrell-Whitworth (2005) investigate Discourses of Frenchness as impacting the emotional investment of their three participants studying abroad in France, showing how gendered practices and harassment were interpreted “through the lens of American ideologies of French gender” (2005, p. 15). In applied linguistics, Ingrid Piller & Kimie Takahashi (2006) in a particularly methodologically-robust study examine the role of the ideology of *akogare* - the “idealisation or longing for all things Western” (Block, 2007a, p. 181) for their female Japanese participants in Australia. In another adult ESL context, this time in California, Julia Menard-Warwick (2009) fuses together gender identity, language learning, power, and ideologies in her research on immigrant language learners, delving deeply into the sociohistorical and political contexts of her participants and urging teachers to create space for a questioning of gendered Discourses which constrain learners.

There is thus an exciting movement in the literature towards more consideration of intersectionality and to the role of ideologies and Discourses, leaving appealing room for even more nuanced understandings of gender and sexuality in SA contexts. This chapter aims to push the field forward by engaging with the ontological properties of gender and sexuality ideologies and showing how my participants use language to negotiate identities within these constraints. Importantly, I do not seek to ‘pin’ norms, Discourses, and corresponding behaviour to a certain milieu and elevate one culture over another, as Kinginger (2015) argues has happened in many studies focusing on North American students’ experiences.

5.2 Gender

It seems apt to return to Simone de Beauvoir at this point and her seminal work *The Second Sex* (1949). That this hugely influential tome was written nearly 70 years ago points to the author's 'audacity' in challenging, unpacking, and ultimately unravelling the status quo of women, their 'reified' status as 'other'. While from today's perspective we can see a few 'holes' (a privileging perhaps of one 'type' of woman rather than an intersectional approach), the sheer depth of exploration and the intricacies of her arguments remain powerful and compelling. The well-known quote *On ne naît pas femme, on le devient/One is not born, but rather becomes, woman* (de Beauvoir, 2011[1949], p. 293) - encapsulates the idea of 'woman' as a socially constructed category and as 'other' (i.e. defined by everything man is not); it dismantles essentialist arguments of innate characteristics and displaces biology with a sociohistorical constitution, one which is governed by the grand narratives of the particular epoch women live within.

Although the social category of men was not at the forefront of de Beauvoir's investigation (because of the social and economic power and privilege they had wielded for centuries), her argument is connected to the construction of masculinity (see e.g. Kiesling, 2007, 2011, 2013). In other words, what it means to be 'man' in different places at different times is also a social construction, and no less a construction than that of 'woman'. That men have ended up holding more power than women is not a miraculous feat of nature, but rather the result of reinforced norms, 'misrecognised' (Bourdieu, 1977a, 1991) as natural and common sense. Examples of longstanding norms in many societies which lead to men having more social power include men treating women as property, more access for men to education, and a corresponding overrepresentation of men in politics, law, medicine and other fields imbued with status. As explained in Chapter 2, these norms manifest themselves as socially 'acceptable' forms of femininities and masculinities and are heavily regulated by social structures such as the law, media, family, religions, schools, all of which have ideological underpinnings.

The idea of a socially-constituted gendered subject is not by any means a new one, a point echoed by Deborah Cameron (2009) when she links the theoretical commitment of feminism to de Beauvoir's famous quote about *becoming* woman. This *becoming* is a cultural achievement and something that must be learned (Cameron & Kulick, 2003, p. 3), as discussed in Chapter 2. Just as women are bound up in these socialisation processes and policing, so too are men. Yet it cannot be denied that these processes have granted (and continue to grant) more freedom and power to men throughout history, which is not to say of course that society's visions of how to 'do

acceptable masculinity' suit every man, and nor for that matter is there only one vision of 'masculinity' at any point in history. This leads to the important concept of heterogeneity, a point that deserves emphasis given the frequency with which I have been referring to 'women' and 'men' to lay the groundwork for this chapter (which may be perceived as homogenising).

It feels simplistic and even facetious to make the point that all women and all men do not share commonality of experience. To be clear, I align with the constructionist emphasis on heterogeneity within the established categories of man and woman, though see value in the considered, strategic use of categories of 'men' and 'women' (explained further in the next section). Persephone, for example, as a young feminist-identifying New Zealander of Indian ethnicity did not experience and enact gender in the same way as Hanna, a young white woman from France. The tools available for identity work and unlocking social meaning were indeed unique to each of them. What was similar, however, was the overarching gender ideology - the 'gender order' - which traverses spaces (France and New Zealand) and in which the two were imbricated.

5.2.1 Gender Order

Despite the heterogeneity that exists within groups, society works hard to create and maintain gender categories which function as a controlling mechanism (e.g. Foucault, 1972, 1978; Mills, 2008) through gender ideologies. Eckert & McConnell-Ginet (2003, p. 32) define gender ideology as "a set of beliefs that governs people's participation in the gender order, and by which they explain and justify that participation". The 'gender order' (Connell, 1987) itself refers to ways of performing or being 'feminine' or 'masculine' in a given society and acts as an overarching societal level constraint to which members of a particular society are expected to orient in their interactions (see also Holmes, 2007). Across societies, this mainly takes the form of hegemonic power relations which rely on a strictly enforced set of dichotomies (woman versus man, heterosexual versus homosexual) and associated normative understandings which have gained societal traction over time. Eckert & McConnell-Ginet (2013, p. 5) explain gender as:

The very process of creating a dichotomy by effacing similarity and elaborating on difference, and where there are biological differences, these differences are exaggerated and extended in the service of constructing gender.

The idea of difference is manifest in the notion of *orders* in that the legitimised, dominant forms of performing masculinity and femininity are accorded most 'status' and associated societal

protection. As a basic example, married women who express a desire to have children ‘win’ in the societal acceptance stakes over those who do not express such a desire. In a similar vein, unmarried women who choose to raise a child alone are accorded less status than those who have a partner. In my data, participants recognise elements of this order when they engage with ideas around socially ‘appropriate’ ways of dressing for women. While context is crucial in terms of what works as social or cultural capital, examples such as the ones just listed have strong purchase in dominant forms of societal recognition.

Ideas and beliefs of what it means to be a woman or a man have swept across much of the world, spurred by globalisation, and erasing heterogeneity through reinforcing dichotomy. This results in ideological commonalities affecting how we enact and police gender. Eckert & McConnell-Ginet (2013, p. 24) make the point that this ‘policing’ of perceived gender performance is closely linked in many Western societies to policing sexual preference, as exemplified in their example of a four year old boy being “steered away from flowers and towards stripes for his curtains (or teased for even caring about what his curtains look like) because his dad doesn’t want him to grow up gay”. I return to this connection in the discussion of sexuality. In relation to my study, Discourses around gender and sexuality are composed of different shades and strengths in the two settings of Paris and Wellington. They still serve, however, a common overarching gender ideology heavily anchored in a gender binary, which when subsumed into a societal belief system, works to justify inequality between men and women (e.g. Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, 2013) by providing a blueprint for this perceived ‘natural’ order.

There is a very firm imprint of such categories on the collective consciousness. Gender ‘divisions’ can, however, be harnessed as both an explanatory force in terms of identity negotiations (from an academic perspective) and as a means to achieve a feminist/political purpose in a wider sense. This latter use can be seen perhaps as a more agentive type of ‘strategic essentialism’ (Boyne, 1990, p. 170), employed by people wishing to emphasise their collective identities as women for example, as is evident in the current climate with Women’s Marches protesting Donald Trump’s election, the #MeToo movement calling out systemic sexual assault and harassment, and other pathbreaking acts of solidarity. Whilst running the risk of concealing heterogeneity, we must acknowledge too that for many people “in everyday life it really is often the case that gender is ‘essential’ ... that gender as a social category *matters*” (Holmes & Meyerhoff, 2003, p. 9; emphasis original). Although power was not the starting place of my analysis, it certainly rears its head on a regular basis in my data. I follow Janet Holmes (2007, p. 57) then, in seeing a level of generalisation

as “strategically indispensable”. This idea is also mirrored in contemporary feminist writing, with Rebecca Solnit (2017, p. 131) offering a succinct and punchy summary: “The idea that gender is a false binary is a useful one, yet gender is also an inescapably useful thing in talking about who does what to whom and has done over the ages”. In terms of this thesis, I choose to use categories (women and men) when it is analytically justifiable and helpful. This does not detract from my constructionist aims to account for heterogeneity within categories and intersectionality of experience in my analysis. To return to my point above, I see the actual instantiation of gender identities as very different, but the ideological underpinnings as having commonalities. The following section introduces the concept of sexuality as it pertains to identity, emphasising the links with gender.

5.3 Sexuality

Within the field of gender and language studies, there has been a growing recognition, or what might even be termed ‘awakening’ among scholars, of the interconnectedness of the two concepts of gender and sexuality (e.g. Cameron & Kulick, 2003, 2006; Coates, 2013a; Ehrlich, Meyerhoff, & Holmes, 2014; Kiesling, 2013; Mills & Mullany, 2011; Sauntson, 2008). Sauntson (2008), for example, emphasises the inseparability of gender and sexuality in feminist linguistic analysis, and Bucholtz & Hall (2004, p. 471) point out the necessity of studying the power relations in which the two constructs sit, both strongly echoing Foucault’s points in his *History of Sexuality* (1976). Cameron & Kulick (2003) in a detailed exploration of the construct, make the point that the most common understanding of the word ‘sexuality’ (in contemporary English-speaking communities) is tied to erotic preference, as in same-sex versus other-sex, “particularly where that becomes a basis for some ratified social identity such as ‘gay man’ or ‘lesbian’” (p.7). While the authors also acknowledge the fluidity and changing nature of such categories, their allusion to the societal ‘safety net’ provided by categorisation and dichotomies is clear. As outlined in Chapter 2, Foucault (1976) emphasises the creation of such categories and associated indexicalities of ‘deviance’ or ‘normality’ as representative of the inner workings of societal and institutional power, of how people come to believe what is ‘normal’ in terms of sexual behaviour and desires, and how discourses can be defined as the “practices which systematically form the objects of which they speak” (Foucault, 1972, p. 149).

It is these constructions of sexuality which have the most relevance for my study. These ‘regimes of truth’ (Cameron et al., 1993, p. 89) always depend on the currency of certain Discourses in circulation in a particular time and place. It is this discursive level, rather than sexual orientation

or affiliation per se, which stimulates my interest, providing as it does the richest explanation of how my participants use language to negotiate identities within existing frameworks in their new settings. Therefore, while I acknowledge that 'sexuality' is more than a social identity, referring as it does to "fantasies, fears, repressions or desires" (Cameron & Kulick, 2003, p.78) (i.e, the psychological and cognitive aspects), I focus rather on the discursive relationship between identities, Discourses, and ideologies as they relate to my participants' identity experiences whilst on study abroad.

5.3.1 Heteronormativity

The highly regulatory ideological structure of 'heteronormativity' (Warner, 1991) links gender to sexuality through the assumption of heterosexuality³¹ as the norm (Mills & Mullany, 2011, p. 172). Cameron & Kulick (2003, p. 7) clarify society's perception in this respect:

Hence, if you are not heterosexual you cannot be a real man or a true woman; and if you are not a real man or a true woman you cannot be heterosexual. What this means is that sexuality and gender have a 'special relationship', a particular kind of mutual dependence which no analysis of either can overlook.

From a linguistic angle, Cameron & Kulick (2006, p. 51) also note the "crucial role played by compulsory heterosexuality in the construction of gender identity and gender relations". Coates (2013a) maintains that the lexicalisation of the term 'heteronormativity' is one of the most important insights of queer theory, showing how "sexuality is organised and regulated in accordance with certain societal beliefs about what is normal, natural and desirable" (Cameron & Kulick, 2006, p. 165). In this sense, the heterosexual couple has come to assume "the privileged example of sexual culture" (Berlant & Warner, 1998, p. p.548). In other words, and in connection with the gender order, dominant forms of 'appropriate' femininity or masculinity are anchored in heteronormative understandings of the world. This point is made very clearly in Coates' work (see e.g. Coates, 1996, 2003, 2013a, 2013b). These works contain compelling empirical evidence of women and men (in separate groups) performing dominant forms of femininity and masculinity in which relations with the 'opposite sex' take discursive precedence. Examples include the unproblematic assumption that 'us' equals 'he' and 'she', and the assumption that the topic of

³¹ It is important to note here that the prefixes of hetero- and homo- also erase heterogeneity of experience, and do not allow for sexually fluid identities. I therefore use these prefixes with the same 'strategic essentialism' as in the above discussion on the categories 'women' and 'men'.

children and being a good mother are indexical to important values for the female groups. A frequent occurrence in the male groups was talking about their aspirations in the context of a heterosexual relationship, ensuring their status as part of a monogamous couple was 'heard'. These examples reveal an unproblematic orientation to a shared knowledge and acceptance of heteronormative values, of which hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987) is widely recognised as being part (Coates, 2013a).

Not all forms of heterosexuality are given equal credence, however, a notion captured well by Cameron & Kulick (2006, p. 165) in their term 'heteronormative hierarchy.' As per this hierarchy "the most favoured form of sexuality is monogamous ... reproductive... and conventional in terms of gender roles" (Cameron & Kulick, 2006, p. 165). Straying from these heavily policed boundaries can result in various types of sanctions, including both institutional and emotional forms (see McElhinny, 2014), and I would argue that remaining within them comes with their own special set of sanctions and constraints, despite for the most part not being recognised as such (e.g. remaining within an unfulfilling monogamous partnership). This idea of 'orders' within ideologies is a pertinent one (as we have seen with the 'gender order'); those aspects characterised as of the highest order are those which have come to be internalised by society as natural and have taken on an ontological status which reflects this 'truth'. While gender and sexual identities can indeed be viewed as separate (constructed) categories and identities, I follow Coates (2013a) and Cameron & Kulick (2003, 2006) in seeing heteronormativity as the crucial link between the two.

I turn now to my participants, whose data anchors the theoretical discussion and literature in real, lived experience. The analysis focuses firstly on the ways in which gender and sexuality were highlighted for Persephone, Athena, and Viv in Paris, and then for Hanna and Hugo in Wellington. The close discourse analysis emphasises the heterogeneity of experience within 'categories' yet shows the inescapability of gender and sexuality ideologies in my participants' identity negotiations during their time abroad.

5.4 Findings and Discussion

5.4.1 Paris: Gender, Sexuality, and Sexual Harassment

Alison Thomas & Celia Kitzinger (1994, p. 152) note, drawing on feminist scholarship, that sexual harassment is "primarily a way of reinforcing male power over women", thus speaking straight to the ideological heart of this pervasive practice. For Persephone, Athena, and Viv, their experiences

of sexual harassment in Paris began almost immediately, throwing their identities as young women into stark relief and simultaneously foregrounding their sexuality.

5.4.1.1 Interview Data - Persephone, Athena, and Shelley: Red Lipstick, Long Flowy Skirts and 'Overthinking'

Week 4 Paris

The first extract is from my first interview with Persephone and Athena. Persephone was beginning her fourth week in Paris and had been ill with a cold as well as significantly homesick. Athena, on the other hand was entering into her second semester in Paris and was feeling very much part of the Parisian landscape. Already, for Persephone, the metro as a localised space was proving daunting in terms of the overt sexualisation she was experiencing. Through Persephone's reflections and many affective stance moves (Du Bois, 2007; Jaffe, 2009), we gain a sense of the struggle she is currently facing during this early stage of her exchange. The following excerpts highlight attempts to reconcile her sense of herself as a young feminist woman from New Zealand with these objectifying practices. The interview is composed of three parts, running for 1 hour and 48 minutes in total. The following excerpts all come from the third and final part which lasted for just over 34 minutes. Persephone had started telling a story about her experiences on the metro after we had stopped recording and after checking with her about recording again, we return to the topic. The 'red lipstick' is indexically-laden and invites us immediately into the realm of wider Discourses as they pertain to gender and sexuality.

Excerpt 1

0.01 – 0.20

1. Shelley: okay so back to the red lipstick
2. Persephone: okay s//o\
3. Shelley: /ok\ \ay
4. Persephone: I get really scared of attracting attention on the
5. met//ro\
6. Shelley: /ye\ \ah
7. Persephone: so I like don't wear clothes I usually wear out
8. Shelley: mm
9. Persephone: and like don't wear tight things or short things
10. whatever cos I get scared that men will
11. [fast]: approach me or do something to me:
12. Shelley: yeah //yeah\

13. Persephone: /and\ then like [tut] + the other night I went out
14. on Saturday and I was wearing my
15. [slightly dismissive tone]: long flowy skirt and a flowy
16. top: and whatever

Persephone's emphasis on her attire on the metro takes us directly to the crux of her current struggle. What she does not wear - *tight things or short things* - (line 9) provides a point of contrast to what she does wear - *long flowy skirt and a flowy top - and whatever* - (lines 15 and 16). The repetition of the adjective 'flowy' serves to emphasise the lack of 'tightness' to her choice of clothing, feeding directly into notions of propriety embedded in traditional versions of femininity which accord importance to 'chasteness'. Persephone's dismissive tone here (accentuated by her use of the general extender *whatever*) provides a valuable contextualisation cue as to her epistemic stance (Biber & Finnegan, 1989; Du Bois, 2007; Jaffe, 2009); it deftly signals her non-compliance on a theoretical level, which in turn mitigates her apparent discursive acquiescence to such constraints. On several other occasions, Persephone spoke of her perception of New Zealand (and in particular her home town of Wellington) as being 'open' and 'liberal', allowing her the freedom to dress as she liked, which included short skirts and tight clothing in general.³² Persephone regularly positions herself as feminist (as we see at the end of this particular extract), and the freedom, as she sees it, to dress how she wants appears to index a level of perceived agency, which is now being called into question in her new environment. The next excerpt continues to build on this idea.

Excerpt 2

0.28 – 0.57

1. Persephone: that's why that's why I put a cardigan on top over it
2. Shelley: yep
3. Persephone: like then I was like I was actually thought about it
4. for like five minutes I was like I really wanna
5. wear red lipstick cos it will go nice with my red top
6. [...]
7. Persephone: and so I was like oh but I did put it on and like honestly
8. I felt so weird wearing it on the metro cos I did
9. get [drawls]: scared: and I did get lots of looks

³² It is worth reiterating that Persephone's perception is the product of her own socially-constituted habitus, and therefore not necessarily representative of all women of her age in New Zealand.

Persephone's addition of a *cardigan* (line 1) to her outfit is significant. In and of itself a cardigan may not be an entirely surprising addition to an outfit for a night out, but it is worth noting two things. Firstly, Paris at this time was experiencing a significant heatwave, and many people I knew were choosing to avoid the metro system because of the extreme levels of heat. Wearing a cardigan in these conditions would have certainly added a level of discomfort. Secondly, the cardigan appears to function as a shield, designed to protect Persephone from the male gaze. Her choice of loose 'flowy' clothing coupled with the protection of the cardigan mirrors some of the strategies adopted by Twombly's (1995) participants in Costa Rica in attempts to deflect unwanted male sexual attention. It also reflects Coleman's (2013b) participants who, during their time abroad in Senegal, developed coping strategies to deal with sexual approaches and spontaneous offers of marriage. As well as changes in dress, these strategies included wearing fake wedding rings and referring to non-existent husbands, a strategy we see used by Athena in a later extract.

There are clear echoes of puritanical Discourses creeping into these notions of 'appropriate' behaviour for women in Persephone's recounting. In this line of thinking, the female body should be covered up so as not to draw attention to itself, and responsibility lies solely with the woman (e.g. Kramarae & Zhang, 2015) because of the corresponding 'powerlessness' of men in the face of such 'provocation'. Persephone herself falls into this Discourse when she expresses her fears of attracting attention. Whether or not she actually 'buys into' this Discourse is not important at this point, but her reflexive positioning shows an awareness of others' willingness to believe it, leading to her need to develop coping strategies in response. The use of 'I' in Persephone's phrase *I get scared of attracting attention* (Excerpt 1, line 1) is not without a certain level of irony in that grammatically Persephone positions herself as the subject, as the agent responsible for her own potential objectivity (explained further in Excerpt 3). This, unfortunately, mirrors 'slut shaming' Discourses which predominate in rape culture, of which a clear example can be seen in those who foolishly seek to pin the blame for sexual assault on women's choice of clothing or amount of makeup worn. In reinforcing her quandary, Persephone may be seen to be distancing herself (as both narrator and protagonist) from the possibility of this perception.

While Persephone often problematised this senseless Discourse with astute and analytical reasoning (lamenting her own relative powerlessness, for example, in the face of this structured inequality), its strength was pervasive. As she mentions later in the same interaction, *if it's a choice of being a feminist and being safe and like I would be safe* (not included in the excerpts), a phrase

which summarises well her struggle. In acknowledging this ‘appropriate’ version of femininity there is a simultaneous acknowledgement of what is not seen as socially appropriate, thus calling forth the false dichotomy (e.g. Bourdieu, 1977a) of the ‘good girl’/‘bad girl’ frame (e.g. Cameron & Kulick, 2003), and Schippers’ (2007, p. 95) notion of *pariah* or *subordinated* femininities in reference to women embracing sexuality and other traits associated with hegemonic masculinity (King, 2011). The symbolic value of the ‘red lipstick’ is exceptionally illustrative in this regard in that Persephone’s indecision around whether or not to wear red lipstick to the party has many indexical ties. Despite it symbolising feminist empowerment (for Persephone) in her home context, meaning shifts to other areas of the indexical field in this Paris context as she seeks to reconcile her sense of self as feminist within the structuring properties of disempowering narratives. Through her emphasis on her indecision, she appears to acknowledge the dynamic properties of the symbolic load:

like then I was like I was actually thought about it for like five minutes I was like I really wanna wear red lipstick cos it will go nice with my red top (lines 3 - 5)

The emphasis on the length of time (five minutes) she took to take the decision is by all accounts in stark contrast to what she would do in New Zealand, where no such considerations were ‘needed’ in order to apply her favourite lipstick colour. The lipstick then, ties into Persephone’s performative identity as a woman, and her New Zealand feminist identity. At a deeper level, it may also be seen to function symbolically as a reclaiming of alternative Discourses, which link red lipstick (among other things) to “narratives of excessive, dangerous femininity” (Ferreday, 2008, p. 48), a point Debra Ferreday makes eloquently in her examination of Burlesque subculture. Embracing the colour red, then, appears to function as a challenge to hegemonic notions, offering an unapologetic commitment to a pleasurable feminine identity, which eschews the “problematic relationship between feminism and feminine identity practices” (Ferreday, 2008, p. 51). Yet it is precisely this relationship which is called to question in the Parisian public transport context.

Persephone’s transition to new norms in Paris appears to trigger her habitus in this respect. Her dormant understanding of the indexical qualities of red lipstick is pushed to the forefront of her considerations, and it is telling, too, that both Athena and I orient just as unproblematically to this symbolism. Despite our twenty year age gap, we have all been socialised into traditional notions of the ‘good girl’/‘bad girl’ dichotomy, so much so that Persephone’s concern over whether to apply the lipstick (and her accompanying justification of her reasons for wanting to) fall neatly into

our existing schemata. Our awareness of the sexual indexical ties associated with red lipstick provides an implicit backdrop of shared knowledge to the interaction. Despite identifying as feminists and objecting to such dichotomies on an ontological level, the very real possibility of sanctions (being leered at or physically harassed) takes interactional (and actual) precedence. This offers useful insights into the contextual constraints upon agency.

The fact that Persephone, after much thought, chooses to wear the lipstick on the metro unfortunately serves to reinforce her fears through their resulting realisation:

and so I was like oh but I did put it on and like honestly I felt so + weird wearing it on the metro cos I did get scared and I did get lots of looks (lines 7-9)

Whether or not the red lipstick was the ‘cause’ of the many looks she received is clearly not the main point. What is of much more interest is that in navigating public spaces in Paris, Persephone’s identity as a young woman and a sexual being was immediately made salient. In order to reconcile her feminist sense of self in this setting, she was forced to engage with wider Discourses which constrain possibilities for action and empowerment. Being subject to the male gaze in such a regular, confrontational, and unapologetic manner brought this into stark relief and was a formative part of her transition to the city. The following phrase later in the interaction demonstrates the force of her identity struggle at the time:

Excerpt 3

1.03 – 1.09

yeah I just get scared like I just ugh and I hate cos like in New Zealand I’m + the biggest well I’m the biggest feminist ever

The use of affective stance moves (*scared*, *hate*), the disdain evident in the use of ‘ugh’ as a discourse marker, and the final use of the superlative phrase all combine to situate this struggle at the juncture of local and ideological frames. The brief hesitation evident in the pause and her use of the discourse marker ‘well’ also serve to emphasise the importance of counter Discourses to what she is experiencing. Later in the same recording, Persephone further elaborates on her struggle and confusion, positioning herself as deficient in comparison to Viv who often presents as more worldly and savvy. Again we feel the force of Discourses of blame and responsibility as commonly experienced by women.

Excerpt 4

20.37 – 20.46

1. Persephone: maybe I overthink cos I feel like talking to Viv she
2. doesn't like feel nervous she'll probably be like
3. oh you're so () Persephone honestly
4. Shelley: yeah
5. Persephone: yeah I dunno I just I dunno probably just my mindset

Persephone's doubts about *overthink[ing]* and her particular *mindset* cannot be seen as benign linguistic choices, indexing as they do a much more sinister Discourse which posits that in the case of unwanted attention, women should look to themselves first (calling back Persephone's previous comments in excerpts 1 and 2). Susan Ehrlich's work (e.g. 2001, 2007) has intricately shown how this Discourse of responsibility is a key tenet of rape culture in its absolution of perpetrator guilt, an occasioning which flips the 'active male' and 'passive female' stereotypes on their heads - for all the wrong reasons. In both Ehrlich's work and that of Kate Clark (1992), there are abundant examples of the (male) agent rendered invisible, aided by strategic linguistic choices (e.g. the use of the passive voice in rape trials, and other distancing strategies) which serve to (re)construct the notion of the culpable woman. That this Discourse is so ingrained in our cultural narratives is evidenced in Persephone's questioning of her own way of thinking and in her use of 'I' in the above examples. As we will see, this is also a Discourse accessed by Athena and Viv in subsequent extracts as they make sense of their own experiences of sexual harassment. Athena then orients the conversation back to the immediate context of the metro system, suggesting that a poster campaign on sexual harassment³³ would be of more value than the current safety campaign which centres on safety features.

Excerpt 5

20.47 – 21.22

1. Athena: like have you seen those things like I don't know if you
2. guys have noticed they have all these new posters
3. about safety on the metro yeah like
4. don't stick your head out the win//dow\

³³ Interestingly, a poster campaign was launched by the Paris Public Transport agency (RATP) in March 2018 with the aim of drawing attention to and eliminating sexual harassment on public transport. The previous campaign was in 2015.

5. Shelley: /oh\\ that's interesting
6. Athena: yeah don't stick your arms out and those things
7. you know don't run when the bell's ringing like they
8. should have those for like um sexual harassment
9. Shelley: [drawls]: yes:
10. Persephone: France is such a liberal country like it's such a liberal
11. again such a liberal country but it's so backward
12. that's such a str- I don't get it

This line of reasoning functions as a clear contextual cue, drawing on our shared understanding of the ubiquity of sexual harassment on the metro, and effectively quashing expressions of self-doubt on Persephone's part. Interestingly, this move also paves the way for a widening of Persephone's reflective lens from personal to societal. In expressing her confusion it is noteworthy that Persephone does not negatively evaluate people per se, but chooses to frame 'the country' as having a blight - *it's so backward* - (line11) against its liberal leanings. Despite the generalised nature of her statement, there is evidence of the beginnings of analytical engagement with the scope of the problem.

5.4.1.2 Interactional Data – Persephone and Athena: Being Followed, Being Hunted, Being 'Prey'

Week 6 Paris

Further evidence of this struggle can be seen in the following extract between Athena and Persephone in week 6 (of Persephone's stay). They had met in a public park in Paris and their conversation quickly turned to their experiences of sexual harassment in the city. Throughout this excerpt, Persephone appears to cast Athena in the role of 'expert', as someone who has experience living in Paris and dealing with unwanted attention from men. As such, the conversation can again be seen as part of the process of exploration of understanding during Persephone's transition period to the city.

Excerpt 6

0.02 – 0.18

1. Athena: okay so I was waiting at um the met- on I came at
2. the metro station waiting for my friend
3. Persephone: mm //hm\
4. Athena: /to\\ get there and I was sitting down at the bench

5. and this guy just kept on looked at me looking at me
6. but I thought I was just overreacting like + and then
7. um my friend like she was um coming from the RER

The *okay* uttered by Athena signals the beginning of her story (Schiffrin, 1987) which establishes the now familiar setting of the metro (and the RER – a separate but linked train system). That public transport is the setting par excellence for the majority of my participants' sexual harassment experiences is a fact that many women, including myself, will find unsurprising. Athena's self-questioning in the form of the verb *overreacting* immediately reflects the Discourses of female responsibility (or exaggeration or attention-seeking) accessed by Persephone in the previous interview excerpts and points to the extent to which this damaging Discourse has been subsumed into her (and many women's) habitus. This expression of self-doubt appears to function in my data as a go-to mechanism, as a way to distance oneself from the (ever-present) possibility of blame or disbelief, and again calls forth Ehrlich's work outlined above. It is a reaction which has become strongly gendered and has indexical ties to sexist notions of women as irrational and emotional (see Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2013, p. 158). In other words, 'credibility' is enhanced by discursively acknowledging the potential for overreaction and signalling that this was accounted for.

Yet the very act of distancing oneself from potential blame implies that it is necessary to do so, and thereby perpetuates this Discourse rather than challenges it. While both participants problematise such Discourses on many occasions, as I have already mentioned, this level of conscious reflection is often relegated to later stages of my participants' discussions. Cameron & Kulick (2003) show this similar phenomenon reflected in an interview with a female pop group (The Donnas). While there was evidence of the Donnas 'pushing back' against constraining Discourses around 'acceptable' female sexuality (through their lyrics and interview data where enthusiastic sexual personas were performed), there was a simultaneous distancing from the 'slut' stigma and a clear allegiance to "the more traditional ideals of love and fidelity – the very ideals that separate the chaste woman from the whore" (Cameron & Kulick, 2003, p. 32). This is similar to my data; problematic frames (such as victim-blaming and the 'slut' stigma) become so ingrained, so normalised, that even in acts of ostensibly agentive 'pushing back' there are clear echoes of structural impediment. The next part of the conversation follows Athena's description of the labyrinth of tunnels in this particular metro/RER station and the ensuing difficulty she had in

meeting her friend at the correct exit. They eventually decide to meet outside at a particular point on a designated street.

Excerpt 7

1.02 – 1.47

1. Athena: so I crossed the road and then I kind of like looked out
2. of the corner of my eye
3. Persephone: oh god
4. Athena: and the [drawls]: guy: was same guy was standing
5. there and I'm like how like did he not just decide
6. to [drawls]: go:
7. Persephone: yeah
8. Athena: he didn't just have to go when I went so oh like
9. my heart's pounding right now I'm like
10. [laughing tone]: freaking out:
11. Persephone: yeah
12. Athena: and so I like literally walked as soon as it turns
13. green I walk fast //like\ like power walking and then
14. Persephone: /yeah\\
15. Athena: like he just starts calling like mademoiselle
16. Persephone: [gasps]
17. Athena: like really loud and I'm like I'm just like literally
18. //like I wanna die like\ I wanna die like what [laughs]
19. Persephone: /that's so creepy yeah\\
20. yeah
21. Athena: um oh my gosh it was so fucking gross //[laughs] sorry\
22. and then um [laughs] and then literally he starts calling
23. my name and then like he's really tall
24. Persephone: /yeah [quietly]: it's alright it's alright:\\
25. yeah
26. Athena: and so like I can't walk that fast and he like
27. catches up to //me\
28. Persephone: /oh\\ my god

As with all the conversational data between Athena and Persephone, there is much evidence of supportive identity co-construction - use of laughter, ratified affective stance moves, and cooperative minimal feedback and overlaps for example, as well as Athena's frequent use of the

discourse markers *like* and *literally* which lay claim at a micro level to her identity as young woman. These features scaffold their interactions and provide valuable contextualisation cues for accessing meaning as it unfolds. The laughter, in particular, appears to be used in moments of high stress to relieve anxiety (cf. Apte, 1985), and shows a simultaneous awareness that Persephone will also orient to these moments as such.

Athena distances herself from any blame by emphasising the height of her pursuer (line 23). In other words, despite her attempts to walk fast and remove herself as the object of unwanted attention, she was unable to succeed because of the disparities in their heights and his ability to walk faster. This type of self-positioning is consistently ratified by Persephone throughout the extract, suggesting both an encouragement to continue talking and a shared orientation to such scripts. Despite both Athena and Persephone telling me that they had never experienced any form of sexual harassment in New Zealand, it is telling that they both orient unproblematically to the script of male as pursuer and female as pursued, anchored in the wider Discourse which sees men as active sexual subjects and women as passive objects of male desire (e.g. Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2013). Athena continues to elaborate on this idea of a ‘harassment script’ as her story continues:

Excerpt 8

1.48 – 1.58

1. Athena: [intake of breath] it was so gross and then he’s the one
2. like stupid like pick-up lines like so gross like he’s
3. [laughs]: what did he say: he’s like I came here to
4. meet someone I think it’s y//ou so\
5. Persephone: /eww\\

The *stupid pick-up lines* (line 2) mentioned by Athena form part of this immediately accessible script. Even though Athena and Persephone report no direct experience of sexual harassment before coming to Paris, these available scripts are socially pervasive, especially in the context of globalisation as Discourses flow with relative ease through both traditional forms of media and newer social media platforms. Athena’s choice of the dismissive adjective *stupid* can be seen as indexing a dual affective and evaluative epistemic stance in this instance (in that her emotional reaction is supported by an implicit evaluative component - the pickup lines are *stupid*, therefore the surrounding framework has been evaluated negatively). Persephone’s immediate stance uptake *eww* (line 5) overlaps supportively, and serves to co-construct their joint disgust at such elements

of the script. Seeds of narrative agency can therefore be seen to be germinating as both participants move away from Discourses of responsibility to seemingly more emphatic stances. Directly following this there is evidence of indexical ties to stereotypes and connotations of the French language which have taken firm hold in many countries, New Zealand included. This is relevant in light of the fact that both participants were highly invested in opportunities to practise their French in the exchange context as part of their overall exchange aim of improving their language skills.

Excerpt 9

1.58 – 2.21

1. Persephone: eww is this in French
2. Athena: yeah this is in //French\ like so gross
3. Persephone: /ugh\\
4. Athena: like so //sleazy\
5. Persephone: /I don't even think\\ French can make it sound nice
6. //you know how French makes everything
7. sound nice\
8. Athena: /no French didn't make\\ s- //that that\ sounded
9. gr//oss in English a- and in French\ and it was just so
10. gross and I'm just like I'm not even a- I'm not
11. responding not answering like [intake of breath]
12. and then oh my gosh and then I think I said like
13. after maybe like following he kept on following me
14. like while I was not responding
15. Persephone: /no no\\
16. /yeah even in French yeah [small laugh]\\
17. Persephone: yeah

Persephone's initial question *is this in French* (line 1) may possibly be seen as relaying admiration, yet the preceding *eww* seems to steer more clearly towards disbelief, a disbelief enhanced perhaps by the accompanying realisation that "the language of love" (Kingerling & Farrell-Whitworth, 2005, p. 6) is indeed a language like any other, with the capacity to injure, frighten, and harass. The discourse marker *you know* (line 6) then precedes her statement about French making *everything sound nice* (lines 6-7), suggesting a shared knowledge between her and Athena. This idea is clearly problematised by the two participants in this interaction, however, through their continued

linguistic co-construction of disgust (e.g. *eww*, *ugh*, and the affective predicates *gross* and *sleazy*). By stating *that sounded gross in English and in French* (lines 8-9), Athena offers a strong evaluation which deftly shatters this ideological bubble. Despite the French language's construction as romantic and elegant - which extends to all things French (cf. Blommaert, 2010) - this ideology, she seems to be saying, does not apply in instances of clear harassment. The language used (in this case, French or English) is irrelevant, and the idea that it might have been perceived as even slightly romantic is swiftly rebutted. Athena states that she *was not responding not answering* (line 11), therefore deploying the 'technique' of ignoring and following patterns of expected defence behaviour in this type of situation. Her sharp intake of breath contributes to her reconstruction of fear at that point. Attempting to remove herself from the situation and not engaging with her pursuer are both examples of Athena enacting the expected script for women in situations of harassment.

Here, the complexity of agency is made salient. While Athena may perhaps be viewed as acting on her environment by virtue of actively attempting to remove herself from the situation, and not verbally engaging, she is being simultaneously stripped of her voice in this emphasis on silence as a prime recourse to safety. Ostensibly agentive, her overarching role in this script can be seen therefore to remain passive in that challenges to the existing gender order cannot be made. This also feeds into ongoing feminist debates around agency - is it agentive, for example for a woman to mobilise resources at her disposal to get out of such a situation, or is agency only defined by calling attention to such behaviour? It seems to me that this debate is in itself redundant in that it is impossible to seek to make such generalisations; context is everything. Persephone's point above is highly salient in this regard: *if it's a choice of being a feminist and being safe and like I would be safe*. The end of Athena's story provides another intriguing example of scripts which cannot be disentangled from ideology. As a final recourse, Athena does use her voice, an occasioning which has the desired effect of ensuring her pursuer finally leaves her alone.

Excerpt 10

2.21 – 2.36

1. Athena: [drawls]: um: and then at the end I was just like
2. I was just like I'm gonna meet like can you g- like
3. I'm just g- I'm gonna meet my boyfriend l//ike\
4. can you go and then he finally like walked //away\
5. Persephone: /yeah\\

6. Persephone: /oh\\ he was //so dodgy\
7. Athena: /but it was\\ so gross and I literally like ran after that
8. to my friend like [small laugh]

Again, this demonstrates the complexity in the structure and agency relationship. It is immediately of note that Athena is constrained by existing Discourses in what equally may be seen as a more ‘concrete’ act of agency in that her pursuer finally *walked away* (line 4). So, while Athena casts herself in an agentic light in her retelling, it is worth noting that in this case, she could only effect change or act on her environment through recourse to a dominant Discourse, the idea that the only ‘acceptable’ reason a woman may not be interested is because she already has a boyfriend - *I’m gonna meet my boyfriend* (line 3). This, in turn, feeds into notions around men’s ownership of women and active and passive roles, all of which can be linked to the structuring effects of the gender order and traditional notions of femininity and masculinity. The ideology of heteronormativity is also playing an active role here in that both the incident itself and the pursuer’s reaction to Athena’s response reveal his assumptions that she is straight, available, and interested.

Casting an eye at the accompanying micro features in this short excerpt is revelatory. The repetition of the word *just* (lines 1-3), for example, seems to serve two simultaneous functions. In the first instance, in Athena’s narrative retelling it appears to function as a ‘softener’ to this potentially face-threatening act (Lindemann & Mauranen, 2001; Vine, 2018), and it is telling that this level of hedging or mitigation has come to be gendered in itself with more women using this linguistic strategy than men in certain settings (cf. Holmes, 1995). While Athena’s ‘reason’ was immediately accepted, she would most likely have been aware of the potential for further harassment, especially now that she had assumed a level of ‘sass’ in using her voice to her assailant. Many women can attest to the fact that this often serves to ‘encourage’ further engagement rather than the intended outcome of deterrence. While we cannot be sure that these were the exact words she used in French during the incident itself, the retelling provides valuable access to a close replica, likely enhanced by a higher emotional investment after time for reflection. The use of ‘just’ may then be seen to add a level of what we may term ‘performed nonchalance’ to her assertion of going to meet her boyfriend (only given away perhaps by the false starts in the recounted version). On a wider level, ‘just’ may equally be viewed as adding nuances of inevitability to her recourse to this particular strategy, drawing again on the shared socio-cultural knowledge between her and Persephone.

The interaction then moves towards Persephone positioning Athena as ‘expert’ and expressing her disbelief at the incident given her friend’s professed and perceived level of comfort and ease in the Parisian setting. Athena validates Persephone’s stance of this being *scary* by emphasising that she still *gets freaked out*, exacerbated in this instance by the fact it was the first time she had been followed at night. Other data includes information about other daytime occurrences, as well as an incident with an Uber driver who had finished his shift and insisted on taking her home regardless. Instances of sexual harassment were a regular occurrence, and, at this point in Athena’s exchange, had come to be woven into the fabric of everyday life. This sparks serious concern and consideration on Persephone’s behalf (whose level of struggle in this respect has primacy at this point in her exchange) and leads to the following interaction:

Excerpt 11

2.59 – 3.11

1. Persephone: yeah it makes you wonder like could you ever be like
2. comfortable a hundred percent in Paris everywhere
3. probably n//ot\
4. Athena: /as\\ a woman I //don’t think so\
5. Persephone: /I don’t think so eh\\ as a woman yeah
6. Athena: I don’t think so because + no I don’t think so
7. // [laughs]\
8. Persephone: /no I just yeah I yeah\\ yeah I agree

Athena, possibly anticipating Persephone’s use of the word *not* (line 3), overlaps here to make explicit her gender identity as a woman, linking her negative evaluation directly to this (line 4). The ensuing uptake by Persephone of both parts of Athena’s preceding phrase - *I don’t think so* and *as a woman* - (line 5) serves to solidify their solidarity on this issue, and thus reinforces their identities as women. Persephone’s use of the discourse marker *eh* (line 5) may also be seen to index their shared New Zealand upbringing, and perhaps their shared backgrounds as ‘minorities’ in a primarily Pākehā New Zealand. Use of the tag ‘eh’ was initially associated with Māori English before developing wider indexical ties of non-standard ‘coolness’, and importantly, it also indexes associated Discourses of egalitarianism and informality prevalent in New Zealand (e.g. Holmes et al., 2017; Holmes & Woodhams, 2013) as recent research investigating its use in workplace contexts has uncovered (Vine & Marsden, 2016). In this sense, the use of *eh* may function as a link

to Persephone's imagined community of New Zealanders and simultaneously othering what she sees at this point as Discourses and practices that have no place in an open, egalitarian society.

Interestingly, Persephone would herself acknowledge and even lament the fact that she saw herself drawing on and (re)-creating this type of binary between France and New Zealand (or more precisely Paris and Wellington). On a theoretical level, she knew binaries did not work, and would often apologise (unnecessarily in my view) for talking in generalities during our chats. This led to several deep and thought-provoking discussions between us which allowed me to witness the depth of her reflections. These divisions, which may seem to be oversimplifying a complex situation, were not solidified at this point in her stay, but rather provided a springboard for further engagement and exploration, presenting ample opportunities for "negotiation of difference" (Papastergiadis, 2000) in this study abroad setting.

In the face of such identity 'assaults', it is also unsurprising that reasoned consideration may take an interactional back seat. The following long turn in a reciprocal story by Persephone builds an extremely powerful metaphor which highlights the strength of her emotions and struggle at this time. Here, she recounts her recent metro trip to the 10th arrondissement for her eyebrow threading. During her walk to the salon, she received unwanted attention by male shopkeepers who stand on the street and employ a 'technique' to encourage women to enter their shops. The number of men, combined with their physical proximity, was in no way welcomed, as the following excerpt shows:

Excerpt 12

3.34 – 3.49

1.	Persephone:	that was so weird I can't believe ¹ //like
2.		[emphatic]: how they come\ ¹ at you: like it's like a
3.		video game ² //you know\ ² when you're all c- like you're
4.		like you're you're like + competitors ³ //or just\ ³ not
5.		competitors like you know like enemy whatever
6.		soldiers come at you and you're ⁴ //like one by one by
7.		one by one\ ⁴ it's like [intake of breath] oh ⁵ //my god it's
8.		so dodgy\ ⁵ it's but my eyebrow I like love getting my
9.		eyebrows done but + I don't know if I'll go back there
10.	Athena:	¹ /I've got I don't know\ \ ¹
11.	Athena:	² /yeah\ \ ²

12. Athena: ³/yeah\\³
13. Athena: ⁴/yeah yeah [laughs]\\⁴
14. Athena: ⁵/it's like you're prey\\⁵

The likening to a video game is interesting in that traditionally video games are a male-dominated domain. Elaborating on the video game metaphor, Persephone likens the setting to a war, a zone of ceaseless combat - *I can't believe how they come at you* - (lines 1-2) and relentless pursuit - *one by one by one by one* - (lines 6-7). Beginning with *competitors* and *the enemy* (lines 4-5), Persephone settles on the description of *soldiers* (line 6), a choice of noun which effectively captures the 'trained' nature of the men involved in such levels of combat. Mills and Mullany (2011, p. 51) make the point that masculinity is often "described in terms of battle and warfare", a Discourse which may be seen to be dialogically permeating Persephone's creative language use. Her metaphor also contains many Bourdieusian threads, notably alluding to Bourdieu's notion of 'fields' as a battleground (e.g. 1977), a combat zone of sorts over varying forms of capital and associated power and distinction. It calls forth notions of habitus, of dispositions which have been socially constituted through repetition until they become almost automatic. These dispositions of aggression have also come to be indexical to masculinity, seen as a biological part of being male (Mills, 2003, p. 188), and as such, Persephone can be seen to be engaging dialogically with these Discourses in her construction.

The development of this metaphor, then, functions as a powerful means to make the abstract notion of gender ideology more concrete (van Dijk, 2018). It paints a compelling picture of Persephone's feelings at this time in Paris. The sheer force of the (gender) structures at play are entirely accessible, as are her clear feelings of reduced agency in this setting, portraying the 'battle' as unevenly weighted and therefore a *fait accompli*. Persephone's feelings of helplessness in the face of such relentless pursuit are encapsulated by Athena in her final comment - *it's like you're prey* - (line 14). This noun choice *prey* is extremely salient in that as well as emphasising the extent of feelings of helplessness (and the fatigue of being constantly 'hunted'), it also conveys the idea of a futile gauntlet. The co-constructed metaphor therefore builds the idea of much stronger and determined hunters (or *soldiers*), who see women as *prey* to be captured or conquered.

While the immediate reason for these men's behaviour is, for all intents and purposes, to attract customers, the fact that the behaviour (both verbal and otherwise) has come to be gendered is telling. To this end, there are strong indexical ties to the gender order and heteronormativity and

longstanding hegemonic ideas of males as active, as those who ‘pursue’, and of females as passive and pursued. The idea of a ‘chase’ and the final aim of ‘conquering’ are clearly unhelpful in achieving equality in that such Discourses reproduce harmful assumptions about gender, sexuality and rights to sexual agency. The co-construction of this metaphor, then, cannot be viewed in an individual vacuum. It is not only co-constructed in the interactional moment by Athena (through orientation to shared sociocultural knowledge), but entirely dialogic in terms of the indexical ties to gender and sexuality ideologies. Widening the analytical lens to acknowledge these dialogical threads adds depth and complexity to what may otherwise be solely analysed as a creative description of an individual experience.

Interactionally, I would argue that the strength of the metaphor, combined with the repeated co-construction of affective stancetaking (indexing disgust), may be seen again as agency in its germination stage. The problem is real, Persephone and Athena seem to be saying, and there is clearly an unequal playing field. But this act of laying out the gravity of the situation seems to function as a platform for further engagement with these structural constraints. One cannot, in other words, challenge an ontological status - a ‘given’ - without deeply exploring one’s own position in this ‘reality’. I return to this conceptualisation of agency in the following chapter. The following extract exemplifies this interactional movement from individual experience to wider societal structures. It is not a completely harmonious shift, however, as we will see from the conversational unfolding. Both participants have just mentioned their wariness about returning to this particular area in Paris (the 10th arrondissement) because of the inevitability of sexual harassment. They express, at the same time, the need for their return, in Athena’s case to buy a special soap for her skin condition (only available at a store in this area), and in Persephone’s to have her eyebrows threaded (at a salon where she received good service).

Excerpt 13

4.11 – 4.45

1. Persephone: [emphatic]: it’s annoying: that we have to change our
2. habits because of these dod//gy guys\
3. Athena: /exactly\\ you have to change (some of) what you
4. wear + you have to change and it’s like I was really
5. wearing like + a dress //a\ long dress and a sweater
6. Persephone: /yeah\\
7. Persephone: yeah
8. Athena: + and ¹//it was like\¹ still it’s not like you know how

9. people say well sometimes girls dress like this way
10. ²//and they\² and like it wasn't
11. Persephone: ¹/it was like cool\ \¹
12. Persephone: ²/[disdain]: oh:\ \²
13. Persephone: yeah
14. Athena: it's not //true\
15. Persephone: [emphatic]: /like you\ \ can't even say that: yeah
16. Athena: you can't say that //because\ I was wearing
17. literally like a long dress
18. Persephone: /yeah\ \
19. Persephone: yeah
20. Athena: like a below my knees //and\ like a sweater
21. Persephone: /like\ \
22. Persephone: yeah oh //[quietly]: honestly:\
23. Athena: /like I \ \ I- I probably looked like a sixteen year old
24. Persephone: hon//estly\
25. Athena: /that's\ \ so gross
26. Persephone: people are just s- ugh [voc]
27. Athena: it was really gross

Persephone begins by expressing her annoyance about having to *change [her] habits* because of these *dodgy guys* (lines 1-2). Again, this feeds into notions of female responsibility, yet it is tempered this time with an affective stance move - *it's annoying* - (line 1), which emphasises the inequality of this situation and lays the blame squarely on the men in question. Athena is quick to orient to the same line of thinking, reciprocating with her own feelings of annoyance and offering a concrete example of what she was wearing - *a dress a long dress and a sweater* - (line 5). This example enters straight into prevalent 'policing' of female sexuality, and again allows Athena to construct herself and her attire as falling within the realms of acceptability. Her emphasis on the adjective *long* and the noun *sweater* demonstrates how much skin was covered, a fundamental part of traditional notions of propriety (echoing Persephone's 'flowy' clothing talked about in the interview data). Her further elaboration acknowledges these Discourses more explicitly - *you know how people say well sometimes girls dress like this way* - (lines 8-9), a comment which results in Persephone adopting a stance of disdain, indicating perhaps a readiness to engage with the ontological elements of this Discourse. This stance is reinforced by Athena who goes on to

emphasise that *it's not true* (line 14), a position strongly supported by Persephone whose tone, combined with the immediate overlap, adds significant force to her agreement.

Interestingly, the potential ontological engagement appears to derail slightly at this point. Instead of continuing to engage with the nature of this senseless Discourse, Athena reiterates that she was wearing *literally like a long dress* (line 17), which was *below her knees* (line 20). These statements may at first glance seem to discursively reinforce rather than problematise due to Athena's insistence on maintaining vestimentary 'propriety'. Persephone, however, continues to express solidarity through her smooth orientation towards this more concrete line of reasoning, her disbelief accessible in the adverb *honestly* (line 22). Athena then draws on Discourses of inappropriacy by emphasising that she probably *looked like a sixteen year old* (line 23), a phrase which concurrently constructs herself (and by extension Persephone) as grown women. This interaction exemplifies the double bind many women find themselves in in such situations. Even though Athena 'adheres' to notions of appropriate femininity and is 'suitably' covered up, achieving a 'demure' appearance, this is still not enough to guarantee exemption from harassment.

Sexual harassment was not solely the purview of Persephone and Athena. Viv, who arrived in Paris one week after Persephone, also began to amass experiences almost immediately. Despite having more life experience (she had lived apart from her parents for many years, had travelled overseas to work on her own, and had visited Paris before 5 years ago), and presenting as more worldly and savvy, Viv was not immune to these encounters. The following extract details one such early incident. It provides evidence of the way Viv negotiates the experience and the recounting, all the while working within the guiding structures of the gender order, structures in which Viv and her recounting are clearly implicated.

5.4.1.3 Interview Data – Viv, Persephone, and Shelley: Being 'Consumed' in a Public Space

Beginning of Week 2 Paris (for Viv)

The extract is taken from an interview with Viv (with Persephone there) in her second week in Paris on the 30th August 2016. The recorded conversation lasted for just under an hour. The excerpt below comes after Viv had just finished recounting her frightening metro ride to the apartment where I was staying. Viv had been "freaking out" because this particular metro had stopped between stations, the lights had been flickering, and there was a man who was doing "some stupid like god talk" throughout, all of which had been exacerbated by her feelings of claustrophobia. This led to much sympathising and provided the impetus for Persephone's topic

manoeuvre towards unwanted male attention. The excerpt below begins just after Persephone has mentioned incredulously that Viv has had people “come up to her and ask her out and like ask for her number on the street”, leading Viv to recount a disturbing moment experienced on the metro.

Excerpt 14

16.03 – 16.15

1. Viv: what about that guy who licked my arm on the
2. sub//way I mean on the metro\
3. Persephone: /yeah\\
4. Shelley: [surprised]: what: //Viv\
5. Viv: /ew\\ that was rank
6. Shelley: [emphatic]: Viv: what happened
7. Viv: this guy //he came up to me on the\ metro
8. it was so foul
9. Shelley: /that’s disgusting\\
10. Shelley: was it on //the platform\
11. Viv: /no\\ he followed me to the metro
12. Shelley: [gasps]

Viv begins her recount with the action which ostensibly appeared the most inappropriate, qualifying the *guy* in question as the one *who licked my arm* (line 1). The initial stages of the excerpt show evidence of a strongly co-constructed affective stance of disgust (e.g. in the use of adjectives *rank* - line 5, *disgusting* - line 9, and *foul* - line 8); Viv sets up the beginnings of her story, stating matter-of-factly that she was followed down to the metro station. She then provides further details, allowing interesting glimpses into Viv’s habitus toolkit as well as that of her pursuer, further indexing Discourses of socially inappropriate behaviour (such as stalking).

Excerpt 15

16.21 – 17.03

1. Viv: he came up to me and sort of did the whole like +
2. like + kissing hello thing and I was like ohh I don’t really
3. like just please //just\ stay away from me
4. Shelley: /ohh\\
5. Shelley: yeah
6. Viv: and then I was just like not really talking but I was like
7. on my [drawls]: phone: and then I was like I’m just

8. gonna go on the met¹//ro so\¹ then he was like oh
9. where are you going and I was like oh I'm I'm
10. going away I'm going on the metro and he was like
11. I'm going there too and ²//I was like fuck\² + so
12. he followed me down to the met³//ro\³ and he just kept
13. like + sort of rubbing his ⁴//hands on my\⁴ back
14. I was like can you please just stop that ⁵//like\⁵
15. I really don't + just + stop it + and then he kept like
16. [voices her harasser]: mmm: ⁶//like\⁶ and I was
17. oh my god just please and [high pitch]: then
18. he licked my arm:
19. Shelley: ¹/[drawls]: oh:\¹
20. S and P: ²/oh no\ \²
21. Shelley: ³/ugh\ \³
22. Shelley: ⁴/argh\ \⁴
23. Persephone: ⁵/yeah\ \⁵
24. Shelley: ⁶/oh god\ \⁶
25. Shelley: oh wow //okay\
26. Persephone: /this was\ \ during the day //eh\
27. Viv: [high pitch]: /and\ \ then he left: + I was like
28. you need to go and he was like () and I was like
29. what the fuck
30. Persephone: it was during the day eh
31. Viv: [high pitch]: yes: there was like thousands
32. of people around

The fact that her pursuer begins by greeting Viv with the culturally normative greeting of 'la bise' (line 2) is telling. To anybody watching the episode, this act (cunningly) indexes a 'familiar' relationship considering that this greeting is generally used by acquaintances and friends in France. This move may therefore be a premeditated one designed to normalise the situation to the outside eye, laying a strategic foundation for subsequent acts such as the rubbing of Viv's back (line 13), again likely designed to effect the appearance of a couple rather than two strangers. It places Viv in a bind in that by virtue of 'returning' the kiss, she unwittingly becomes complicit in this scenario. The forces of gender order and heteronormative socialisation are clear here in Viv's unquestioning acceptance and response.

Despite this outward appearance of complicity, her retelling suggests an alternative interpretation. Viv's recourse to relatively polite formulations (e.g. *I don't really like* - line 2), instances of the word *please* (lines 3 and 14), as well as several instances of the adverb *just* (e.g. lines 3, 6, 7, 17) reveal the strength of constraining Discourses on 'appropriate' ways of dealing with such incidents. Accessing a stronger linguistic form (the imperative *stop it* – line 15) aligns with her overall tone adopted in this retelling, which could be described as one of 'savvy disbelief'. Use of the expletive *fuck* (lines 11 and 29) feeds into this tone as does her final utterance *then he licked my arm (line 18)*, the tone strengthened by the rise in pitch. Viv then (re)claims some agency (as narrator and protagonist) by telling her pursuer to leave, before expressing the strength of her confusion at that point in time - *and I was like what the fuck* (line 29). This excerpt also connects to the discussion of women as prey in Persephone and Athena's interactions above. The unwanted act of licking indexes her pursuer's belief in his own male entitlement to women sexually (cf. Kinginger & Farrell-Whitworth, 2005), as well as a more literal instantiation of prey in that he actually uses his mouth; he 'consumes' her in a public space (see Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2013 and their discussion of metaphor). The longstanding narrative construction of man as hunter and women as prey (see Simone de Beauvoir's discussion) is thus enacted in 2016, pointing to the saturation across time and space of such disempowering Discourses.

While Persephone, Viv, and Athena all experience sexual harassment during their exchanges in Paris, it is interesting to note how this affects their identity construction as young women differently. Overall, there appears to be an alignment on the inappropriateness of the practice, yet a difference in the agentive self-positioning that occurs interactionally. The following excerpt (from the same interview) is illustrative and follows on from a discussion around possible strategies.

Excerpt 16

19.26 – 20.07

1.	Shelley:	it's such an unfortunate part of it
2.	Persephone:	yeah it's such a l- honestly it's such a deal breaker
3.		for me like
4.	Viv:	[surprised]: really:
5.	Persephone:	yeah
6.	Viv:	it's not really for me I'm pretty alright with it
		[...]
7.	Viv:	well I'm kinda like + at the end of the day +

8. if something really terrible happened +
9. there's thirty people around me
10. Persephone: yeah
11. Viv: I'll just be like fuck off you know like
12. Shelley: well yeah there's always that you could say
13. I'm sure most people would understand that
14. Viv: it's more that I get into these situations because I don't
15. want to be that rude straight away and then you're like
16. this is gross + but like + nothing terrible's going to
17. happen unless it's like super late and you're alone or
18. something you know + I feel safer here than
19. I do in Wellington
20. Persephone: [surprised]: really:

While Persephone classifies this behaviour as a *deal breaker* (line 2) for the overall exchange experience, Viv adopts a more outwardly pragmatic approach saying she *is pretty alright with it* (line 6). Her sense of security stems from the fact that she is surrounded by people, and she insists on her own agency when she relays her intention of telling somebody who goes too far to *fuck off* (line 11). As her previous description in Excerpt 15 shows, however, these intentions may be problematic in their realisation. Being surrounded by people in the metro did not appear to deter her last pursuer. If a person can touch a woman's back repeatedly and lick her arm, it is not beyond the realms of imagination that these acts could go further, and that the crowd would still remain mute. Fear of violence and fear of intervening in what is not 'one's business' are powerful deterrents, as the recent increase in bystander education serves to attest to (e.g. Edwards, Rodenhizer, & Eckstein, 2017; Keene, 2015).

Added to this is the even larger constraint of women being socialised into 'supporting' the male, to the extent that even in uncomfortable situations, women will seek to avoid creating overt conflict, seeking instead to maintain harmony and minimise possible violence. This is exactly what we see reflected in Viv's words *I don't want to be that rude straight away* (lines 14-15). A closer look at her full utterance indicates just how she is operating within the realms of not only this particular Discourse, but the closely linked Discourse of female responsibility so prevalent in Persephone's and Athena's data. Linguistically, she positions herself as being at fault - *I get into these situations* (line 14) because of her asserted 'choice' of not wanting to be rude. Telling somebody to *fuck off* then with ease and conviction, is not an oft-employed go-to strategy,

mitigated as it is by societal expectations - expectations which manifest themselves in the contradictory messages involved in socialisation of women into to 'be polite' and to 'clearly say no' to unwanted advances (see Ehrlich, 2001, 2007 for a rigorous problematisation of this point). Viv makes clear that she sees this occurrence as *gross* (Excerpt 15) yet believes that being surrounded by people provides a perceived safety net from anything 'terrible' occurring. For Viv, this means that Paris feels safer than Wellington (lines 18-19), an utterance met with disbelief by Persephone (line 20) whose ideas of safety are firmly bound up in her imagined community of New Zealanders. Despite their differences in the interactional self-positioning, Viv's and Persephone's experiences and reactions mirror that of many women who, rather than immediately call out such behaviour, opt (consciously or unconsciously) to work within established discursive frameworks which importantly allow them to pragmatically deal with such incidents, yet ultimately do nothing to destabilise the pillars of heterosexual male sexual entitlement.

Sexual harassment was indeed pervasive for my female participants in Paris, and it fast became part of their daily lives, for the most part on the metro system but also on the street. It affected their identities as young women in different ways, and spurred different levels of reflection as the above analysis has demonstrated. Sexual harassment, however, is not a localised Parisian practice. It is linked to the gender order and the maintenance of power over women. It is an ingrained social construction which has 'colonised' the social world with impunity, to borrow Kress' (1989) metaphor, and therefore unsurprisingly also occurs in my New Zealand-based data.

5.4.2 Wellington: Gender and Sexuality

5.4.2.1 Hanna

In this second part of the Gender and Sexuality chapter, I present case studies (firstly of Hanna, then of Hugo) to illustrate their identity negotiations in the New Zealand context, showing, as with Persephone, Athena, and Viv, how gender and sexuality came to be salient for them. I begin with Hanna, whose experience of an incidence of sexual harassment at a bus stop in Wellington provides an interesting (and unfortunate) parallel to participants' experiences in Paris. I foreground intersectionality (given the relevance in the data) and pay attention to the role of wider Discourses in Hanna's recounting. Hanna's recounting offers a rich exemplification of the overlapping nature of identities, and their connections to wider Discourses, painting a complex picture of how she is negotiating her identity as a young woman at this point in her exchange. In terms of contextually helpful information, it should be noted that Hanna had recently broken up with her boyfriend, and this had had a profound effect on her experience during study abroad. Hanna messaged me

the day that the breakup occurred, and we had a lengthy chat where I aimed to provide an empathetic ear. In summarising her unhappiness, she informed me that she had ‘dumped’ Khaled because he had been unfaithful.

This contextual information provides useful scaffolding to the analysis which follows, where I show how Hanna’s recounting of the incident of sexual harassment is bound up in several overlapping social layers (including her French identity and associated cultural capital - as seen in the previous chapter - and wider Discourses and ideologies associated with heteronormativity), none of which can be isolated for ease of analysis. Despite the similarities in the occurrence of sexual harassment (and the ideologies that underpin this behaviour), Hanna’s approach to the recounting of the incident is very different to that of Persephone, Athena, and Viv.

5.4.2.1.1 Interview Data – Hanna and Shelley: Le ‘Gros Dégueulasse’, the Land of the Care Bears, and a Focus on Intersectionality

Week 14 Wellington (one month before departure)

This interview took place in a café on campus and lasted for just over one hour. Hanna had just asked about preparations for Persephone’s and Viv’s upcoming exchanges to Paris. Hanna herself was in the final month of her own exchange and, as the following extract attests to, had developed mostly negative appraisals of her time in New Zealand, seemingly stemming from her relationship breakup. In order to gain a sense of the complexity mentioned above, I have broken one long section into excerpts.

Excerpt 17

11.08 – 11.20

1. Hanna: non mais elles vont tomber des nuls hein
no but they’re going to come across some losers
2. Shelley: oui ça c’est sûr ça c’est sûr oui + //oui\
yeah that’s for sure that’s for sure + //yeah\
/parce\\ que [emphatic]: Paris c’est pas Wellington:
//because\ [emphatic]: Paris isn’t Wellington:
4. Shelley: non non non non non mm mm
no no no no no mm mm
5. Hanna: moi j’ai deux choses qui m’ont arrivées de mauvaises
I’ve had two bad things happen to me
6. à Wellington

Immediately, Hanna draws a clear division between Wellington and Paris (line 3), (similar to both Persephone and Victoria), drawing on her epistemic rights (Heritage & Raymond, 2005) as a French person to assert the certitude of Viv and Persephone meeting some *nuls* ('losers' - line 1), a statement I unproblematically orient to. Foregrounding her Frenchness here is part of a clear epistemic stance; Hanna positions herself as one with rights to such knowledge by virtue of mobilising her Frenchness as a resource (a salient theme throughout Hanna's data as Chapter 4 has shown). That Paris is not Wellington (line 3), and that Paris contains many *nuls* does not invite an easy, unproblematic mapping to meaning, and necessitates ethnographic support to get at a nuanced understanding. While one might be tempted at first glance to see Wellington being cast in a positive light (i.e. it is not the city with 'losers'), it seems rather that Hanna is indexing Paris as a 'real' city with 'real' problems (in this case, the regular occurrence of sexual harassment). This was a topic she had initiated on several other occasions, and the above interaction exemplifies the 'status' she conferred to this perception, one which I appear to co-construct through my minimal feedback.

This stance simultaneously highlights Hanna's view of Wellington's 'deficiency' in these reality stakes, an idea which also feeds into her perception of young New Zealanders as being sheltered and not worldly. Hanna mentioned to me on a few occasions how none of her New Zealand friends expressed a desire to travel; according to her, they were happy to continue living with their parents in New Zealand. This surprised me, and I spoke of the Overseas Experience ('OE') as a rite of passage for many young Kiwis. In hindsight, what I should have perhaps mentioned is that travel too is linked to privilege, and perhaps her friends were living at home out of financial necessity (a few of her friends lived in a lower-socioeconomic area of the city and definitely did not give me any feelings of entitlement or privileged upbringings). Hanna's point therefore, about only having 'two bad things' happen to her in Wellington (line 5) seems to reinforce her current perception of New Zealand as a non-worldly bubble (emphasised in excerpt 5), effectively setting the scene for her recounting of the episode of sexual harassment. The following excerpt begins immediately after she has reiterated her first negative experience with one of her flatmates.

Excerpt 18

11.27 – 11.47

1. Hanna: et l'autre mec euh le gros dégueulasse en plein milieu

- and the other guy er the really disgusting one right in the middle
2. de la rue à six heures du matin
of the street at six o'clock in the morning
3. Shelley: ah [high pitch]: non: je
ah [high pitch]: no: I
4. Hanna: [checking]: je t'ai pas dit:
[checking]: didn't I tell you
5. Shelley: ah non un i- inconnu? oui // donc ()\
ah no a s- stranger? yeah so
6. Hanna: /il a comm\\ encé à se masturber juste à côté de moi
he started to masturbate just in front of me
7. Shelley: quelqu'un quoi
someone what
8. Hanna: a commence à se masturber //juste à côté de moi\
started to masturbate just in front of me
9. Shelley: /[sharp inhalation]\\ et tu étais seule
/[sharp inhalation]\\ and you were alone
10. Hanna: oui j'étais seule et je venais de larguer Khaled
yeah I was alone and I'd just dumped Khaled

Hanna's construction of agency in this extract is of note and provides an interesting contrast to the data analysed so far in its direct instantiation. Calling this man a *gros dégueulasse* ('a disgusting guy' - line 1), is a highly agentive linguistic move (both as narrator and protagonist); it lays blame on the man's character, positioning him as deficient. Hanna explains the man's ensuing actions, adopting what might best be termed a matter-of-fact tone, indexing notions of worldliness and being in control (both in the retelling and by extension during the actual incident). At this point, the incident, despite its seriousness, takes a narrative back seat to a more important point for Hanna - the fact that she had just *dumped* Khaled (line 10). Again, she self-positions as a woman with agency; she did the 'dumping' because she was not the one flouting the established rules of the heteronormative hierarchy (in terms of adhering to the principle of monogamy). Examples of such agentive positioning continue to flow throughout the interaction, as the following snippet shows. Here, Hanna provides further detail about the unfolding of the event, which took place at a deserted bus stop at around 6am (reinforcing the ubiquity of public transport as a setting for such occurrences). The man had just asked her the timetable details for a particular bus.

Excerpt 19

12.51 – 13.01

1. Hanna: okay il s'installe à côté de moi où il commence à
okay he sits down beside me where he starts to
2. euh voilà
er there you go
3. Shelley: aïe aïe aïe
oh no
4. Hanna: et //euh\ [double voicing herself at the time]: mais
and er [double voicing herself at the time]: but
5. mais tu déliras là:
but you're completely mad:
6. [high pitch]: t'es t'es un gros dégueulasse:
[high pitch]: you're you're disgusting:
7. Shelley: /oh Hanna\\

Hanna reconstructs her frustration by narratively foregrounding her agency through direct comments towards her harasser. Her comments about him being *mad* and *disgusting* (lines 5 and 6) offer pertinent examples of this agentive tone, harnessed through a combination of affective and epistemic stances. The following excerpt offers clear reasons for this emphasis on agency, providing a linguistic link from her break up to the incident at the bus stop. The switch into English augments the reality of the occurrence and invites me, as the interlocutor, to understand from a native speaker perspective the 'force' of the emphasised phrase *what do you mean*, aided by Hanna's change to a very high pitch. This use of Bakhtinian double voicing also holds potential narrative salience in that it allows her to voice the characters (both the harasser and Khaled), whilst creating distance from them.

Excerpt 20

13.04 – 13.33

1. Hanna: et il a fait et il a dit [double voicing; high pitch]:
and he did and he said [double voicing; high pitch]:
2. what do you mean:
3. I'm just waiting for the bus:
4. Shelley: [drawls]: ugh:
5. Hanna: and just before actually Khaled his his er excuse about
6. the other girl was [emphatic]: what do you mean

7. and I was like //what\ do you mean
8. what do you fucking mean:
9. Shelley: /oh\\
10. Shelley: that is not your favourite phrase
11. Hanna: no not anymore and and no it's not even like
12. it's how they lie
13. Shelley: mm mm yeah
14. Hanna: they //lie\ like this
15. Shelley: /yeah\\
16. Shelley: yeah [drawls]: oh: okay s-

Throughout her retelling, Hanna constructs herself as a strong young woman, a positioning in line with our initial messenger chat the day after her break up. Throughout her recounting Hanna discursively refrains from perpetuating ideas of women as 'polite' and as socialised into a passive acceptance. This stance of personal non-accountability stands in direct contrast to Viv, Athena, and Persephone who, in their own ways, all engaged with Discourses of blame at some level. In line with this, anger was foregrounded as the most salient emotion, and behaviour (Khaled's kissing another girl) was directly equated with character. Hanna self-positions then as someone who does not accept any form of behaviour directed at her which may serve to belittle or demean her as an empowered young woman. This is indeed a stance to be celebrated on many levels, yet the strength of gender and sexuality Discourses are still very much bound up in Hanna's identity work. Hanna appears to be working clearly within constructions of the heterosexual hierarchy which posits couple fidelity (i.e monogamy) as the desired state (Cameron & Kulick, 2006). When this breaks down, Hanna quickly asserts her rights to judgement as one who has not strayed beyond the boundaries of the acceptable. In this vein, she conflates the behaviour of Khaled and the man at the bus stop through her emphasis on their shared phrase *what do you mean*, (repeated in her retelling four times on lines 2, 6, 7, and 8). She strengthens this conflation even further through her clear epistemic stance *it's how they lie* (line 12), a stance I appear to discursively encourage at this point through the provision of minimal feedback.

Hanna's seemingly simplistic conflation of these two instances belies its complexity. There are discursive echoes in this lumping together of men with bad behaviour; she appears to be drawing on Discourses which posit 'cheating' and deviant sexual behaviour as primarily the domain of men. This Discourse has links to the gender order and, in particular, notions of male sexual agency, notions which in turn stem from biological arguments of an 'uncontrollable urge', and men doing

what they have been ‘pre-programmed’ to do (an argument swiftly debunked in de Beauvoir, 2011[1949]). As is made clear in the next extract, Hanna’s French identity also has an important role to play in her retelling of her reactions, and in her (most likely unconscious) essentialising.

Excerpt 21

13.57 – 14.21

1. Shelley: aïe aïe aïe tu as racont- tu as raconté ça à tes parents
 oh no did you t- did you tell your parents about this
2. Hanna: oui j’ai raconté ça mais mais tu sais
 yeah I told them but but you know
3. [emphatic]: mes parents sont français:
 [emphatic]: my parents are French:
4. c’est pas la première fois qu’ils entendent
 it’s not the first time they’ve heard
5. une histoire pareille
 such a story
6. Shelley: mm mm
7. Hanna: c’est la première fois que ça arrive à moi
 it’s the first time it’s happened to me
8. Shelley: mm
9. Hanna: mais c’est pas la première fois que (c’est //arrivé)\
10. une histoire pareille
 but it’s not the first time such a thing has happened
11. Shelley: /oui mm\\
 yeah mm
12. Shelley: c’est vrai
 that’s true
13. Hanna: [emphatic]: on n’est pas a Wellington:
 [emphatic]: we’re not in Wellington:
14. Shelley: mm mm
15. Hanna: euh ici c’est euh + c’est c’est le monde
16. des Bisous Nours
 er here it’s er + it’s it’s the land of the Care Bears
17. en Nouvelle Zélande on sait rien
 in New Zealand people know nothing

After expressing my disbelief, I ask Hanna if she had told her parents about this incident, a question which provides the interactional impetus for her story to come full circle in a sense, in that it triggers a return to notions of Frenchness and cultural capital. The instantiation is complex, however, and the interpretation is again aided by ethnographic information. Towards this end point in her exchange, and as mentioned earlier, Hanna was processing many negative emotions as a result of her relationship ending. While the experience of sexual harassment was described in strong affective terms and with much narrative agency, Hanna places more emphasis on the fact that this was one of only two bad things that had happened to her in New Zealand, which I have argued takes the form of a negative rather than positive assessment. Hanna's emphasis on her parents' nationality (line 3) can therefore be seen as indexing a wider point by contrasting the way of life in France with the way of life in New Zealand (as she perceives them). Because her parents are French, she stresses, *it is not the first time they have heard such a story* (lines 4-5). There are strong echoes of cultural capital in her assessment in that the normalisation of sexual harassment appears to have indexical ties to notions of 'real life' (the regularity of unwanted sexual attention being part of this), and stands in direct contrast to Wellington (line 13). Hanna's perception of New Zealand (at this point in time) as being a place where people *know nothing* (line 17) and exist in a fantasy-like bubble not unlike *the land of the Care Bears* (line 15-16) was in direct contrast to the friendliness and openness which characterised Hanna's initial perception of New Zealanders. This type of black and white categorisation appears strategic, and perhaps even cathartic for Hanna as she struggles with the aftermath of her breakup. It was not, however, out of character; Hanna often mentioned her aversion for *humains stupides*, and it was not rare for her to speak of her dislike of particular people.

The above excerpts provide useful insights into the overlapping nature of identities. Hanna's experience with sexual harassment was embedded within the larger crisis of the break-up, which was itself intertwined with her own identity as a young French woman on exchange in a new setting. As such, Hanna asserts that this type of behaviour is not shocking in any way. It is the preserve of the *gros déguelasse*, and these men are an unfortunate part of everyday life.

What is also salient about these events for Hanna is that they seem to have spurred the beginnings of a commitment to a version of a feminist identity. This was highly evident in the changed nature of Hanna's Facebook posts, which gained sufficient traction upon her return to France. She shared many articles and memes about sexual harassment and the behaviour of men in general, as well as posts which acknowledged the emotional repercussions of breakups. These suggest discursive

evidence of Hanna continuing to experiment with this agentive version of her identity as a young woman.

This feminist identity is not without constraints, however, as the following excerpt shows from the same interview. Hanna has been talking about her preferential treatment at a nightclub (in terms of entry) because of the friendship she feels she has developed with one of the bouncers. She likens this professed ease of entry to ‘entering as if in a windmill’ (*c’est comme rentrer comme dans un moulin*), which as the ensuing explanation clarifies, means to be able to enter something easily and quickly. I should note, too, that Hanna and I had developed linguistic norms of regular sharing and explanation of idiomatic language. After explaining the general meaning, Hanna moves quickly to a second, more specific, sense, which is where the structuring effects of underlying Discourses reveal themselves.

Excerpt 22

7.22 – 7.25

1. Hanna: oui ++ bah je vais te dire quelquechose de très sale
 yeah ++ umm I’m going to tell you something very dirty
2. mais euh mais parfois ça se dit pour certaines filles
 but er but sometimes it’s used for certain girls

After her opening which functions as a warning - *je vais te dire quelquechose de très sale* - *I’m going to tell you something very dirty* (line 1), she moves to the crux of her sentence which explains that sometimes this windmill phrase is used for *certain girls* (line 2). This is an excellent example of the many flavours of feminism. Despite Hanna’s strong objection to sexual harassment, her comment above appears to exemplify her own process of ‘ideologically becoming’ (Bakhtin, 1992; Menard-Warwick, 2014), in that Discourses of ‘proper’ (i.e. non-‘slutty’) femininity have strong purchase in her interactional repertoire. In fact, these Discourses may have even been strengthened due to her break up, the reasons for which were grounded in infidelity (and, it seems, assumptions of typical male behaviour). By emphasising the phrase *certain girls*, Hanna is simultaneously placing herself outside of this category, cementing her place high in the heteronormative hierarchy (Cameron & Kulick, 2006, p. 165), i.e. as one who values monogamy and non-promiscuity as a naturally oriented-to norm.

While Hanna's experiences certainly triggered a reflection, the reflection remained (at this point) at a discursively superficial level, anchored firmly in the subjective realm. Given the extent to which her break-up affected her exchange experience, however, this level of reflection is not surprising. I would also stress that this does not preclude the occurrence of future deeper engagement with ontological categories, and gaining a more objective insight into her experience of the social world and the constructed nature of social categories and ideologies in it. Hanna will no doubt, as all humans do, continue to amass experiences and her reactions to these will both be informed by prior experiences and shape future experiences. That the incidents recounted above happened during exchange in New Zealand means that her exchange recollections of place and people, at this moment, are imbued with complex indexical layers despite her own discursive emphasis on painting a clear and simple picture. While *nothing happens in New Zealand*, Hanna ironically builds a complex picture of two men behaving badly and hurting people, which Hanna herself would be the first to acknowledge, is clearly not 'nothing'. The *land of the Care Bears* seems to be anchored in an ideological dichotomy between New Zealand and France where France 'wins out' despite, and perhaps because of its 'real world' problems (as I will explain further in Hugo's analysis). Hanna does not talk about these with a sense of pride, to be clear, but indexes their 'capital' in her interactions (cf. the idea of national superiority from Chapter 4). I turn now to Hugo, whose experiences allow revealing insights into the constraints of heteronormativity.

5.4.2.2 Hugo

Hugo's gender and sexual identities fast assumed prominence in our discussions, allowing him to explore his experiences through reflection. These reflections and identity instantiations simultaneously put the structure and agency relationship under an illuminating interactional lens, and were strengthened by the longitudinal aspect to this collection (Hugo's exchange was for one year and some of the data for analysis is from his return to France). My data contains several episodes in which Hugo comes into contact with circulating normative Discourses of sexuality, making his identity as a gay man salient. I begin the analysis by providing an example which clarifies the force of heteronormativity as an entrenched ideological structure. When Hugo was in the process of looking for a WWOOFING (Willing Workers on Organic Farms) position in the summer holidays (half way through his exchange), all he could find was a place in the home of an Ordained Minister. The outdoor physical work appealed, but the religious aspect generated alarm bells, and not just because of the clash with his own atheist ideals. Hugo worried, rather, that *she doesn't like my style or personality if you know what I mean*. He continued to elaborate on this concern during our conversation, stating that despite his Catholic upbringing, he was *done* with

religion *after the church rejected me*. This was a powerful reminder of the inescapability for many of pervasive structures such as religion which, as Foucault (1976) shows, have had a powerful effect on constructions of ‘acceptable’ forms of sexuality. Hugo’s habitus has therefore been primed to anticipate the rumblings (and potential eruption) of discursive faultlines (Menard-Warwick, 2014). These faultlines occur between normative understandings of gender and sexuality and his ‘non-normative’ sexual identity and version of masculinity (which is fluid and falls outside traditional norms).

Assuming a non-heterosexual identity involves being confronted with many more discursive stumbling blocks than those who navigate the path deemed ‘normative’ will ever meet. It involves an ongoing “practical social reflection” (Warner, 1991, p. 6) of the social institutions and norms in which heterosexuality is taken for granted. The above example provides a clear instance of such reflection in that through Hugo’s conscious discursive exploration we see how ideologies of heteronormativity affect Hugo’s interactional space. I turn now to a more detailed analysis, building on the concept of heteronormativity as a structure which guides Hugo’s identity work.

5.4.2.2.1 Interview Data – Hugo and Shelley: Redefining Social Norms, Pushing Back, and Becoming Woke

1 year Wellington (3 days before departure)

This final interview took place in a café on campus and lasted for 32 minutes. The following excerpts centre on Hugo’s exploration of his feelings of becoming ‘woke’³⁴ regarding LGBTQ issues and the accompanying repercussions upon his return to Paris. In the following excerpt, Hugo explains why this ‘becoming woke’ feels like a paradox given his exchange setting of New Zealand, engaging with what he sees as differing discursive climates and sparking the beginnings of his structural reflections.

Excerpt 23

4.54 – 5.18

1. Hugo: which is which is kinda weird because we’re like //lost\
2. Shelley: /i-\ in a bubble yeah

³⁴ Woke as an adjective has its origins in Erykah Badu’s 2008 song Master Teacher. It has since been used in the hashtag #staywoke, particularly in the 2013 #BlackLivesMatter movement. It has indexical ties to racism, sexism, and classism and involves ‘seeing past’ the grand narratives that have come to structure our environment, thus indexing an awareness of the workings of social power and inequalities. Hugo’s choice of adjective is therefore extremely apt.

3. Hugo: we're lost //in\ an island at the end of the world
4. Shelley: /yeah\\
5. Shelley: yeah that's interesting
6. Hugo: [gentle sarcasm]: like nothing happens here: /we're\\
7. Shelley: /yeah\\ yeah
8. Hugo: we're in such a safe bubble
9. Shelley: mm mm
10. Hugo: with because you're so far away you can look
11. at the outside
12. Shelley: oh my god that's really interesting + yeah
13. Hugo: nothing //happ\ens here we don't have anything to +
14. really + look upon here
15. Shelley: /yeah\\
16. Shelley: yeah
17. Hugo: so we look at what's happening outside

Hugo likens New Zealand's geographic isolation as being *lost in an island at the end of the world* (line3), and builds on my proffered addition of being in a bubble by clarifying that he sees the bubble as *safe* (line 8), simultaneously adding meaning to his previous statement that *nothing happens here* (line 6). The epistemic stance taken by Hugo echoes that of Hanna, suggesting a cultural grounding (Jaffe, 2009) in France, while the affective stance that accompanies this 'knowledge' is very different. It seems likely that the backdrop of the French terror attacks (Paris, 2015 and Nice, 2016, as major examples) played a very important role in this epistemic construction. Hugo makes this clear in an eloquent and moving Facebook post, written almost immediately after the Nice attacks.

Excerpt 24

Être à l'autre bout de la Terre ne rend pas les choses plus faciles, au contraire.

(Being at the other end of the Earth does not make things easier, but rather quite the opposite³⁵.)

This is a useful example of the constitution of this culturally-grounded epistemic stance, accounting for this common perception that *nothing happens here* (line 6). New Zealand, then, is seen as a safe and calm exchange destination, a perception reiterated in a meeting I had in Paris at

³⁵ The Facebook post was in French (my translation).

my participants' university (where Hugo, Jules, Félix, and Pierre had come from and where Persephone and Viv attended whilst in Paris). During this fruitful discussion with the International Affairs Manager for Oceania, I was told that this perception was augmented by the perceived 'exotic' nature of the country, which is linked to geographic distance (as also described in Chapter 1). It seems likely that this perception would have had an effect on the above epistemic stance taken by both Hugo and Hanna. What is particularly interesting though is that for Hugo this perception of being in a 'safe bubble' was positively assessed in terms of the affordances he saw it providing for reflection on the world - *because you're so far away you can look at the outside* (lines 10-11). In this emphasis on reflection, Hugo's habitus may be seen to be called into question.

At this point in our conversation, I reiterate Hugo's idea of holding hands for same sex couples as a concrete example of this 'safe' environment. Hugo had elaborated on this during our previous (unrecorded) chat in a Wellington café in which he had also mentioned being in a 'safe bubble' (hence my re-use of the term in this conversation). He orients seamlessly to this idea, describing the impact on his sexual identity within the parameters of what he saw as empowering LGBTQ Discourses and accompanying norms in Wellington.

Excerpt 25

5.20 – 5.56

1. Shelley: mm: okay and yeah and another time when we met in
2. [café] that time you were telling me how + you'll miss
3. + Wellington like kind of for that community //because
4. like\ you can walk down the street holding hands
5. for example
6. Hugo: /oh I know\\
7. Hugo: oh yeah I'm gonna miss so much
8. Shelley: mm
9. Hugo: + yeah + yeah Wellington really [drawls]: redefined
10. my: ideas and conceptions + of + what social limits
11. social norms [upward contour]: could be:
12. Shelley: yeah
13. Hugo: that's also what I'm a bit afraid like when I come
14. b//ack\ that I don't have the right social codes
15. Shelley: /okay\\
16. Shelley: mm
17. Hugo: because they've been redefined here

Hugo's description allows an intriguing insight into his own process of 'ideologically becoming' (Bakhtin, 1992; Menard-Warwick, 2014), comparing his interpretations of prevalent Discourses around what 'acceptable' sexual identities look like in Paris and Wellington. The example of holding hands is usefully illustrative of this difference in its indexical ties to these wider Discourses. It echoes Berlant & Warner's (1998) important Foucauldian point of the societal delegitimisation of certain behaviour, and Cameron & Kulick's (2003, p. 115) example of homosexual couples kissing and holding hands as being constructed as 'indecent behaviour' and policed as such. As Hugo laments, he will miss being able to this *so much* (line 7). His repetition of the concept of *redefinition* (lines 9 and 17) aptly captures the extent of this change as he experiences it, as does his affective stance expressed in his expression of fear of not having *the right social codes* (line 14) upon his return to Paris. He continues to deepen his level of reflection as our interaction unfolds.

Excerpt 26

5.57 – 6.27

1. Hugo: it's taught me it's ++ it always seemed normal to me
2. Shelley: mm
3. Hugo: that it was right to hold hands but still I wouldn't do it
4. in Paris and I was like //you\ can't do it and you know
5. why and stuff but here I'm like [exhales] of course
6. I do it and I don't see why I couldn't
7. Shelley: /yeah\\
8. Shelley: yes
9. Hugo: and I'm just a bit afraid that I would go back
10. and feel + oppressed
11. Shelley: mm
12. Hugo: by those social norms that + I've been + beyond
13. Shelley: mm hm y//eah\
14. Hugo: /did\\ that make sense
15. Shelley: that really does make sense //yeah\
16. Hugo: /it\\ feels like can I go + back
17. Shelley: yeah + yeah stepping back
18. Hugo: yeah

Hugo returns to the emotion of worry and fear yet tempers this affective stance with an emphasis on the growth involved in going beyond the restrictions he feels in Paris. He begins by painting

his Wellington experience as one of learning (line 1) yet segues after a brief pause into a more agentive stance which emphasises perhaps his underlying epistemic ‘wokeness’ - *it always seemed normal to me* (line 1), *that it was right to hold hands* (line 3) - despite the restrictive structures he was working within. We therefore gain a picture of Hugo’s habitus as dormant yet primed for change in Paris, and triggered in the Wellington setting through his interactions with liberating Discourses around LGBTQ issues. The idea of liberation captures Hugo’s feelings and experiences extremely well and is revelatory in terms of his own movement within the structure/agency relationship – *social norms that I’ve been beyond* (line 12). Clearly, it is not as simple an equation as Paris equals these Discourses and these norms and Wellington equals these (different) Discourses and these norms (as Hugo himself acknowledges several times), but for Hugo at this point his identity construction and accompanying reflexive positioning is greatly aided by this discursive division. For him, the difference is entirely meaningful; it is the difference between feeling *oppressed* (line 10) and feeling liberated - allowing what he always knew was *normal* (line 1) and *right* (line 3) to be enacted freely and without restraint. At this point in our discussion, I engage with this division by bringing my analytical interest in structure and agency in line with Hugo’s experience.

Excerpt 27

6.30 – 6.58

1. Shelley: so you don’t + you wouldn’t feel comfortable at all +
2. pushing back against those norms in Paris because it’s
3. too [upward intonation]: dangerous to do that: or +
4. I mean obviously it would depend on the place
5. //that you were\
6. Hugo: /yeah it would depend\\ on the place //it would\
7. depend on the context
8. Shelley: /yeah\\
9. Shelley: yeah
10. Hugo: and I’d love to push
11. Shelley: m//m\
12. Hugo: /the\\ norms + [drawls]: but: I don’t wi- I don’t want
13. ah I don’t really want to put myself at risk
14. Shelley: no exactly + //that’s\ the whole kind of

15. structure agency³⁶ //thing\ isn't it like
16. Hugo: /but\\
17. Hugo: /yeah\\
18. Hugo: it's just me I can't do much alone

After orienting smoothly to my point about context (through cooperative overlaps and repetition - see lines 5-7), Hugo enters directly into the structure/agency dilemma. The modal verb element of his phrase *I'd love to push* (line 10) presupposes an idea of non-reality, 'in an ideal world' type of Discourse. While he would like to, in such a world, move freely about his social spaces enacting identities important to him, the threat of being harmed or being unsafe (line 13) meant that the pendulum swung more towards the structure end of the continuum. Hugo's self-positioning as not being able to do much *alone* (line 18) underscores his sense of isolation in what he often described to me as highly heteronormatively-influenced Parisian gay spaces. Hugo emphasised the cultural capital associated with heterosexual hegemonic masculinity in these spaces, which supports much of the literature on the preference for stereotypically masculine qualities in gay contexts (e.g. Baker, 2008; Barrett, 2017; Connell, 1987). My own experience living in Paris also supports this notion, whereby 'performatively camp' versions of homosexuality were rare even within areas that are known for being LGBTQ-friendly.

Hugo's almost fatalistic narrative stance on this issue gains complexity, however, when his agentive acts in Wellington and on Facebook are taken into account, allowing a more nuanced and non-static view of the structure/agency continuum and a person's movement within discursive spaces. Around ten days before our final interview, Hugo had hosted a joint farewell party at his flat in Wellington, to which Persephone and I were invited, as well as my other French participants Pierre and Félix (Jules had already returned to France). Hugo regularly spoke of the importance of the friends he had made in this flat (a mix of cultures, ages, and sexualities) and there is no doubt that the growth in his LGBTQ awareness can be attributed in great part to this accepting environment in which he felt comfortable, validated, and a real sense of belonging. On the night of the farewell party Hugo dressed in drag for the second time in his life. The following are my observations from my field notes: **16th June 2017, Hugo's farewell party, his apartment, Wellington CBD**

³⁶ Hugo had already been introduced to the concepts of structure and agency in his Sociology class, as well as to Butler's concept of performativity. These ideas were regular inclusions in our conversations.

When I arrived, Hugo was seated on one of the high seats at the big table in the middle of the kitchen. His make-up was being expertly applied by a friend of the head tenant and he was perfectly at ease chatting with me while this was being done. He looked amazing at the end, complete with long blonde wig, above-the-knee boots, breast padding and long, thick eyelashes. Persephone and I had a few photos taken with him and he told us that it was only his second time dressing in drag. He commented a few times during the evening that dressing in drag 'desensitised' him, or made him 'not give a fuck'. He perhaps made this point most strongly when he found out that his ex wasn't going to come to the party. When we last spoke, he had been certain that his ex was going to come and he had told me how he had invited 'all the people that were special in some way to him'. Both Pierre and Felix did not seem surprised at all by seeing Hugo in full drag. It is clear that Hugo hasn't been a core member of the French group, and that this was his choice. While he gets on with them and is pleased to have them as friends, he has preferred to find his own friends and 'build' everything on his terms (see final interview). At the end of the evening, Hugo and some of his flatmates/friends were heading into town but Pierre, Felix, Persephone and myself decided against joining them. Hugo was in his element and I hoped he would make some more wonderful memories to take away with him.

From these recollections, what stands out the most is how at ease Hugo was the whole evening. The particular space of his flat and flatmates fed into his experience of what he perceived as an open and liberal Wellington, akin to Canagarajah's (2004) notion of a safe house - a space outside of institutional surveillance in which counter Discourses to oppression can be nourished. Leaving to continue the party in town whilst dressed in drag can thus be seen as a challenge to the restrictions of heteronormativity, most keenly felt for Hugo in Paris. Here, in Wellington, Hugo was able to try out this identity in what he saw as a safer and more accepting environment. Through drag, and the appropriation of femininity, he was able to disrupt and challenge the "normative alignment of sex assignment, gender identity and sexual identity" (Bucholtz, 2014, p. 37), gaining confidence and commitment in the process.

In this sense, his exchange experience can be seen to have planted seeds of agency and to have contributed to the development of an agentive 'pushing back'. Whilst Hugo's self-positioning in the interview data above supports the idea of the absolute stronghold of structures in Paris, and his perceived inability to push back against these ingrained heternorms, this is not necessarily set in stone as subsequent Facebook data from his return to Paris demonstrates.

5.4.2.2.2 Facebook Data

On the day Hugo returned to Paris (after having spent a couple of months with family in his own region of France), he posted the following on Facebook, along with a map of Paris:

Excerpt 28

Bitch I'm back, by popular demand.

This pithy statement belies its depth in terms of the identity work it is doing. For Hugo, it seems likely the most salience lies in the indexical ties to the drag subculture. RuPaul's Drag Race Dictionary (n.d.) defines the noun 'bitch' as such: *A fierce woman. A friend. Used as a term of endearment among drag queens.* Hugo's reflexive positioning may therefore be seen as assertive, or 'fierce', as a precursor perhaps to how he intends to confront heteronormative structures in Paris. Before this Facebook post, I had heard Hugo on occasion use the word 'bitch' to negatively evaluate the behaviour of gay men he did not like, as well as to refer to himself in an ironic way (see Barrett, 1997, 2017). Context is clearly crucial. The quote above also references a line taken from Beyoncé's 2016 song 'Formation', an anthem of Black empowerment speaking directly to the Black Lives Matter movement. The indexical field is therefore wide. As well as indexing notions of overcoming the oppressor, and the cultural capital globally associated with Beyoncé, this phrase also links indexically to a diva-esque, fierce, and unapologetic instantiation of his gender identity.

Facebook, too, as a platform, appears to function as a type of safe house in that it provides for Hugo an empowering, non-threatening platform to enact this bold confidence and lay a direct challenge to what he sees as the existing heteronormative social order in Paris. The seeds of agency planted in Wellington appear to be growing well at this point. The final evidence from Facebook which shows Hugo's continued exploration of agency within these ideological structures is his post after his Bachelor's Ball at his Paris university (accompanied by two photos of Hugo dressed in immaculate drag as Daisy):

Excerpt 29

Last night was the [] Bachelor graduation ceremony. I didn't go...but Daisy did! I was asked if it was for fun or a political statement: obviously both. I feel special as a (baby) drag queen, but it was even more special to be a drag queen around my classmates in such a prestigious and standardised environment. Break the rules, be true to yourself and have fun. That's my

statement. 🙌🏳️🌈

Some people also "thanked" me "for doing it": it was my honor and pleasure. It's now my turn to thank everyone for all the compliments and all the kindness y'all gave me. I knew well that you were brilliant minds, but now I'm sure you're also beautiful souls. Daisy will come back! 🍷

The use of English, here as in the previous post, may well be intended to capture his intended audience (i.e. the choice of using English ensures the majority of his friends can understand the message whereas French would limit his readership significantly). This has direct ties to his friends in Wellington, particularly in the LGBTQ community, whose investment in this aspect of Hugo's identity would have been strengthened during his exchange period. It is of note too that Hugo employs creative linguistic features within this, as in the use of *y'all*, a form regularly used by RuPaul. As well as indexing drag directly, it may also index notions of friendliness and linguistic dexterity (given that it is more commonly associated with the Southern states of the USA rather than New Zealand English).

The agentive positioning is striking, both in the discursive construction and in the event itself. It is worth reiterating Hugo's statement about the prestigious nature of his Parisian institution, heavily anchored as it is in tradition, and definitely not known as a bastion of rainbow liberalism. This may well have been the first time a student had 'flouted' these institutional and societal norms by disregarding gender expectations in such an explicit way. Socially and linguistically (as evidenced in the above Facebook post), Hugo is crossing from an unmarked to a marked position, which Cameron & Kulick (2003, p. 97) make clear is "more noticeable than the reverse". They give the example of a man wearing a dress as opposed to a woman wearing pants, noting that the man's "gender deviance" in this instance "will be more visible" than the woman's (p.97), with the clear implication that everything gendered as 'male' has come to assume superior status.

The positivity with which Hugo constructs people's reactions is therefore heartwarming and not without a sense of relief. In a separate post he also thanked all the people who gave him 'the finger' on his way to the ball because, as he put it, at least they had noticed him. Acknowledging his junior status as a *(baby) drag queen*, hints at his desire to attain a more senior drag queen status, which links to a corresponding development of agency and investment in this movement towards his desired imagined community. Hugo's advice to *break the rules, be true to yourself and have fun* displays a much more agentive stance than indicated in his final interview, epitomised by the

fearless *Daisy*. In this sense, Hugo's dressing in drag may function as protection, simultaneously shielding him from potential negativity (recall his comment above on not 'giving a fuck') while at the same time 'pushing back' in a highly visible way.

Hugo's experiences and discursive positioning therefore allow insights into his gender and sexual identity trajectories and corresponding insights into agency within changing structural environments. While his developing sense and enactment of agency is to be celebrated, structure does not fall by the wayside, but is parallel and intertwined. Rather than paint an overly agentive picture, I argue for a recognition of the force of ideological structures and for an acknowledgement of how crossing borders can be the impetus for a liberating 'ontological excavation', as Hugo's analysis has shown. These ideas form the basis for the following chapter. Moving from France to New Zealand led to the activation of discursive faultlines around 'appropriate' ways to 'do' sexuality and gender, resulting in an unlocking and examination of habitus. Hugo's understandings of and relationship with heteronorms was put under a microscope and evaluated from new vantage points and now, in Paris, the past, present, and future can be seen to "encounter and transform each other" (Papastergiadis, cited in Block, 2007, p.864), leading to new possibilities for constructing his gender and sexual identities. While Hugo is indeed *only one person* (to return to our interview data), his recognition of the emancipatory potential of pushing back is a celebratory first step in overcoming oppressive social norms.

5.5 Concluding Remarks

Gender and sexuality were an inescapable part of the overall study abroad experience for Persephone, Athena, Viv, Hanna, and Hugo. While their identity negotiations were very different, they were all in varying ways influenced and constrained by the gender order and heteronormativity. Data from my other participants also shows evidence of these gender and sexuality ideologies at play (though not to the same extent), pointing to the ubiquity of these structures. Therefore, we are always 'doing' our identities as women and men and negotiating our sexualities wherever we are, most likely without a conscious recognition of the structuring forces we are working within. As my data reveals, however, the study abroad experience can 'trigger' a deeper engagement with ideological structures. As I have argued in this chapter, ideologies of gender and sexuality do not limit themselves to a particular time or place. The shape they take may indeed be locally variable, but the overarching tenets of power and inequality as manifest in such ideologies have colonised much of the world imperialistically with all the force of a military power (Kress, 1989). In other words, in negotiating one's gender and sexuality identities in a new study

abroad context, the dominant ideological framing stays the same; yet what changes (or is at least perceived to change by virtue of the experiences one has) are the shape and strength of the particular norms and Discourses one may be exposed to.

For my participants in Paris - Persephone, Viv and Athena - norms around sexual harassment (on the metro and on the street) and associated Discourses were the impetus (the 'trigger') for this engagement. This unprecedented and unwanted sexualisation (through a regular interactive positioning) encouraged reflections on how they conceptualised themselves as young women and provided discursive constraints to how they negotiated their identities as (heterosexual-identifying) young women. Negotiations involved aligning and disaligning with many Discourses nourished by ideological roots. These included Discourses of blame, ideas of passivity and agentivity, false dichotomies of the 'good girl' and the 'slut' and associated stigmas, double binds, expectations of availability and willingness, and ownership of men over women. For Hanna, in New Zealand, despite her self-positioning as highly agentive, and in control, there is an equal engagement with gender and sexuality Discourses which provides structure to her identity work. Her national identity as French is closely bound up in this, emphasising again the importance of an intersectional approach. Hugo's data allows us to access heteronormativity from another perspective, as one who has long understood the constraining forces of this ideology. As he grapples overtly with competing Discourses (as he perceives them in Paris and Wellington), we gain an understanding of the pervasive nature of the 'rules' of heteronormativity and accompanying insights into the workings of the structure and agency relationship from this perspective.

At times, the discursive faultlines (Menard-Warwick, 2014) (as related to gender and sexuality) are acknowledged and reflected on by participants, though at others, they remain below the level of conscious attention. This is not to say that my participants are consistently and blissfully unaware of the Discourses they are dealing with. However, even the most reflective of my participants fall into symbolic domination at times and perpetuate unhelpful Discourses. Thus, whether participants were interactionally drawing on, aligning with, or contesting (consciously or unconsciously) gender and sexuality Discourses and ideologies, their identity negotiations could not be disentangled from these structuring properties. The regular instances of deep reflection offered by Persephone and Hugo offer a level of promise, however, in that certain categories and supporting ideologies are beginning to be problematised on an ontological level and not accepted as the 'way things are' or 'common sense'. This is resonant of the current interrogation of misogyny we are seeing in the #MeToo movement and supports the notion of SA as social change (see Anya,

2016). The following chapter examines the macro concepts made salient in the past two chapters, and shows how attention to ideologies in particular has rich repercussions for evolving understandings of the structure and agency relationship in identity scholarship and in the social sciences more generally.

Chapter 6: Widening the Lens: Ideology as a Portal into the Structure and Agency Relationship

We might dream of flying but we cannot defy the gravity of the social field (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 370)

This chapter explores in more depth the macro-level concepts that became prominent in the analyses, laying bare increasingly invisible patterns of power that are indexed in SA settings today (cf. Darvin & Norton, 2015, p. 41; De Costa, 2010). Specifically, I harness the constructs of ideology, Discourses and habitus as undergirding my participants' identity negotiations, and from this engage with the ongoing structure and agency debate in the social sciences. I argue that understandings of *how* identities are negotiated whilst on study abroad are enriched by close attention to these theoretical constructs, which are themselves illuminated through the interactions of participants. Again, we encounter notions of conceptual connections and inextricability which returns the focus to surpassing the binaries so well entrenched in social research. In Chapter 2, I mentioned the utility of theorising identity as a living 'whole', and I prioritise this idea throughout this discussion.

As Chapters 4 and 5 have shown, ideologies play an important role in identity co-construction. For my participants during their exchanges, ideologies of gender and sexuality, and nationality and 'standard' languages both infiltrate and act as a resource in their identity negotiations. What study abroad contexts afford, by virtue of movement across geographical and discursive space, is access to how identities are negotiated in light of these ideological constraints by young people living in an increasingly mobile and globalised world. This focus emphasises the social embeddedness of participants (and myself, as the researcher), which in turn has rich implications for our understandings of the relationship between the individual and the social, as connected to agency and structure. The setup of this chapter will therefore be necessarily theoretical. I begin by returning to the ontological characteristics of ideologies, structure, and agency before revisiting my data, which I synthesise to highlight the connections between constructs, and problematise certain findings in SA. Specifically, a major outcome of investigating the important role of ideological structure in SA identity negotiations is the parallel need to explore and conceptualise agency in as much depth. In so doing we can attain the most valuable and nuanced understandings of the

complexity involved in this critical, but theoretically elusive component of identity co-construction.

I acknowledge at the outset the conceptual slipperiness I am engaging with and reiterate my commitment to multiple voices and a complex social reality (see Chapter 2). The notion of ideology for example, despite its scholarly popularity, remains one of the “vaguest and most ‘contested’ concepts of the social sciences” (van Dijk, 2011, p. 6), and ‘structure’, more generally, is often left unaccounted for definitionally (Block, 2013b). Chapter 2 initially explored the construct of ideology as part of my theoretical set up and I bring together now the most relevant aspects of this exploration so as to establish a definitional baseline. Teun van Dijk’s (2011, p. 7) working definition is a useful starting point, whereby he posits that ideologies are “the fundamental beliefs of a group and its members”. As mentioned in Chapter 2, Julia Menard-Warwick (2014, p. 2) adds an important critical element in defining ideologies as the “beliefs and perceptions linked to power relations between social groups - which may or may not be expressed explicitly as discourses, but often become apparent in taken-for-granted practices”. Discourses, therefore, can be conceptualised as the portal through which ideologies gain voice. In so far as ideologies are socially situated and “tied to questions of identity and power in societies” (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2001, p. 246) I conceptualise these ‘beliefs’ as powerful forms of social structure.

6.1 Ideologies, Identities, and Study Abroad Settings

One might be tempted to question the value of using study abroad contexts to reveal how ideologies infiltrate identity negotiations, especially when it is fair to say that anybody negotiating their gender or national identities, no matter where they are, is constrained in some way by ideological structures. Negotiating one’s gender identity as a New Zealander in New Zealand is just as likely to involve interaction with ideologies as negotiating one’s gender identity as a New Zealander in France. What crossing geographic and sociocultural boundaries does, however, as well as allow for a focus on mobility within a sociolinguistics of globalisation (Blommaert, 2010), is heighten the possibility of threats to habitus (cf. Block, 2007a; Kinginger, 2013), which has the potential to throw one’s sense of self into various shades of disarray and bring about a reconciliation of sorts. This sense of self hinges on large scale social identity categories such as gender, sexuality, or nationality (as explained in Chapter 2).

My data aligns with Block’s (2007a) argument that movement across socio-political or geographic borders can result in the activation of “discursive faultlines”, defined by Menard-Warwick (2014,

p. 1) as “tensions, stresses and collisions [which] occur between discourses”. I have argued that it is not unusual for ideologies to spread their roots widely (or ‘colonise’ in Kress’ (1989) terminology) across geographic or linguistic boundaries. What do change to varying degrees are the particular forms of the Discourses and norms associated with overarching ideologies, resulting in a propensity for the activation of ‘discursive faultlines’ and accompanying habitus destabilisation. Blommaert (2005, p. 72) builds on this idea and introduces further connections to cultural capital:

Whenever discourses travel across the globe, what is carried with them is their shape, but their value, meaning, or function do not often travel along. Value, meaning, and function are a matter of uptake, they have to be granted by others on the basis of the prevailing orders of indexicality, and increasingly also on the basis of their real or potential ‘market value’ as a cultural commodity.

Further, and in relation to the important concept of uptake, “indexical restratification” (Blommaert, 2017, p. 96) can occur when negotiating discursive faultlines. An example of this would be Persephone’s determination to ‘keep’ her New Zealand accent when speaking in French in that the indexical ties to New Zealand characteristics were not recognised by her French language teacher (and many other French interlocutors). Instead, her accent was often interpreted as indexical to Discourses of deficiency as standard French language ideologies assumed interactional importance. Persephone’s accent in French exemplifies these mismatches in orders of indexicality and resultant clashes of capital that can occur in study abroad contexts.

As outlined in Chapter 5, discursive faultlines were also activated as regards gender and sexuality. Persephone, Athena, and Viv encountered ‘norms’ of sexual harassment (and unwanted daily sexualisation in general) as well as Discourses around these practices (generally pertaining to strategies of avoidance). This was not something that had featured in their New Zealand experience and as a result, carried the potential to consciously destabilise their New Zealand-infused habitus, and impact on how they recounted and enacted their identities as women in this new setting. Similarly, for Hugo in Wellington, encountering what he perceived as more inclusive LGBTQ Discourses resulted in elements of his habitus being called into question with repercussions for his gender and sexuality identities and corresponding agency. These examples, which I explore in more detail in this chapter, point to the need to give clear attention to the structuring properties of ideologies when considering questions of agency.

6.2 Agency as Tethered to Structure

Structure and agency go hand in hand in their mutual ongoing constitution. Chapter 2 made the important point that social structures are constitutive of and constituted by individual agency (cf. Ortner, 1995) in a type of ongoing discussion. I argue therefore, in line with Desjarlais (1997, p. 204), that one does not ‘possess’ agency as an ontologically prior and unchanging attribute with the ability to effect change on one’s environment irrespective of context. As well as being constituted in the first instance, it is a dynamic construct and will ebb and flow according to sociocultural contexts and one’s ongoing experiences and exposure to Discourses. This dynamism has been underexplored in applied linguistics where poststructural approaches to identity have highlighted agency (e.g. Block, 2003, 2007a; Duff, 2012; Kramsch, 2009; Norton, 1997, 2000, 2013; Norton Peirce, 1995; Pavlenko & Norton, 2007) and relegated social structures to a secondary plane (Block, 2013b). Whilst structure is acknowledged in identity-focused studies in applied linguistics, its importance is not often made explicit, resulting in agency being portrayed as distinct from structure in identity co-construction.

In the embracing of agency, too, there has seemingly been an ironic (unintended) tendency to conceptualise agency as an essential property of all learners, implying that making choices and exerting influence are options equally available to all (see Miller, 2014 for a critique). While instantiations of agency are to be celebrated, the ‘ease’ of assumed deployment feels simplified, and may be seen to exclude the experiences of many learners for whom challenging normative ways of thinking is not a possibility. The ‘over-agentive’ tone which has come to characterise applied linguistics (Block, 2013) does not just pertain to learners. It has also been argued to place unrealistic expectations on language teachers and applied linguists who are constrained by the very real social conditions and structures in which their work takes place (Norton & Morgan, 2013, p. 4). Expectations of the ability to transform sites of practice or unequal power can consequently result in undue pressure. Miller’s (2014) conceptualisation of agency as performed (drawing on Butler’s performativity theory) and as socially mediated coheres with my ontological considerations and overall social realist theoretical stance outlined in Chapter 2. Like identity, agency is something we *do* (or not) to different levels in interactions in specific sociocultural contexts. This idea of social mediation is valuable in continuing to build connections between agency and structure, and signals the value of conceptualising habitus as a mediating device.

Bourdieu defines habitus as "systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles of generation and structuring of practices and representations" (Bourdieu, 1977a, p. 72). In other words, as an "internalized system shaped by ideology, habitus is the system by which people make sense of the world" (Darvin & Norton, 2015, p. 45). As well as guiding beliefs and perceptions, it guides the ways of being and doing (linguistic and otherwise) involved in identity construction, and as such, is a central concept in breaking down false dichotomies of the individual and society, and agency and structure. I reiterate my conceptualisation of habitus as durable yet non-static (e.g. Blommaert, 2005), in that habitus can both reproduce and reconfigure itself through practices (Bourdieu, 1977a, p. 78), calling forth the metaphor of a toolkit developed in Chapter 2. And, as been argued throughout the thesis, this reconfiguration can be triggered upon encountering new Discourses and norms, clearly pertinent to study abroad contexts.

These ideas resonate strongly with Bakhtinian notions of dialogism and intertextuality (see e.g. Menard-Warwick, 2009, 2014; Vitanova, 2010), which I have argued also offer a promising middle ground between structure and agency in identity co-construction. As shown in Chapters 4 and 5, these considerations all bring to bear on my participants' identity negotiations in the dialogic nature of their interactions. In co-constructing identities in their new sociocultural contexts, they were not only speaking with others, but speaking with (and through) ideologies. They could not simply choose to ignore the 'steer' of their habitus, or simply choose to act without recourse to the connected cultural capital at their disposal (Reay, Crozier, & James, 2011, p. 22). Habitus and intertextuality are therefore valuable in understanding the "sociocultural mediation" to which Ahearn (2001) refers in her definition of agency. In order to better grasp the inextricability of these concepts, I turn to a deeper exploration of ideology as structure and how this manifests in my participants' data.

6.3 Ideological Structures in Study Abroad

The call for more attention to social structure in applied linguistics is also seen in sociolinguistics with Natalie Schilling (2013, p. 342) reminding us that "we cannot create meaningful style out of nothing", drawing attention to the binding properties of structures and norms on the micro-level linguistic forms which impact identity work. Susan Erlich (2008b), too, urges more analytical attention to Butler's (1990) "rigid regulatory frame" in order to advance understandings of what and how agency is constrained and enabled in identity construction. In Chapter 2, I made transparent my conceptualisation of structure, drawing on Bourdieu's notion of subjective (mental)

structure as most pertinent to my study. Ideologies are a form of mental structure in so far as they infiltrate our belief systems. It is this type of structure - ideological - which resonates the most strongly in my data and allows us to explore the role of structure as linked to identity in study abroad contexts.

The legitimisation of dominance is an important function of ideologies (and clearly evident in my data). Yet, I agree with van Dijk's (2011) proposal of a more general notion of ideologies which includes 'positive' ideologies (feminism and anti-racism for example), systems that "sustain and legitimise opposition and resistance *against* domination and social inequality" (p.8). While there is evidence of such positive ideologies in my data (Persephone's self-positioning as feminist, for instance, or Hugo's rejection of heteronormative boundaries), the fact that they arose from 'negative', hegemonic ideologies such as the gender order assumed the most salience in the data. These dominant forms thereby warrant the most analytical focus. In other words, the occurrence of positive ideologies could not feasibly be understood in identity negotiations without attention to the deeper, underpinning ideologies from which they stem. I return now to my participants, anchoring the theoretical concepts of agency, habitus and ideological structure in real and diverse experiences.

In returning to my participants, I emphasise the diversity of experience within the commonality of ideological constraint. My data shows that the equation of *study abroad* = *destabilisation of habitus*, while probable, is not a *fait accompli* (cf. Kinginger, 2013; Kramsch, 2009). Assuming that habitus destabilisation invites 'negotiation of difference' (Block, 2007a), a level of reflection on one's own socially-constituted identities, and a potential movement towards problematising aspects of this constitution (which include the norms and Discourses of the new setting), my data clearly indicates varying levels across participants. This wide variety points to the important role of each participant's intersectional experiences and what they bring with them to the exchange setting, as well as what they encounter. As linked to habitus destabilisation, the Bakhtinian notion of *ideologically becoming* (as explained in Chapter 2)³⁷ did not appear to fit uniformly in that not every participant showed evidence of struggle between various available ideological standpoints.

Although this may be partly due to the specific data I was able to collect from each participant, as well as the length of time participants spent on exchange (Block, 2007a; Kinginger, 2013), my

³⁷ The process of ideologically becoming involves social agents in a constant process of "assimilating [their] consciousness to the ideological world" (Bakhtin, 1992, p. 341).

ethnographic perspective provided crucial scaffolding in this respect in that the time I spent with my participants allowed for a holistic understanding of their experiences. Relationships with participants also varied, which undoubtedly affected the shape of conversations. The friendship between Persephone and Athena (and their common experiences) led to their interactions having more of a reflective tone, a tone not mirrored in other participants' naturally occurring data. In saying this, I am confident in the level of trust established in all relationships with participants, and as I hope the data has shown, they felt comfortable sharing their thoughts, feelings, and problems with me.

It is timely to reiterate that my initial intention was never to amass 'equal' data sets or to seek standardised comparisons. Such claims to objectivity do not fit within my ontological and epistemological stances, and nor are they indicative of 'better', more 'scientific' research (see Chapter 2 where this argument was presented). Given the importance of complexity, contingency and context in our social worlds, seeking this kind of determinacy would immediately raise alarm bells. Importantly, the interactional data (naturally occurring and interviews) I have from participants is what they were happy to provide me, and in all cases the levels of participant reflection in the analysed data mirrors insights gained from the ethnographic scaffolding. In this sense, the ethnographic component sharpened the focus of the close discourse analysis, which in turn benefited from a widening of the lens to consider larger patterns of systemic power in the form of ideologies. In sum, the data extracts are snapshots of my participants' identity experiences in a particular place and at a particular time, yet imbued in these are historical threads and future projections, speaking to the wider societal significance. To see these snapshots as purely individual and as two-dimensional would be to miss the wider theoretical significance.

With this qualification in place, I return to considerations of why some participants showed explicit evidence of moving further along in their ideologically becoming. An interesting finding in this regard is that habitus destabilisation resulted in the most discursive reflection for the participants who had prior experience of systemic marginalisation in some form (cf. Holmes, 2018). While none of my participants were magically able to operate outside the realms of ideological structures, the level of discursive reflection varied, from Hanna's "that's just the way things are" in relation to the 'nature' of men to Persephone's and Hugo's deeper reflections on the ontological characteristics of gender, sexuality and language ideologies. In order to illustrate these differences in more depth, I return to the ideology of standard French and associated notions of Frenchness,

with which Hanna, Victoria and Persephone all engaged in some way in relation to their national identity co-construction (see Chapter 4).

6.3.1 Ideologies of French Language and Nationality

Hanna, as a young white woman from an affluent family in France can be seen to embody a societally-privileged position in that her experiences have reflected those of the normative majority in her sociocultural contexts. By all accounts, she has not had to question her place in the world and has been able to move through social space with relative ‘freedom’. Her identity as French (and as a speaker of standard French) is both socially sanctioned and imbued with significant amounts of transportable cultural capital (as we have seen in her interactions with her language buddy, Michael). Her strict adherence to French language ideologies, and the status that is assumed to be garnered from a focus on correction, for example, serves as an example of her discursive complicity in these ideological structures, highlighting Bourdieu’s notion of symbolic domination. In her emphasis on ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ (both to do with French language and with modes of behaviour in general), there is a perpetuation of power in that those who fall into the ‘wrong’ category are stripped of assumed value (e.g. Ager, 1996; Estival & Pennycook, 2011). By harnessing these ideologies in her own identity work as ‘French teacher’, and having them ratified by Michael (though not always unproblematically), Hanna’s interactions provide evidence of perpetuation of such ideologies.

For Hanna, there is no reflexive problematisation of the fundamentally arbitrary nature of such categories. Why is *le français parlé à la télé* (see Chapter 4) the benchmark? Why, if Hanna and Victoria understand each other very well, is Victoria’s New Caledonian variety of French accorded lesser value by society? As we have seen, the answer lies in considerations of power and the ideologically-laden Discourses that do the social distribution. Hanna’s data provides evidence of a blanket acceptance of the ontological status of such Discourses, seemingly indicating an ossification, rather than a loosening, of habitus (cf. Coleman, 2013a). Marshalling these ideologies of French language and Frenchness in her identity work may have been an agentic move on Hanna’s part (sensing her habitus was under threat) to maintain interactional power when other exchange contexts (such as her tutorial class) did not afford her this same status.

Agentic intentionality aside, however, the power relations invoked through Hanna’s recourse to such ideologies are indisputable, and show the extent to which they have been normalised. Through indirect indexical processes, we can see Hanna’s French identity assuming interactional

importance; her recoiling into discourses of national superiority (e.g. Block, 2007a; Kinginger, 2013; Murphy-Lejeune, 2002) was not the result of direct reflections or of overt interactional positioning, but rather tied to an ideological commitment to the cultural capital seen as inherent in speaking standard French (cf. Revis, 2015). That these claims to prestige were consistently ratified by Michael in his language learner role points to the fluidity of these ideologies between France and New Zealand and to the importance of co-construction. It also points to the roles they both assumed, but it is worth remembering that when they spoke in English these same patterns did not occur, and the shape of interactions was more relational. Hanna's case study provides a useful example of agency as tethered to structure. In order for Hanna to assume status and act on her environment, she was both constrained and enabled by common beliefs and understandings of what the role of a French teacher entails. As I argued in Chapter 4, this role is ideologically fed and can be traced back to historical connections between the French language and the French nationality which still have significant traction in the collective consciousness today (e.g. Ager, 1996; Estival & Pennycook, 2011).

Victoria's interactions also provide evidence of her engagement with French language ideologies (and associated Discourses related to nationality). In the face of threats to her habitus with regards to her Caledonian and Pacific identities, Victoria appeared to recoil into Discourses of national superiority, though in a very different way to Hanna. Victoria positions herself firmly as part of her imagined community of Caledonians in her many affective stance moves by rejecting delegitimising Discourses around the French spoken in New Caledonia. As with Hanna and Persephone, Victoria engages with dichotomies, often through use of (ideologically-laden) stereotypes (cf. Coleman, 2013a), which in her case function to problematise the assumed capital of standard French (and notions of Frenchness). This brings to the fore the historical dimension of the relationship between France and New Caledonia. 'Rejecting' a positioning as French (and the associated ideological load) does not occur in a vacuum. For Victoria, staking a claim to her Caledonian and Pacific identities involved navigating interactive positioning underpinned by French language ideologies (not to mention the negotiations around her ethnic Vietnamese identity). Yet, ideological becoming is a dynamic and non-linear process and the pull of hegemonic ideologies is difficult to discursively resist. This is exemplified in Excerpt 4.2 when Victoria appears to perpetuate notions of status associated with speakers of standard French, lamenting the use of her own New Caledonian variety. While data indicates that Victoria does not subscribe to the underpinning ideology, her (inadvertent) perpetuation illuminates Bourdieu's notion of symbolic domination.

In sum, Victoria's engagement with these ideologies shines light on the added complexity of identity negotiations for students who fall outside the normative majority. While she would not purport to have experienced marginalisation as such, her experiences in New Zealand show that claims to her Caledonian identity, as distinct from the French identity and that of a Vietnamese identity, were not easily ratified, providing an interesting contrast to Hanna whose claims to a French identity were never (directly) questioned. In terms of oppression, however, Victoria told me about (and returned to this topic on a few occasions) her grandmother's experience of fleeing the Vietnam War and losing her husband and another family member in the process. Her grandmother arrived in New Caledonia with a young family at a particularly turbulent time in New Caledonian history characterised by violent unrest between the Kanak people and the French. While Victoria did not live through "the Events"³⁸ herself, she had clearly taken on an appreciation of their significance and understood her comparative privilege in that she had not had to experience such terror (not dissimilar to Persephone's reflections on the importance of her mother's history). These stories can therefore be seen to form part of her habitus, informing her understandings of power and structures, as well as of herself as Caledonian (and the ways in which she enacts this).

Victoria's experiences problematise the traditional study abroad expectation of immersion in the 'host culture' (see Chapter 1). While her experiences in New Zealand seem to have triggered the destabilisation of habitus, her 'negotiation of difference' (Block, 2007a) prioritised the navigation of ideologically-infused positioning and assumptions related to her own national and ethnic identities. Thus, her identity negotiations in New Zealand, and her experiences in her Pacific Studies class in particular, allowed her to move forward in her own understandings of herself as a Caledonian woman and as a woman from the Pacific more widely. Reconciling differences with the 'host culture' did not take discursive priority for Victoria. This adds complexity to our understandings of the study abroad experience in that movement towards the 'host culture' cannot always be assumed to be of the greatest importance for students (cf. Block, 2007a; Kramsch, 2009).

Persephone's data also reveals the force of ideological structures of the French language (and associated Discourses of Parisian-ness) in identity co-construction. As with Hanna and Victoria, her intersectional experiences clearly play a role in negotiations, and her experience with marginalisation appears to contribute to the extent with which she engages with the arbitrary nature

³⁸ This is the name given to this particular period in New Caledonian history.

of ideologies. As one who has experienced racism in New Zealand, Persephone can be seen to have been sensitised from an early age to inequality, and to perhaps anticipate ‘sanctions’ (i.e. to have aspects of her identities ‘questioned’) in some form (cf. Shin, 2014, p. 101). While these experiences did not have an adverse effect on the strength of connection to her New Zealand identity, they can logically be seen to have played a major role in the constitution of her habitus and corresponding lens through which she sees and discursively engages with ideologies.

In Chapter 4, we saw the effects of Persephone’s secondary socialisation (from her study of sociolinguistics at her New Zealand university) in her agentive rejection of the assumed cultural capital associated with speaking ‘proper French’ (see Excerpt 4.1). Data shows her astute reasoning in this regard, cutting as she does through the ideological veneer and revealing the fundamentally arbitrary nature of accent and associated ideological ties. Notions of being Parisian too, jar with her strong attachments to her imagined community of New Zealanders, as well as to her sociohistorically-constituted sense of self as a Kiwi Indian (recall her discussion of her mother’s experiences in Excerpt 4.4). In her narrative accounting work, Persephone makes an ideological case as to why she sees a clear dichotomy between these identities. While she readily acknowledges (and apologises for) her recourse to stereotype, we gain a sense of the beginnings of ontological excavation in that she is engaging with the foundations of categories and not accepting them at face value.

Taking as an example (standard) French language ideologies and ideologies of Frenchness, and examining these in light of Hanna’s, Victoria’s and Persephone’s experiences allows for insights into the relationship between identities and ideologies. We see that national identity negotiations for Hanna, Victoria and Persephone were all different, and heavily dependent on their own intersectional experiences (which informed their habitus). While they all appear to fall into discourses of national superiority in very different ways, I would argue that this is not necessarily as negative as it has been deemed in much of the literature (see Kinginger, 2013 for an overview) in that it can provide an impetus for reflection and engagement with constructed categories. For all three participants national identity negotiations were constrained in some way by ideological structures (and associated ideas of cultural capital, as I outline in Chapter 4) and imbued with power. As members of ethnic ‘minorities’, Victoria and Persephone problematised these ideological strongholds to different degrees whereas Hanna’s data (representative of being the

closest to the ‘normative centre’)³⁹ provides evidence of an unproblematic acceptance and perpetuation of the ‘natural’ state of such ideologies and Discourses. Waugh’s (1982) argument that “socially marked individuals are more aware of their markedness than those who embody the normative centre” (Meadows, 2009, p. 23) thus gains credence in assuming that the ability to problematise requires first an awareness of unequal power relations (accessible through the realisation of one’s ‘marked’ status). These ideas of marginality and normativity merit further attention.

6.3.2 Normativity and Experiences with Marginalisation

To return to Hanna’s example above, to say that she has not had her habitus affected by her time in NZ is perhaps going too far. In regards to beliefs about language learning in particular, studies have shown that students who spend longer than six months on study abroad experience greater changes, moving away from an emphasis on the teacher and towards learner autonomy (Amuzie & Winke, 2009). While Hanna’s case is different in that she enacts the role of teacher herself, it is entirely possible that the shape of this enactment may have changed had she stayed longer in her exchange context (cf. Kinginger, 2010). In Chapter 5, I suggest that study abroad experiences may well be reflected on in more depth after the return to the home context. It may therefore be unrealistic to expect significant ideological movement in those who do not spend a prolonged amount of time in the host context or for whom “critical experiences” do not ‘force’ the destabilisation of the habitus (cf. Block, 2007a). While there is evidence of Hanna’s discursive struggle as regards the break up with her boyfriend in the New Zealand context, and a furtive alignment with feminist Discourses after her return to France (see Chapter 5), it seems that throughout her exchange period, discursively at least, she remained unquestioning with regards to her structural constraints. In this sense, her habitus may have been triggered, but the discursive faultlines lie predominantly dormant, with a suggestion of occasional rumbling.

Viv, too, in Paris demonstrated a similar tendency to discursively ‘accept’ the status quo, and again it is interesting to note that Viv also embodies a more normative centre though she has had more ‘life experience’ (and critical experiences) than Hanna. If we recall her retelling of having her arm licked on the Paris metro (see Excerpt 5.13), there is a clear construction within her narrative agency of the ‘acceptance’ of this type of behaviour as part and parcel of living in a big city. Whilst

³⁹ I acknowledge that people in this ‘normative centre’ may also have this reflective ability. I would argue, however, that there needs to be a consciousness-raising event of some sort to trigger this awareness, and that even then, those in the centre have the option of ‘turning it on and off again’ in a way that marginalised groups do not.

Viv frames the behaviour as disgusting, there is no evidence in the interactional data or from my time spent with Viv in general which points to her habitus being destabilised in this regard. Rather, there was always a pragmatic dismissal of sorts and an accompanying refusal to let this bother her. That she continued to dress as she normally would and wore immaculate and striking make up was the exact opposite of Persephone whose identity as a woman was seriously called into question in this particular Parisian context where she struggled with the overt and unwanted sexualisation (recall her quandary around the *red lipstick*). The point I wish to emphasise here is that Viv, Persephone, and Athena all encountered ‘norms’ of sexual harassment in Paris, underpinned by ideologies of gender and sexuality. Because of my participants’ individual intersectional experiences (and the experiences they continued to accumulate), and the different shapes of their habitus, however, the ways in which they discursively engaged with these ideologies and the amount of attention they paid them, clearly differed. Whether my participants were momentarily drawing on, aligning with, or contesting (consciously or unconsciously) them, ideologies were inescapable and pervasive in their interactions. This has implications for how we understand participant agency.

6.3.3 Ideologies of Gender and Sexuality: Accessing Agency and Further Conceptualisations

The above examples have introduced the role of agency within ideological constraints, and I turn now to a more detailed consideration of these connections. Athena’s data in the Parisian context speaks straight to the heart of this complex relationship and is revelatory in the process. As demonstrated in Chapter 5, Athena’s recourse to an imaginary boyfriend is ideologically laden, calling forth the deepest elements of the gender order and heteronormativity - the idea of men’s ownership of women. Negotiating her identity as a woman at this point (both in the retelling and during the event itself) involves working within structural confines. Athena appears to use this boyfriend strategy as a last resort, hinting at the interpretation that she ‘knows’ the idea of ownership will have more clout than protestations or other excuses. The pervasiveness of gender ideologies can be felt in that there is no “restratification of indexicality” (Blommaert, 2017) evident, as can sometimes occur when crossing into new contexts. Despite the indexical leaps required to reveal the ideological roots of this phrase - *I’m meeting my boyfriend* - it is unproblematically ‘understood’ by her follower (as well as by Persephone in the retelling). In so far as Athena is able to effect change on her environment, i.e. ensure that she stops being followed, her linguistic and embodied behaviour can therefore be viewed as agentive. What is telling, however, is the fact that the only way for her to demonstrate agency at this point is through recourse to this dominant ideology.

As well as throwing interesting light on the connections between ideological structure and agency, the above example also returns us to the question of what ‘counts’ as agency and to the question I posed in Chapter 2 - Should agency be conceptualised as ‘pushing back’ against hegemonic structures or perhaps as ‘choosing’ to adhere? Athena’s example shows that any conceptualisation cannot be made without attention to the contextual dynamism of acts of agency and to ideological structures which play a lead role in the creation of this context. Despite Athena’s narrative self-positioning as agentic at the end of her story, a blanket interpretation of ‘pushing back’ against hegemonic structures (during the actual event and in the retelling) is not warranted. In order to extricate herself from a frightening situation, she strategically accesses Discourses of men’s ownership (and whether this is conscious or unconscious is a moot point), ensuring their redistribution into social space. The positive result of ensuring her own safety therefore occurs simultaneously with a more negative perpetuation of dominating gender ideologies. Ultimately, while nothing is done to destabilise the pillars of male sexual entitlement, the importance of nuance (cf. Ahearn, 2001; Macleod, 1992) in interpretations of agency is raised.

Taking a wider lens to this example allows access to what I have termed seeds of agency. Athena and Persephone’s conversations (both with each other and with me) show the beginnings of the problematisation of gender-related Discourses and ideologies, moving into the realm of ontological excavation (similar to Persephone with regards to language ideologies). Seeds of agency can therefore be seen to be planted in their new societal contexts as part of the habitus destabilisation that arises from encountering different norms. In Persephone’s and Athena’s conscious discursive engagement with structures of gender and sexuality, their conversations may be seen to nurture these seeds and create optimal conditions for future agentic acts. Seeing categories as constructed is helpful in that it allows for their potential excavation, and eventual dismantling. This leads to Hugo, whose data in Chapter 5 allows extraordinary insights into this process.

As I have argued, Hugo’s experiences of encountering more welcoming LGBTQ Discourses in his Wellington context planted seeds of agency which were then given opportunity to flourish upon his return to Paris. Like Persephone, Hugo had experience of marginalisation, in his case related to his sexual identity. For Hugo, identifying as gay in France, even within the more LGBTQ-friendly areas of Paris, resulted in an understanding of heteronormative ideologies and the inequality perpetuated through hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1987, 2005) in particular. It is

therefore unsurprising that Hugo adopted a fatalistic narrative stance in our interviews when he spoke of returning to Paris and what he would miss about Wellington (see Excerpt 5.8). He saw structures as all pervasive, and ingrained heteronorms as constraining his movement as a gay man in Paris (constructing a dichotomy between the freedoms he saw Wellington offering in this respect). Yet his conceptualisation and enactment of his own agency is in flux, as his developing commitment to his desired imagined community of drag queens shows. As I argued in Chapter 5, the safe house environment (Canagarajah, 2004) provided by his Wellington household is no small part of this, providing the nourishment for counter Discourses to oppression and allowing agency to germinate.

These seeds of agency appear to then be transported to his Parisian context and given full expression in his Bachelor's graduation ceremony (at his prestigious Paris institution) where Hugo attends as Daisy, his drag persona. Strikingly agentive (both in the discursive construction on Facebook and in the event itself), this is a clear example of 'pushing back' in the most visible sense. While ideologies of gender and of heteronormativity have not disappeared, Hugo's understandings of his place within these and ways in which he can strategically question their stronghold have been examined from new and promising vantage points. This notion of strategy is paramount and calls forth the Bourdieusian view of agency discussed in Chapter 2, which posits that social actors act 'strategically', guided by their habitus, within fields where they have developed a 'feel for the game' (Bourdieu, 1977a, 1984, 1991). This strategic sense of agency fits my data well in that it emphasises the social embeddedness of individuals and, I would argue, allows for 'levels' within agency which can account for the various ways in which participants are constrained or enabled by structures. As I have repeatedly argued, all acts of agency are tied to structures in some way and, as Bourdieu (1977a, 1991) emphasised, can therefore never be equated with 'free will'. Levels of awareness, however, into ideological confines and associated perceived possibilities for pushing back differed for my participants.

Revisiting the data has shone light on the interrelatedness of ideological structures and agency, leading me to the conclusion that conceptualisations of agency are just as important as those of structure. Through an analytical commitment to highlighting and explaining the role of (ideological) structure in identity work, it has become clear that one definition of agency is not adequate in accounting for the differences in participants' data. Although Block (2013b) rightly notes that definitions of agency are more readily available than those of structure, he also emphasises the potential theoretical gains of engaging more deeply with the concept. Many identity

studies in applied linguistics which foreground agency appear to smooth over the complexities and nuances in adopting a singular ‘agency as resistance’ position and not acknowledging the ontological properties of agency in the first instance, or ways in which it is tightly interwoven with structure. By engaging with such challenges in my analyses and in this discussion chapter, I have come to align with Ahearn (2001), who argues for more attention to nuance and multiplicity in accounting for human action (and accompanying attempts to define agency).

For this reason, I reject the acceptance of one definition to end all definitions and use my data as a platform to offer the following conceptualisations as theoretically generative. Part of the value of a discursive approach to identity is in the access it allows to the germination of agency, as Hugo’s data in Chapter 5 serves to instantiate most clearly. We also see seeds of agency planted in the conversations between participants (and sometimes with me) as they begin to engage with structures (of gender or language, for example). In this sense, understandings of agency need not only be tethered to grand gestures, given there is considerable value in attending to interactional instances of germination.

By conceptualising agency as highly contextualised, dynamic, and as co-constructed in interaction, it is never a sole project (cf. Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992). In its inception, ongoing constitution, and enactment, it is always linked to particular times, Discourses and ideologies, as well to the people we communicate with. Given the power inequalities that my data has revealed with regards to ideological buttressing of nationality, ethnicity, and language, as well as gender and sexuality, I see value in the form of agency known as oppositional (Ahearn, 2001, p. 115). I reiterate my argument that this form of agency (also known as resistance or transformative in the Applied Linguistics literature) is not equally available to all, however, and take seriously Abu-Lughod’s (1990) caution against the “romance of the resistance” in which complexity and ambiguity are pushed aside in favour of more palatable interpretations. While Hugo’s striking displays of agency are celebratory in so far as they ‘push back’ against oppressive hegemonic structures, I have shown how both his sense of and enactment of agency were inextricably linked to the social spaces and ideologies he navigated before, during, and after his exchange. This adds weight to Ortner’s (1995) cogent point that there is no such thing as pure resistance.

In between (and within) the germination stage and oppositional forms of agency are many other forms which emphasise the need for nuance in defining and interpreting agency. Hanna, in her seeming complicity with Discourses of ‘proper’ French is no less agentic than other participants

in that she is still acting upon the world. That her discursive alignments are sedimented in her habitus and are accomplished perhaps below the level of conscious awareness emphasises the important point that agency is not always intentional (see Bucholtz & Hall, 2005, p. 606). As my examples have shown, agency for my participants is co-constructed and multifaceted, involving resistance, perpetuation, complicity, and strategic harnessing of Discourses - both conscious and unconscious. My data has shown that these characteristics are dynamic and can overlap, echoing MacLeod's (1992, p. 534) "complex and ambiguous agency" and Ahearn's (2001) emphasis on going beyond rigid conceptualisations.

6.4 Concluding Remarks

I therefore argue for a renewed focus on ideological structure as something which coexists with agency in identity construction. I have shown that my participants in Wellington and in Paris negotiate identities of nationality, ethnicity, gender and sexuality within dominant ideological frames, whether or not these were noticed, acknowledged, or reflected upon in interaction. Many people commonly think of institutional structures as the ones wielding power and performing the most prominent societal gatekeeping function. This is easy to do, given their visibility. Before 2013 in New Zealand, for example, it was illegal for people of the same sex to marry. This was rightly seen by many as a barrier to equality. Today, same sex marriage is legal but this institutional change has not miraculously transformed people's beliefs and attitudes (though there is evidence of a gradual change). What keeps people in check, rather, are firmly entrenched belief systems that legitimate this dominance (Bourdieu, 1977a, 1991).

Discourses give voice to ideologies (Menard-Warwick, 2014) that do the insidious policing of how men and women 'should' behave and the 'natural' state of heterosexuality, for example, or how French 'should' be taught or spoken. As I have shown, interactional and ethnographic data are excellent portals for this exploration of ideology. Understanding how students negotiate, harness, or contest these power imbalances in their identity negotiations during study abroad allows for a richer picture to emerge and scaffolds corresponding conceptualisations and analyses of agency. Whether it involves reflecting on societal expectations of what it means to be a woman, or accepting that this is just the way things are in terms of sexist behaviour, emphasising the importance of a grammatical rule and placing value on overt correction, or refusing to be bound by notions of acceptable pronunciation, all my participants were constrained (or enabled) to various degrees.

Furthering theoretical understandings of the relationship between structure and agency (cf. Block, 2013b), is not the only benefit a focus on ideologies brings. It also adds depth to conceptualisations of study abroad participants and the overall experience. Study abroad participants are clearly not a homogenous group as I have shown through the diverse experiences of Persephone, Athena, Viv, Victoria, Hanna, and Hugo. Language learning may be a common goal (amongst others), but their experiences in France and New Zealand position them firmly as “whole people” (Coleman, 2013b; Kinginger, 2008) in that they continue to experience real-world issues in their exchange contexts. There is sexism, there is harassment, and there is benevolent racism and unwanted positioning, yet there are also many moments of joy including Athena’s liberating experience of blackness in the Parisian context (see Chapter 4), and Hugo’s path to becoming ‘woke’ in Wellington (Chapter 5). In negotiating these experiences and identities, dialogic connections to ideologies were an inextricable part of this process. The extent to which my participants’ habitus was destabilised (e.g. Block, 2007a; Kinginger, 2008, 2013), and the ensuing levels of reflection were all different despite the commonalities in ideological threads, and I have argued that these differences are a result of (ongoing) intersectional experiences, habitus constitution, and experience with marginalisation (cf. Holmes, 2018; Shin, 2014). Considerations of agency must be made with clear attention to this structural scaffolding. To this end, I advance that understandings of identity during study abroad may not be most fruitfully served by having the ‘host culture’ and notions of assimilation as the assumed benchmark (as Victoria’s and Persephone’s cases demonstrate poignantly). Recognising the diversity of study abroad students (as well as the heterogeneity of the host cultures themselves) is extremely important as we move forward in our own ontological examinations of identity within the overall ‘study abroad experience’.

A focus on ideologies also carries exciting potential for real world practical consequences. Nobody would argue that dismantling deeply rooted ideologies is fast or easy. Yet, some of my participants’ identity experiences and the way they talked about these can be seen to contribute to a growing collective, forming part of a larger whole and providing conditions for new counter Discourses to gain societal traction. Developing an awareness of ideologies as arbitrary, as constructed, and as receptacles of power can result in moments of perception and clarity, providing new tools for the habitus toolkit. It is this realisation and this clarity that may well clear the way for real social excavation, leading to social justice. In this sense, whether or not these moments of clarity occur during or after their exchanges, study abroad students are well placed to spark, and lead, societal change.

6.5 Bringing Everything Together: The Inextricability of Concepts

The discussion in this chapter has placed particular emphasis on revealing connections between theoretical concepts, connections which are rarely acknowledged explicitly in the literature. I have aimed to show that while we can isolate concepts for explanatory purposes, it is more fruitful to examine their inextricability. Bringing these concepts together may blur the theoretical picture somewhat; yet by not entering into these 'messy' considerations there will be no advancing towards a semblance of theoretical clarity. I therefore end this chapter by exploring the theoretical potential I see in these connections. Using the analogy of a tree, and in particular a form of tree which loops around (see Figure 1), I aim to illuminate some of this abstraction and illustrate how these concepts work with one another. It is not a perfect analogy by any means, but it provides a starting place for further exploration.

Figure 3 Tree Analogy: Identity, Structure, and Agency

If ideologies are the roots of the belief system (underground and therefore not visible yet providing strong support), then society can be represented by the trunk. Importantly, while ideologies are

numerous, some have gained a firmer foothold than others (e.g. the gender order) and thus have more penetration and sway in society. Roots therefore come in different sizes; the root representing heteronormativity, for example, would be old and sizable, indexical to its societal dominance, whereas that representing an empowering LGBTQ ideology would feasibly still be growing and embedding itself in the soil. Regular exposure to ideologies results in ongoing habitus constitution (collective and individual), the internalised mediator between ideological structure and ways in which this is given outward expression by social agents, which is represented by the water running through the trunk in the picture. While a key component of identity construction, it is also not visible. This, in turn, feeds into Discourses, which are the branches that grow. They are visible and numerous and above all connected and sustained by ideologies through the vehicle of society (recall Menard-Warwick's conceptualisation of Discourses giving voice to ideologies). These branches then inform the leaves, or the more micro ways in which individuals negotiate identities (through moment-by-moment positioning and stance) in interactions, characteristic of the discursive unfolding of identity negotiations. New leaves grow, branches change directions, and trunks grow taller and bend, metaphorically pointing to the dynamic processes involved as social agents constantly (re)negotiate attachments to particular Discourses and the ideologies that underpin them.

The particular arrangements of leaves at any one point in time represents the dynamic co-construction and indexical processes involved as we position ourselves and are positioned by others in relation to these Discourses and ideologies, thus negotiating identities within the social-constructed categories available. The patterning of veins on the leaves may be likened to agency in that while they apparently have a unique system of their own, they are still firmly implanted on the leaf itself, representative of the 'imprint' one makes upon the other and the inextricability of structure and agency in considerations of identity. Importantly these negotiations can lead to new buds growing on the branches and these 'buds of dissent' can perhaps be represented as the oppositional form of agency Ahearn (2001) speaks of, given that they still grow from the tree but take on a new shape. Agency could also be represented by the seeds which fall to the ground and germinate, with the transformative potential to grow new trees.

The most important aspect of the diagram is the idea of connectedness and interrelatedness between all components, which has conceptual repercussions for the study of identity. As Figure 1 shows, particular configurations are always in motion, affecting one another. Despite the longevity of ideologies and associated Discourses, they are never immune to change or even

eventual extinction. Ideologies, Discourses and discourse are in a constant state of (re)negotiation (though just as social change is an extremely lengthy process, so too is the time it takes for new trees to grow). By visualising everything as connected, and as sturdy yet dynamic, we can extend our theoretical reach and destabilise dichotomies of the social and individual, as well as of structure and agency. The analogy therefore provides a useful starting point from which to conceptualise the complexities involved in the negotiation of social identities.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

This chapter marks the culmination of the thesis journey. Study abroad contexts form part of the wider trend of increasing global mobility, and the internationalisation of education and emphasis on global citizenship more specifically. As I have shown over the course of the last six chapters, the changing face of SA brings an added dynamism, and invites a flexibility in approach. Widening the ‘language learning’ frame and moving beyond the traditional focus on SA participants as language learners embraces this ‘reality’ and contributes further social insights and depth to the rich body of qualitative identity-focused SA literature. Participants are ‘whole people’ (Coleman, 2013b), and they continue to experience real world issues on exchange, in contexts where the revered immersion experience has been replaced by connectedness through technological advances.

Further, attention to identities as emergent and as discursively co-constructed invites us into the very fabric of social life, into what has been constructed as ‘reality’ and how established large-scale identity categories are held together by robust (though not unbreakable) ideological thread. I have shown how negotiating identities therefore involves negotiating ideologies, and the different shapes these negotiations take. Exploring these ideological parameters through interaction (and the micro linguistic features this comprises) enriches understandings of identity processes, and provides valuable entry into the wider structure and agency relationship. In sum, identity negotiations in study abroad contexts are a key site for practice and theory to come together, offering crucial insights into the relationship between language, identity, and society as experienced by today’s increasingly mobile generation.

In this chapter, I return to my research questions, which stemmed from the first of many conversations I had throughout this thesis, this time around the philosophical and theoretical underpinnings of social life. I then outline the theoretical, methodological, and analytical contributions I make, before detailing possible avenues for future research and practical applications. I finish the chapter with some final reflexive considerations, bringing the thesis full circle.

My first research question asked *what* identities became salient for exchange students in Wellington and Paris, and *how* this salience occurred. I have shown in Chapters 4 and 5 that

particularly salient social identities for my participants related to the interwoven constructs of nationality, ethnicity, gender, and sexuality, and I have demonstrated that the salience of these identities came to light in different ways. As well as through participants' conscious discursive exploration of categories, it also emerged through seemingly unconscious instantiation. Persephone, Athena, Hugo, and Victoria, for example, all reflected on and indexed social identities directly (as well as indirectly) during their identity negotiations. On the other hand, Hanna's instantiations of a French teacher identity provide an interesting counterpoint in that her French identity becomes interactionally prominent without being consciously explored or directly indexed. Accessing salience therefore relied on the useful combination of emic and etic approaches (Cameron, 2009; Holmes, 2007). This involved careful attention to the interpretations of meaning from a participant's perspective, and a simultaneous 'outsider' eye on the wider social forces at play (as I have shown through attention to Discourses and ideologies). A commitment to exploring indexical layers was an important part of this etic/emic combination, opening up useful analytical space.

I have argued that Julia Menard-Warwick's metaphor of 'discursive faultlines' (2014) is particularly apt in this respect, as well as being semantically pertinent in the idea of movement it connotes. For some of my participants, meeting 'new' (ideologically-laden) Discourses in the exchange setting resulted in a 'destabilisation' of habitus⁴⁰, which prompted reflections (and contributed to a 'movement' in their own process of 'ideological becoming'). These tremors were particularly evident in Persephone's negotiations and reflections around her national identity as a New Zealander (Chapter 4) and her gender identity as a woman (Chapter 5), both of which involved discursive attempts to reconcile 'who she was' as a woman from New Zealand in her Parisian contexts (and thus revealing the importance of an intersectional lens). Interactional positioning sometimes led to the activation of faultlines, as evidenced in Victoria's and Persephone's negotiations around their ethnicity and Discourses of 'Frenchness' in Chapter 4. Hugo's gender and sexuality trajectory also provides strong evidence of him negotiating discursive faultlines. In his Wellington contexts Hugo met liberating LGBTQ Discourses, which sparked a conscious exploration of his gender and sexuality identities (and their initial constitution in the French context) and possibilities for movement and transcendence within these.

My second research question asked *how* exchange students negotiated identities in study abroad contexts. Participants negotiated identities with friends, language buddies, acquaintances, and with

⁴⁰ In Chapter 6 I argue that these effects on habitus are not a *fait accompli*, and depend on many factors.

me. They drew on the various linguistic and sociocultural resources, and ‘knowledge’ (in the form of capital) at their disposal, to stake claims to particular identities and to position themselves (and their interlocutors) as certain types of people in a particular time and place, all within the identity categories available to them. At times, these claims were ratified, and at others, they were contested. Struggle was a common theme, as was the strength of dominant ideologies (of nationality, language, gender, and sexuality), which were pervasive in participants’ identity work. Posts on Facebook harnessed the power of reflexive positioning and performativity, while interactional data illuminated the dynamic, contingent, and sometimes contradictory processes of identity co-construction. This analytical focus on the *hows* of identity co-construction proved a fruitful springboard from which to investigate the place of ideologies in exchange students’ identity negotiations, a focus which I believe has the exciting potential to be theoretically generative, as discussed further below.

7.1 Theoretical Contributions

An overarching aim of the thesis has been to reconcile the binary between theory and practice, and between the social and the individual. Simply put, I hope that attention to theory has added interpretive depth to the lived experiences of my participants, and that these experiences have added nuance to theory. In this approach, I have undoubtedly been inspired by Pierre Bourdieu (e.g. 1977a, 1991) and his insistence on the inseparability of the theoretical and the empirical. These considerations formed part of the early philosophical attention given to my ontological and epistemological standpoints, and well as to the ‘epistemological vigilance’ I practise throughout. This, in turn, led to the study’s social constructionist framing within an overall social realist stance and a firm anchoring of social actors in their social contexts. I see this emphasis on social realism as adding beneficial parameters to constructionist arguments, in particular as they relate to considerations of structure and agency.

Chapter 6 is the locus of this theoretical contribution. I explore connections between macro concepts with a view towards rendering complexity analytically accessible, and have presented the analogy of a tree to depict these connections visually and hopefully to spur further theoretical considerations. Specifically, I show how structure can never be disentangled from agency and that going beyond the surface level allows access to the ‘hidden gems’ of identity construction, and an accompanying unveiling of the workings of power in everyday contexts. My data provides access to this relationship, demonstrating how even ostensibly agentive acts are constrained by ideological structures, which act as vehicles of power. I conceptualise agency as being co-constructed,

dynamic, and multifaceted, and as involving resistance, perpetuation, complicity, and strategic harnessing of Discourses - both conscious and unconscious. Within these broad parameters, my data provides evidence of transformative potential in forms of 'oppositional' agency, and at the same time, fledgling potential in what I term agency in a germination phase. I argue that seeds of agency are planted for some participants in their new settings and that reflecting on the arbitrary nature of ideologies and accepted truths was a more common outcome for participants who had prior experience of systemic marginalisation (e.g. racism and homophobia). This has particular repercussion for social justice aims, which I elaborate on below in section 7.4.

7.2 Methodological Contributions

The study also contributes methodologically. In order to fully embrace the dynamism and complexity of identity as a construct, it was necessary to question traditional methodological approaches to investigations of language learner identity. This questioning resulted in innovative choices which meet current calls for increased methodological rigour, diversity, and innovation in the field of study abroad (De Costa, Rawal, & Zaykovskaya, 2017). Specifically, my study adds methodological value through the bidirectional research design, a diverse participant pool, layered data sets, handing over 'creative control' to participants, inclusion of social media, and going beyond the participant perspective in analysis, discussed further below.

My overall methodological stance, characterised as a participant-focused, ethnographic approach with a critical lens, was instrumental in providing a solid platform from which to make considered decisions regarding data collection processes and accompanying analyses. The novel bidirectional element of the study has particular promise in this respect, in that it allows for a unique capturing of two sides of the story: those leaving New Zealand for France and those coming to New Zealand from France and New Caledonia, in this study's case. As a researcher, being in both research sites was a crucial part of developing a strong ethnographic perspective. Importantly, the diverse data sets and focus on intersubjectivity allowed for depth as well as important warrants for interpretations, moving beyond the traditional SA reliance on participant perspectives (see Kinginger, 2013 for a critique).

Within the overarching benefit of the importance placed on researcher/participant relationships, there are clear methodological benefits in the decision to place elements of the data collection in the hands of participants (see Holmes & Stubbe, 2003, 2015). This resulted pleasingly in many participants taking on a 'co-researcher' role and ensuring they had full control over what was

recorded. The fact that participants gave me the recordings they were happy to give me and spoke to me about topics that were mutually developed is much more important, as I see it, than attempting to 'hide' behind a mask of objectivity. There is no doubt my presence affected the data collected in some ways, yet my research experience has led me to firmly advocate for the notion that interaction (between researcher and participants) enhances research (Cameron et al., 1993). And, importantly, all interaction is affected by who is there, which renders impossible the idea of capturing a completely 'neutral' or 'authentic' recording. The particular identities and ideologies that gained salience for participants during their exchanges would no doubt have done so without my presence (such is the power of the categories that assumed importance). I account for my presence in the research as an embodied social being through an initial and ongoing reflexivity, acknowledging my own dynamic identities, and by positioning myself as a co-constructor of the data (either through my immediate or imagined presence). My commitment to reflexivity required a careful, ongoing navigation of my roles, and I see this as part of the 'epistemological vigilance' which is crucial in moving towards methodological rigour in social research (e.g. Cameron et al., 1993; Norton & Early, 2011; Sarangi & Candlin, 2003).

The layered data sets are a further benefit, in that they appropriately operationalise my theoretical commitment to multivocality, and provide important warrants for interpretations. The addition of Facebook data, too, whilst not the centrepiece of the study, adds a valuable (albeit limited) lens into how identities are discursively constructed online during study abroad. I see social media posts as crucial sites for identity work and positioning, rather than as an impediment to L2 learning, and inclusion of this element begins to address the increasing call in SA to further investigate the role of social media in participants' study abroad experiences (e.g. Coleman & Chafer, 2010; Dressler & Dressler, 2016; Kinginger, 2010, 2013).

An unanticipated contribution from my thesis is the representation of diversity in my participant pool, again meeting an important call in SA to address issues in the lack of diversity of representation (cf. Anya, 2016). As outlined in Chapter 3, participant recruitment relied solely on the goodwill and interest of participants, and the only criteria specified were that participants be either coming to Wellington on exchange (for French or Francophone students), or going to France or a French speaking country (for New Zealand students). That my participants (both the core group and the wider group I worked with) represented such diversity was entirely fortuitous, allowing my explorations to move beyond the overrepresentation of not only American students, but also of the white, straight majority.

7.3 Analytical Contributions to Study Abroad

Analytically, the thesis has much to offer. The overall, interdisciplinary approach has made room for interpretive depth, and on a more specific level a discursive approach to capturing identities offers enriched understandings of how participants actually *do* identities at ground level. Interactional Sociolinguistics suited the complexity of my data well, allowing for attention to micro linguistic elements combined with wider sociocultural factors. Additionally, the analysis gives insights into both the early ‘transition’ period to new contexts, as well as to the final stages (and the return home in one case). The longitudinal ethnographic element provides particular value.

A major part of the analytical contribution recognises the role of societal ideologies as an integral component of identity negotiations around nationality, ethnicity, gender and sexuality. Identities are not constructed in a vacuum. I argue that while dominant ideologies related to these categories are increasingly porous, the Discourses and norms which give them voice can sometimes change shape in the new study abroad context. This is particularly apparent in Chapter 5 where the gender order and heteronormativity were given voice through Discourses of sexual harassment and LGBTQ empowerment and disempowerment, and these Discourses were themselves embodied by different norms in both settings (e.g. overt sexualised attention in Paris or, as Hugo notes, the ‘freedom’ for gay couples to hold hands in the street in Wellington). Discourses of Frenchness and Parisian-ness too were clearly ideological in their connections to nationhood, belonging (i.e. the ethnicised ‘othering’ that occurred for Victoria and Persephone), and the notion of ‘standard’ languages.

This ideology focus is relatively unexplored in identity-focused studies in SA, and sheds valuable light on the role of structural constraints within which exchange students operate. Through engaging with such macro concepts, we gain an important appreciation of categories as socially and historically constructed and as vehicles of power. Just as ‘nationality’ and ‘language’ are not benign categories with even amounts of power distributed across (and within) the various possibilities in their plural forms (e.g. Heller, 2011; Milroy, 2001), neither are categories of gender and sexuality (e.g. Cameron, 2009; Cameron & Kulick, 2003). The chasm is often wide and inequalities keenly felt, especially by those who fall outside the normative ‘powerful’ majority. We have seen clear examples of this imbalance in the different meanings associated with ‘Frenchness’ by Victoria, Hanna, and Persephone in Chapter 4, and in the fact that only my female participants reported unwanted sexualisation and harassment in their exchange destinations (Chapter 5). This

ideology focus provided a valuable lens through which to interpret the ongoing perpetuation, questioning, and contestation of identity categories by participants, who had differential access to societally-sanctioned resources. The concept of intersectionality troubles these categories and associated 'group' identities further, and this is highlighted throughout the analysis. Despite the appearance (and experience) of fixity, I argue that ideological foundations are always sites of potential (re)construction. The emphasis in my thesis is on the diversity of experience even when the stronghold of hegemonic ideologies provides a discomforting commonality.

This attention to the social embeddedness of participants also relates to my analytical rejection of a 'deficiency' perspective. In other words, I reframe elements of the study abroad experience which have previously been viewed from a negative lens, as in the portrayal of Facebook as "an electronic umbilical cord" (Kinging, 2010, 2011). These interpretations are tied closely to an SLA perspective which has traditionally assumed immersion in the 'host culture' (note the homogenisation) and language learning as the main goals of exchange students. While, for many, these are indeed important objectives for their time abroad, the assumptions do not sit well in today's SA climate, which is characterised by fluidity, multilingualism, mobility and above all an ongoing connectedness (e.g. Coleman & Chafer, 2010; Duff, 2015). Remaining connected to multiple communities whilst on study abroad is the norm and is certainly no longer the sign of someone 'rejecting' opportunities for linguistic or intercultural advancement. As Persephone's astute reflections show in Chapter 4, decisions around social media are multifaceted and tightly connected to sociocultural Discourses and identities.

Findings also show that the 'negotiation of difference' in study abroad contexts cannot always be conceptualised as a negotiation between 'home' and 'host' cultures. For Victoria, reflection on 'difference' was certainly spurred in the Wellington setting, but her negotiations cannot simply be reduced to a New Caledonia versus New Zealand distinction. Rather, she negotiated claims to a regional Pacific identity and made attempts to distance herself from both her ethnic Vietnamese identity and notions of Frenchness tied to her accent. For Persephone too, her 'refusal' to move towards elements of the 'French culture' is indicative of her own socially and historically constructed relationship to her New Zealand Indian identity, and engagement with power and Discourses of colonialism. Casting a critical eye on such occurrences is therefore imperative to access a richer identity picture. Traditional notions of 'immersion' in 'the language' and 'the culture' are therefore no longer adequate to capture the complexity and dynamism of the experiences of today's mobile generation of global citizens.

As part of this reframing, I have argued in my analysis that recourse to stereotypes and dichotomies is a common but not necessarily negative occurrence. Or, at least, it cannot be applied as a blanket evaluation in all instances. While it reflects in part the ‘recoiling’ into discourses of national superiority that has been a common finding in the SA literature (Block, 2007; Kinginger, 2013; Murphy-Lejeune, 2002), I have shown how it appears to function as an important part of processing experiences and can therefore perhaps be seen as the impetus for or the first stage in the ‘negotiation of difference’. I have illustrated that for some participants, accessing dichotomies brings about an engagement with their social construction, and have argued that this may well lead to an ‘ontological excavation’, which can contribute to social change. The thesis thus opens up myriad avenues for future research: in the prioritising of theoretical depth through attention to conceptual connections, and social realism as a portal to the structure and agency relationship; the innovative approach to methodology; the discursive approach to accessing the dynamic processes of identity negotiations; and in the analytic focus on nationality, ethnicity, and gender and sexuality, categories which have invited much needed critical attention to the role of ideologies in negotiations.

7.4 Future Research and Implications

As detailed in Chapter 3, this thesis has taken a particular shape due to the exploratory nature of data collection. Investigating identity from a dynamic, emergent perspective necessarily entailed prioritisation of certain data over others, in order to achieve the depth of analysis I was committed to. While I have had a necessarily limited focus as a consequence, the analytical angles that I identify offer opportunities that I hope others will be able to take up and explore.

In particular, I see the social justice angle as an especially worthy avenue for future research. As I hope I have shown in my study, young people who participate in Study Abroad are well placed to lead societal change, and Discourses play a crucial role in the actual effecting of this change (as we have perhaps seen the most clearly in Hugo’s case study). My study has illuminated the oppressive role of dominant ideologies in participants’ identity negotiations yet has shown the potential for change in the attention given to the germination of agency. This opens up space to access in more depth counter Discourses to entrenched societal constraints as experienced by a diverse participant pool, and to investigate the ways in which, discursively, participants navigate the complexities of dismantling years and years of accepted truths. Related to this, there are clear pathways for further investigations of the role of marginality and how this shapes and is shaped by the SA context. In

this sense, insights might be gained into the actual trajectory of agency from its germination phase. In capturing societal change in action, there is a concomitant emphasis on hope, something which needs to be foregrounded now more than ever as ideologies of isolationism and racism threaten to undermine those of open borders, open dialogue, and global empathy. The bidirectional element of the research design also lends itself to further exploration, particularly in under-investigated SA contexts. Moving beyond the Global North and the focus on English speaking countries and English speaking participants would add important insights into SA as it is experienced by a wider variety of people.

As well as the potential for looking at new contexts, there is also potential for programme design. New Zealand universities have not typically taken up the model offered by Ogden (2006), common in North America, which integrates an ethnographic component into Study Abroad coursework. The inclusion of an (auto) ethnographic research project, as well as a possible service element whilst on exchange, offers value to New Zealand SA programmes, and to the student experience. This potentially credit-bearing ethnographic project could take as its focus a single interaction or ‘critical experience’ whilst on SA, and thus encourage depth of analysis rather than a broader comparison of the ‘two cultures’, which, as we have seen is problematic. Combined with a service element (volunteering in a homeless shelter, for instance), this ethnographic component has the potential to contribute to an appreciation of host cities as socially, culturally, and linguistically diverse, and to build a global perspective. Ultimately, the design of such programme components should be done with the aim of developing global citizens who conduct their lives across borders with empathy and criticality. These ideas also connect well with the discussion above on future research avenues, in that the ethnographic research project would lend itself to analysis. Possibilities are numerous, and I see my local data as offering a useful pathway for New Zealand universities to move into this area of programme design.

7.5 Concluding Comments

This thesis is made up of many conversations. Not only is it a conversation with the reader, it is also a conversation between participants, between myself and participants, and a conversation with many inspirational scholars from diverse disciplines who have paved the way in terms of thinking. These disciplines include applied linguistics, study abroad, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, sociocultural theory, gender and sexuality, feminist theory, and queer theory, and together they form a constellation of valuable voices which have added texture to this study. Histories collide

with the present and impact the future in the overarching conversation between languages, identities, and societal ideologies. Importantly, the thesis is also a conversation about what has been constructed as a dichotomy, revealing this as arbitrary and as never disconnected from questions of power. In conversing with theory the empirical is emphasised; in exploring agency, there are connections to structure; and the individual is always deeply embedded in a social storyline. Each of these concepts is interwoven and dynamically impacts one another, weaving a rich and intricate tapestry from which to investigate just how it is that we use language in particular times and places and with particular people to co-construct identities and stake a meaningful place in our social worlds. The tapestry is always changing, dynamic yet imperceptible, but the particular patterning and connections at any point in time offer valuable access to this complexity. In order to continue to drive the SA field forward in exciting future directions, the conversation between the practical and the theoretical needs to remain at the forefront of our research decisions. Crucially, this dialogue allows participants to remain the centrepiece of my study, and I return to them now as the thesis comes full circle.

I am not sure I will find the right words to express the depth of gratitude I have for my participants at this point. Without their generosity of spirit, this thesis would not have taken the particular shape it has, and their willingness to let me into their lives with such openness and candour is deeply appreciated. As mentioned in Chapter 3, an unanticipated benefit of the participant recruitment process was the strength of friendships developed (not only between country groups but across them as well), and I include myself in this equation. As explained in Chapters 1 and 3, focusing on the interactions of core participants aligned well with my aims of accessing analytical depth within thematic commonality. At the same time, the experiences of all participants allowed for valuable comparisons and support for understanding, and I remain extremely grateful to everyone for their contributions.

Remaining in close contact with my participants means I am privy to their ongoing identity trajectories. In other words, in our continued communication (face-to-face and online), my researcher's brain is often switched on, sparked by a phrase or a comment which provides 'evidence' of their continued ideological becoming. I have seen participants grow and mature; many of them are now in the workforce carving career paths; others have moved on to postgraduate study, flourishing in different ways. I have seen their opinions fluctuate and change, and social media representations take different forms, all of which, of course, is evidence of identities as an ongoing social project and more widely of my participants' trajectories into

adulthood. My point is that all people change. This is why the discursive approach to identity with a focus on ideology is so valuable; it does not seek to position participants as a particular type of person, or lock them into rigid characterisations. Rather, we gain intriguing insights into how they navigate identities and ideologies with different people in particular places and at particular times. This dynamic perspective is better suited to capturing the social complexity and contradictions that surround us.

I return now to some final reflexive considerations. The thesis has been a journey in many ways – geographically, emotionally, and intellectually. The study's initial conceptualisation was based on a bringing together of my academic, personal and professional interests involving the French language, exchanges, and a desire to investigate identity in more depth. My identities, too, were in flux during the research process and, like my participants, I met new Discourses and ideas (or saw them with 'new eyes' perhaps) which challenged my own ways of thinking. I was seduced from the outset by the French poststructuralists and spent many an evening with their ideas, at times befuddled but consistently impressed by the intellectual rigour and daring (in the case of Simone de Beauvoir in particular) which still has considerable interpretative purchase today. In moving to the area of gender, language, and sexuality, I was further enticed by the breadth and depth of the field, and as well as harnessing the explanatory potential for my data, it allowed me to understand some of my own experiences from a sharper lens. The fact that my study has overlapped with the current #MeToo movement speaks to the recognition of the need for societal change, as I advocated for in the discussion on future research directions.

I hope that the story I tell about identity co-construction in SA settings is one that inspires discussion on both practical and academic levels. I hope, too, that it speaks to many groups of people, including academics, educators, policy writers, and not least, students themselves who will continue to experience the joys, frustrations, bewilderment, and everything in between that SA in globalised settings affords. Participants may well return from abroad with an enhanced linguistic resource, and developed intercultural competence, but they will definitely return with experiences to talk about and to reflect on. Connecting these experiences to identities and ideologies, and to issues of power and social justice may not be immediate (and in fact these connections may never be made, or they may not be reflected on until much later), though as I have shown, the fact that there is potential for this, (even the mere beginnings of a socially-oriented reflection) renders SA a valuable site for continued focus and efforts. I end this thesis with an ambitious statement which carries a further message of hope. As global citizens, SA participants are well placed to advance

social change and to lead with empathy and criticality, qualities which have much power on their own, and together form a formidable strength in beginning to dismantle structures and create a more just society. This is a hope worth embracing.

References

- Abu-Lughod, L. (1990). The romance of resistance: Tracing transformations of power through Bedouin women. *American Ethnologist*, 17(1), 41–55.
- Adler, P., & Adler, P. (2001). Observational research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Routledge.
- Agar, M. (1996). *The professional stranger: An informal introduction to ethnography* (2nd ed.). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Ager, D. (1996). *Language policy in Britain and France: The processes of policy*. London ; New York: Cassell.
- Ager, D. (1999). *Identity, insecurity, and language: France and language*. Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters.
- Agha, A. (2003). The social life of cultural value. *Language & Communication*, 23(3–4), 231–273.
- Ahearn, L. M. (2001). Language and agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, 109–137.
- Amuzie, G. L., & Winke, P. (2009). Changes in language learning beliefs as a result of study abroad. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, 37(3), 366–379.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism (Rev. ed.)*. London: Verso.
- Angouri, J., & Marra, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Constructing identities at work*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Angouri, J., Marra, M., & Holmes, J. (2017). *Negotiating boundaries at work: Talking and transitions*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Anya, U. (2016). *Racialized identities in second language learning: Speaking Blackness in Brazil*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Apte, M. L. (1985). *Humor and laughter: An anthropological approach*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Bacon, S. M. (2002). Learning the rules: Language development and cultural adjustment during study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35(6), 637–646.
- Baker, P. (2008). *Sexed texts: Language, gender and sexuality*. London: Equinox.
- Bakewell, O. (2010). Some reflections on structure and agency in migration theory. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(10), 1689–1708.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). The problem of speech genres. In M. Holquist & C. Emerson (Eds.), V. W. McGee (Trans.), *Speech genres and other late essays* (pp. 60–102). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1992). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. (M. Holquist, Ed., M. Holquist & C. Emerson, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bamberg, M., De Fina, A., & Schifffrin, D. (2011). Discourse and identity construction. In S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V. L. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research* (pp. 177–199). New York, NY: Springer.
- Barkhuizen, G. (2011). Narrative Knowledging in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(3), 391–414.
- Barr, S., & Seals, C. A. (2018). He Reo for our future: Te Reo Māori and teacher identities, attitudes, and micro-policies in mainstream New Zealand schools. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 1–14.
- Barrett, R. (1997). The “homo-genius” speech community. In A. Livia & K. Hall (Eds.), *Queerly phrased: Language, gender, and sexuality* (pp. 181–202). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Barrett, R. (2017). *From Drag Queens to Leathermen: Language, gender, and gay male subcultures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bazeley, P., & Jackson, K. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis with NVivo* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE.
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity*. London ; Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Belczyk-Kohl, Y. (2016). Some remarks on transcript translation in discourse analysis. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 139–164.
- Benson, P., Barkhuizen, G., Bodycott, P., & Brown, J. (2012). Study abroad and the development of second language identities. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 3(1), 173–193.
- Benwell, B., & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Berlant, L., & Warner, M. (1998). Sex in public. *Critical Inquiry*, 24(2), 547–66.
- Biber, D., & Finnegan, E. (1989). Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. *Text - Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 9(1), 93–124.
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. London ; Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Blackledge, A. (2001). The wrong sort of capital? Bangladeshi women and their children's schooling in Birmingham, U.K. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5(3), 345–369.
- Blackledge, A., & Pavlenko, A. (2001). Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5(3), 243–257.
- Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

- Block, D. (2007a). *Second language identities*. London: Continuum.
- Block, D. (2007b). The rise of identity in SLA research, post Firth and Wagner (1997). *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(s1), 863–876.
- Block, D. (2013a). Issues in language and identity research in Applied Linguistics. *ELIA; Sevilla*, (13), 11–46.
- Block, D. (2013b). The structure and agency dilemma in identity and intercultural communication research. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 13(2), 126–147.
- Block, D. (2015). Researching language and identity. In *Research methods in applied linguistics: A practical resource* (pp. 527–540). London, New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). Bourdieu the Ethnographer. *The Translator*, 11(2), 219–236.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2017). Commentary: Mobility, contexts, and the chronotope. *Language in Society*, 46(01), 95–99.
- Blommaert, J., & Jie, D. (2010). *Ethnographic fieldwork: A beginner's guide*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Blommaert, J., & Verschueren, J. (1998). *Debating diversity: Analysing the discourse of tolerance*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977a). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977b). The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information*, 16(6), 645–668.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241–258). New York: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. (J. B. Thompson, Ed.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Bown, J., Dewey, D. P., & Kirk Belnap, R. (2015). Student interactions during study abroad in Jordan. In R. Mitchell, N. Tracy-Ventura, & K. McManus (Eds.), *Social interaction, identity and language learning during residence abroad* (Vol. 4, pp. 199–222). European Second Language Association.
- Boyne, R. (1990). *Foucault and Derrida: The other side of reason*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (5th ed.). Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bucholtz, M. (2000). The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(10), 1439–1465.
- Bucholtz, M. (2014). The feminist foundations of language, gender, and sexuality research. In M. Meyerhoff, J. Holmes, & S. Ehrlich (Eds.), *The handbook of language, gender, and sexuality* (2nd ed., pp. 23–47). Hoboken, United States: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2004). Theorizing identity in language and sexuality research. *Language in Society*, 33(4), 469–515.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4–5), 585–614.
- Burawoy, M. (1998). The extended case method. *Sociological Theory*, 16(1), 4–33.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: on the discursive limits of “sex.”* New York: Routledge.

- Cameron, D. (2009). Theoretical issues for the study of gender and spoken interaction. In P. Pichler & E. Eppler (Eds.), *Gender and spoken interaction* (pp. 1–17). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cameron, D. (2014). Gender and language ideologies. In S. Ehrlich, J. Holmes, & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *Handbook of language, gender, and sexuality* (2nd ed., pp. 281–352). Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cameron, D., Frazer, E., Harvey, P., Rampton, B., & Richardson, K. (1993). Ethics, advocacy and empowerment: Issues of method in researching language. *Language & Communication*, 13(2), 81–94.
- Cameron, D., & Kulick, D. (2003). *Language and sexuality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, D., & Kulick, D. (Eds.). (2006). *The language and sexuality reader*. Abingdon, [England]; N.Y.: Routledge.
- Canagarajah, S. (2004). Subversive identities, pedagogical safe houses, and critical learning. *Critical Pedagogies and Language Learning*, 116–137.
- Canagarajah, S. (2009). The plurilingual tradition and the English language in South Asia. *AILA Review*, 22(1), 5–22.
- Chapelle, C. A., & Duff, P. (2003). Some guidelines for conducting quantitative and qualitative research in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(1), 157–178.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Charmaz, K., & Mitchell, R. G. (1996). The myth of silent authorship: Self, substance, and style in ethnographic writing. *Symbolic Interaction*, 19(4), 285–302.
- Chen, S.-H. (2011). Power relations between the researcher and the researched: An analysis of native and nonnative ethnographic interviews. *Field Methods*, 23(2), 119–135.

- Clark, K. (1992). The linguistics of blame: Representation of women in 'The Sun's reporting of crimes of sexual violence. In *Language, text and context: Essays in stylistics* (pp. 208–224). London: Routledge.
- Clough, P. (1992). *End(s) of ethnography*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Coates, J. (1996). *Women talk: Conversation between women friends*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Coates, J. (2003). *Men talk: stories in the making of masculinities*. Oxford, UK ; Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Coates, J. (2013a). The discursive production of everyday heterosexualities. *Discourse & Society*, 24(5), 536–552.
- Coates, J. (2013b). *Women, men and everyday talk*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Coleman, J. A. (2013a). Dymplexity: new theories, new contexts and new labels for mobile students. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 8(1), 20–28.
- Coleman, J. A. (2013b). Researching whole people and whole lives. In C. Kinginger (Ed.), *Social and cultural dimensions of language learning in study abroad*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Coleman, J. A. (2015). Social circles during residence abroad: What students do, and who with. In R. Mitchell, N. Tracy-Ventura, & K. McManus (Eds.), *Social interaction, identity and language learning during residence abroad* (pp. 33–52). European Second Language Association.
- Coleman, J. A., & Chafer, T. (2010). Study Abroad and the internet: Physical and virtual context in an era of expanding telecommunications. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 19, 151–167.

- Collie, P., Kindon, S., Liu, J., & Podsiadlowski, A. (2010). Mindful identity negotiations: The acculturation of young Assyrian women in New Zealand. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 34(3), 208–220.
- Compiègne, I. (2017, February). *Being on the move: The role of social media in second language identity development in study abroad*. CLIC study abroad conference, Rice University, Houston.
- Connell, R. (1987). *Gender and power: Society, the person and sexual politics*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Connell, R. (2005). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). Crows Nest, N.S.W.: Allen & Unwin.
- Copland, F., & Creese, A. (2015). *Linguistic ethnography: Collecting, analysing and presenting data*. Los Angeles, London: Sage.
- Corbin, J., & Morse, J. M. (2003). The unstructured interactive interview: Issues of reciprocity and risks when dealing with sensitive topics. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 9(3), 335–354.
- Coupland, N. (2007). *Style: Language variation and identity*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Coupland, N. (2014). Language, society and authenticity: Themes and perspectives. In V. Lacoste, J. Leimgruber, & T. Breyer (Eds.), *Indexing authenticity: Sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 14–39). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Coupland, N. (Ed.). (2016). *Sociolinguistics: Theoretical debates*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 14, 538–554.

- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, 39(3), 124–130.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon; Buffalo, N.Y.: Multilingual Matters.
- Cutler, C. (2014). Accentedness, “passing” and crossing. In J. M. Levis & A. Moyer (Eds.), *Social dynamics in second language accent*. Boston: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2015). Identity and a model of investment in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 36–56.
- Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 20(1), 43–63.
- Davis, K. (2008). Intersectionality as buzzword: A sociology of science perspective on what makes a feminist theory successful. *Feminist Theory*, 9(1), 67–85.
- Dawson, S. (2014). *The complexities of identity co-construction: A case study of two language learners’ trajectories towards a desired future* (Master’s thesis). Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington.
- de Beauvoir, S. (2011). *The second sex*. (C. Borde & S. Malovany-Chevallier, Trans.). London: Vintage.
- De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (1999). The discursive construction of national identities. *Discourse & Society*, 10(2), 149–173.
- De Costa, P. I. (2010). Reconceptualizing language, language learning, and the adolescent immigrant language learner in the age of postmodern globalization. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 4(9), 769–781.
- De Costa, P. I., Rawal, H., & Zaykovskaya, I. (2017). Introduction: Methodological diversity and innovation in study abroad research. *System*, 71, 1–6.

- De Fina, A. (2007). Code-switching and the construction of ethnic identity in a community of practice. *Language in Society*, 36(3), 371–392.
- De Fina, A. (2011a). Discourse and identity. In *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (2nd ed., pp. 263–282). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- De Fina, A. (2011b). Researcher and informant roles in narrative interactions: Constructions of belonging and foreign-ness. *Language in Society*, 40(1), 27–38.
- De Fina, A., & Georgakopoulou, A. (2008). Analysing narratives as practices. *Qualitative Research*, 8(3), 379–387.
- De Fina, A., & Perrino, S. (2011). Introduction: Interviews vs. “natural” contexts: A false dilemma. *Language in Society*, 40(1), 1–11.
- Dekeyser, R. (2010). Monitoring processes in Spanish as a second language during a study abroad program. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(1), 80–92.
- Denzin, N. K. (2003). The call to performance. *Symbolic Interaction*, 26(1), 187–207.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2008). *The landscape of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Desjarlais, R. R. (1997). *Shelter blues: sanity and selfhood among the homeless*. Philadelphia, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Diao, W., Freed, B., & Smith, L. (2011). Confirmed beliefs or false assumptions? A study of home stay experiences in the French study abroad context. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 21, 109–142.
- Diao, W., & Trentman, E. (2016). Politicizing study abroad: Learning Arabic in Egypt and Mandarin in China. *L2 Journal*, 8(2), 31–50.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (Eds.). (2009). *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Bristol, UK ; Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

- Dressler, R., & Dressler, A. (2016). Linguistic identity positioning in Facebook posts during second language study abroad: One teen's language use, experience, and awareness. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics / Revue Canadienne de Linguistique Appliquée*, 19(2), 22–43.
- Du Bois, J. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction* (pp. 1–26). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Duff, P. (2012). Identity, agency, and SLA. In A. Mackey & S. M. Gass (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 410–426). London: Routledge.
- Duff, P. (2014). Case study research on language learning and use. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 34, 233–255.
- Duff, P. (2015). Transnationalism, multilingualism, and identity. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 57–80.
- Early, M., & Norton, B. (2014). Revisiting English as medium of instruction in rural African classrooms. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(7), 674–691.
- Eckert, P. (2008). Variation and the indexical field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12(4), 453–476.
- Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1992). Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 21(1), 461–488.
- Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2003). *Language and gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2013). *Language and gender* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, K. M., Rodenhizer, K. A., & Eckstein, R. P. (2017). School personnel's bystander action in situations of dating violence, sexual violence, and sexual harassment among high school teens: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*.

- Ehrlich, S. (2001). *Representing rape: Language and sexual consent*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Ehrlich, S. (2007). Legal discourse and the cultural intelligibility of gendered meanings. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(4), 452–477.
- Ehrlich, S. (2008a). Language and gender. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 304–328). Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ehrlich, S. (2008b). Sexual assault trials, discursive identities and institutional change. In R. Dolon & J. Todoli (Eds.), *Analysing identities in discourse*. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ehrlich, S., Meyerhoff, M., & Holmes, J. (Eds.). (2014). *The handbook of language, gender, and sexuality* (2nd ed.). Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ellwood, C. (2011). Undoing the knots: Identity transformations in a study abroad programme. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 43(9), 960–978.
- Estival, D., & Pennycook, A. (2011). L’Académie française and Anglophone language ideologies. *Language Policy*, 10(4), 325–341.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press.
- Ferreday, D. (2008). ‘Showing the girl’: The new burlesque. *Feminist Theory*, 9(1), 47–65.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285–300.
- Fishman, P. (1983). Interaction: The work women do. In B. Thorne, C. Kramarae, & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language, gender and society*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Foley, D. E. (2002). Critical ethnography: The reflexive turn. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 15(4), 469–490.
- Foucault, M. (1971). *Madness and civilizations: A history of insanity in the age of reason*. (R. Howard, Trans.). London: Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1976). *History of sexuality*. (R. Hurley, Trans.) (Vol. 1). New York: Penguin Books.
- Fought, C. (2006). *Language and ethnicity*. Cambridge, England ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Freed, B. F. (Ed.). (1995). *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam ; Philadelpia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Gal, S. (1989). Language and political economy. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 18, 345–367.
- Gal, S., & Irvine, J. (1995). The boundaries of languages and disciplines: How ideologies construct difference. *Social Research*, 62(4), 967–1001.
- Garner, M., Raschka, C., & Sercombe, P. (2006). Sociolinguistic minorities, research, and social relationships. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 27(1), 61–78.
- Gee, J. P. (1990). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in Discourses*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Gee, J. P. (2015). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in Discourses* (5th ed.). Florence: Taylor and Francis.
- Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretative theory of culture. In C. Geertz (Ed.), *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge: Polity.

- Goffman, E. (1963). *Behavior in public places; notes on the social organization of gatherings*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Gramsci, A. (1995). *Further selections from the prison notebooks*. (D. Boothman, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Greenbank, E. (2019). *Discursive navigation of employable identities in the narratives of former refugees* (Doctoral Dissertation). Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington.
- Greenbank, E., & Marra, M. (forthcoming). Narrating belonging: Realising the impact of self and other positioning in former refugees' stories of flight. *Language and Intercultural Communication Special Issue on Translational Research: Language, Intercultural Communication and Social Action*.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982a). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982b). *Language and social identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1996). The linguistic and cultural relativity of inference. In J. J. Gumperz & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 374–406). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (2001). Contextualization and ideology in intercultural communication. *Pragmatics and beyond New Series*, 35–54.
- Hall, S. (2000). Who needs identity? In J. Evans, P. Du Gay, & P. Redman (Eds.), *Identity: A reader*. London: SAGE.
- Hatoss, A. (2012). Where are you from? Identity construction and experiences of “Othering” in the narratives of Sudanese refugee-background Australians. *Discourse & Society*, 23(1), 47–68.

- Hechanova-Alampay, R., Beehr, T. A., Christiansen, N. D., & Horn, R. K. V. (2002). Adjustment and strain among domestic and international student sojourners: A longitudinal study. *School Psychology International*, 23(4), 458–474.
- Heller, M. (1995). Language choice, social institutions, and symbolic domination. *Language in Society*, 24(3), 373–405.
- Heller, M. (2011). *Paths to Post-Nationalism: A critical ethnography of language and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heller, M. (2013). Gumperz and social justice. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 23(3), 192–198.
- Heller, M., Pietikäinen, S., & Pujolar, J. (2018). *Critical sociolinguistic research methods: Studying language issues that matter*. Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY: Routledge.
- Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: Indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(1), 15–38.
- Heyl, B. (2001). Ethnographic interviewing. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of ethnography* (pp. 369–383). London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif., London: SAGE.
- Holland, D. C., Skinner, D., Lachiotte, W., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, men and politeness*. London: Longman.
- Holmes, J. (1997). Women, language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 1(2), 195–223.
- Holmes, J. (2006). *Gendered talk at work: Constructing social identity through workplace interaction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Holmes, J. (2007). Social constructionism, postmodernism and feminist sociolinguistics. *Gender and Language*, 1(1), 51–65.

- Holmes, J. (2018). Negotiating the culture order in New Zealand workplaces. *Language in Society*, 47(1), 33–56.
- Holmes, J., & Hazen, K. (Eds.). (2014). *Research methods in sociolinguistics: A practical guide*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons
- Holmes, J., Marra, M., & Lazzaro-Salazar, M. (2017). Negotiating the tall poppy syndrome in New Zealand workplaces: Women leaders managing the challenge. *Gender and Language*, 11(1), 1–29.
- Holmes, J., Marra, M., & Vine, B. (2011). *Leadership, discourse, and ethnicity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holmes, J., & Meyerhoff, M. (Eds.). (2003). *Handbook of language and gender*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Holmes, J., & Stubbe, M. (2003). *Power and politeness in the workplace: A sociolinguistic analysis of talk at work*. Harlow: Longman.
- Holmes, J., & Stubbe, M. (2015). *Power and politeness in the workplace: A sociolinguistic analysis of talk at work* (2nd edition). Oxon, New York: Routledge.
- Holmes, J., & Woodhams, J. (2013). Building interaction: The role of talk in joining a community of practice. *Discourse & Communication*, 7(3), 275–298.
- Inda, J. X., & Rosaldo, R. (Eds.). (2008). *The anthropology of globalization: A reader* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.
- Isabelli-Garcia, C. (2006). Study abroad social networks, motivation, and attitudes: Implications for SLA. In M. A. DuFon & E. Churchill (Eds.), *Language learners in study abroad contexts*. Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Jackson, J. (2008). Globalization, internationalization, and short-term stays abroad. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 32(4), 349–358.

- Jackson, J. (2010). *Intercultural journeys: From study to residence abroad*. Basingstoke, Hampshire, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jaffe, A. (2009). *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives*. New York ; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jaspers, J. (2012). Interactional sociolinguistics and discourse analysis. In J. P. Gee & M. Handford (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis*. Routledge.
- Jaworski, A., & Coupland, J. (2005). Othering in gossip: “You go out you have a laugh and you can pull yeah okay but like” *Language in Society*, 34(5), 667–94.
- Jefferson, G. (1979). A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance/declination. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 79–96). New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Jenks, C. J. (2011). *Transcribing talk and interaction: Issues in the representation of communication data*. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kanno, Y., & Norton, B. (2003). Imagined communities and educational possibilities: Introduction. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 2(4), 241–249.
- Keene, S. M. (2015). *Risky residences: An exploratory study of sexual violence in university halls of residence* (Master’s thesis). Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington.
- Kidner, K. (2015). *Beyond Greenwash: Environmental Discourses of appropriation and resistance* (Doctoral Dissertation). Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington.
- Kiesling, S. (2007). Men, masculinities, and language. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 1(6), 653–673.
- Kiesling, S. (2011). The interactional construction of desire as gender. *Gender and Language*, 5(2), 213–239.

- Kiesling, S. (2013). Flirting and “normative” sexualities. *Journal of Language and Sexuality*, 2(1), 101–121.
- King, B. (2011). *Linguistic negotiations of sexual agency in sexuality education* (Doctoral Dissertation). Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington.
- King, B. (2014). Tracing the emergence of a community of practice: Beyond presupposition in sociolinguistic research. *Language in Society*, 43(01), 61–81.
- Kinginger, C. (2004). Alice doesn’t live here anymore: Foreign language learning and identity construction. In A. Blackledge & A. Pavlenko (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp. 219–242). Clevedon ; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Kinginger, C. (2008). Language learning in study abroad: Case studies of Americans in France. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92, i–131.
- Kinginger, C. (2009). *Language learning and study abroad: A critical reading of research*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kinginger, C. (2010). American students abroad: Negotiation of difference? *Language Teaching*, 43(2), 216–227.
- Kinginger, C. (2011). Enhancing language learning in study abroad. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 58–73.
- Kinginger, C. (2013). Identity and language learning in study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals*, 46(3), 339–358.
- Kinginger, C. (2015). Student mobility and identity-related language learning. *Intercultural Education*, 26(1), 6–15.
- Kinginger, C. (2016). Echoes of postfeminism in American students’ narratives of study abroad in France. *L2 Journal*, 8(2).

- Kinginger, C., & Farrell-Whitworth, K. (2005). Gender and emotional investment in language learning during study abroad. In *CALPER Working Paper Series*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Center for Advanced Language Education and Research.
- Kramarae, C., & Zhang, W. (2015). Sexist language and sexuality. In *The International Encyclopedia of Human Sexuality*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Kramsch, C. (2009). *The multilingual subject*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kress, G. (1989). *Linguistic processes in sociocultural practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Labov, W. (1972). Some principles of linguistic methodology. *Language in Society*, 1(1), 97–120.
- Lam, W. S. E., Warriner, D. S., Poveda, D., & Gonzalez, N. (2012). Transnationalism and literacy: Investigating the mobility of people, languages, texts, and practices in contexts of migration. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47(2), 191–215.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, S.-H., Wu, Q., Di, C., & Kinginger, C. (2017). Learning to eat politely at the Chinese homestay dinner table: Two contrasting case studies. *Foreign Language Annals*, 50(1), 135–158.
- Leung, C., Harris, R., & Rampton, B. (2004). Living with inelegance in qualitative research on task-based learning. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 242–267). Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- LeVelle, K., & Levis, J. M. (2014). Understanding the impact of social factors on L2 pronunciation: Insights from learners. In *Social dynamics in second language accent* (pp. 57–66). Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Levi-Strauss, C. (1963). *Structural anthropology*. (C. Jacobson & B. Grundfest Schoepf, Trans.). New York: Basic Books.

- Li Wei, & Zhu Hua. (2013). Translanguaging identities and ideologies: Creating transnational space through flexible multilingual practices amongst Chinese university students in the UK. *Applied Linguistics*, 34(5), 516–535.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2008). The Ideology of interculturality in Japanese language-in-education policy. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30(2), 1–16.
- Lillis, T. M., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. Milton Park, Abingdon ; New York: Routledge.
- Lindemann, S., & Mauranen, A. (2001). “It’s just real messy”: The occurrence and function of Just in a corpus of academic speech. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20(1), 459–75.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Lippi-Green, R. (2004). Language ideology and language prejudice. In E. Finegan & J. R. Rickford (Eds.), *Language in the USA.: Themes for the twenty-first century* (pp. 289–304). Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Luke, A. (2009). Race and language as capital in school: A sociological template for language education reform. In R. Kubota & A. M. Y. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice* (pp. 286–308). London, UK: Routledge.
- Lysgaard, S. (1955). Adjustment in a foreign society: Norwegian Fulbright grantees visiting the United States. *International Social Science Bulletin*, 7, 45–51.
- Macalister, J. (2009). Investigating the changing use of te reo. *NZ Words (Online)*, 3–4.
- Macalister, J. (2016). Tracing it back: Identifying the impact of a trans-national language teacher education programme on classroom practice. *RELC Journal*, 47(1), 59-70.
- Macalister, J. (2017). English and language teacher education in Malaysia: An exploration of the influences on and experiences of pre-service teachers. *RELC Journal*, 48(1), 53-66.

- Macleod, A. (1992). Hegemonic relations and gender resistance: The new veiling as accommodating protest in Cairo. *Signs*, 17(3), 533.
- Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon, U.K.: Channel View Publications.
- Mar-Molinero, C., & Stevenson, P. (Eds.). (2005). *Language ideologies, policies and practices: language and the future of Europe*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marra, M. (2012a). Disagreeing without being disagreeable: Negotiating workplace communities as an outsider. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(12), 1580–1590.
- Marra, M. (2012b). Discourse analysis and conversation analysis. In Carole A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Languages*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Marra, M., Holmes, J., & Kidner, K. (2017). Transitions and interactional competence: Negotiating boundaries through talk. In S. Pekarek Doehler, A. Bangerter, G. de Weck, L. Fillietaz, E. González-Martínez, & C. Petitjean (Eds.), *Interactional competences in institutional settings: From school to the workplace* (pp. 227–251). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Martel, P., & Cagolet-Laganière, H. (1995). Oui . . . au français québécois standard. In *La qualité de la langue au Québec* (Vol. Vol. Diagnostic 18, p. 167). Québec, Canada: Centre d'analyse et de traitement informatisé du français québécois (CATIFQ)- Institut québécois de recherche sur la culture.
- McElhinny, B. (2014). Theorizing gender in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology. In S. Ehrlich, M. Meyerhoff, & J. Holmes (Eds.), *The handbook of language, gender and sexuality* (2nd ed.). Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.

- McKay, S. L., & Wong, S.-L. C. (1996). Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(3), 577–609.
- Meadows, B. (2009). Capital negotiation and identity practices: investigating symbolic capital from the ‘ground up.’ *Critical Discourse Studies*, 6(1), 15–30.
- Meadows, B. (2010). “Like my tutor and stuff, people I would talk to”: Laying claim to imagined national communities of practice in language learner discourse. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 7(2–3), 88–111.
- Meadows, B. (2014). Examining the role of nationalism in folk theories of language: The case of language complaints in multilingual settings: Nationalism in folk theories of language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 24(3), 337–356.
- Menard–Warwick, J. (2009b). Co-constructing representations of culture in ESL and EFL classrooms: Discursive faultlines in Chile and California. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 30–45.
- Menard-Warwick, J. (2005). Both a fiction and an existential fact: Theorizing identity in second language acquisition and literacy studies. *Linguistics and Education*, 16(3), 253–274.
- Menard-Warwick, J. (2009). *Gendered identities and immigrant language learning*. Bristol, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Menard-Warwick, J. (2014). *English language teachers on the discursive faultlines: Identities, ideologies and pedagogies*. Bristol, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Michael, M. (1996). *Constructing identities: The social, the nonhuman and change*. London: Sage.
- Miller, E. R. (2014). *The language of adult immigrants: Agency in the making*. Bristol ; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Mills, Sara. (2003). *Gender and politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mills, Sara. (2008). *Language and sexism*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mills, Sarah, & Mullany, L. (2011). *Language, gender and feminism*. Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- Milroy, J. (2001). Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 5(4), 530–555.
- Ministry of Education. (2018). Education Counts: Subject Enrolment. Retrieved November 6, 2018, from <https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/schooling/student-numbers/subject-enrolment>
- Mitchell, R., Tracy-Ventura, N., & McManus, K. (2017). *Anglophone students abroad: Identity, social relationships and language learning*. Taylor and Francis.
- Morgan, B., & Clarke, M. (2011). Identity in second language teaching and learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 817–831). New York: Routledge.
- Mu, G. M. (2016). Looking Chinese and learning Chinese as a heritage language: The role of habitus. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 15(5), 293–305.
- Murphy-Lejeune, E. (2002). *Student mobility and narrative in Europe: The new strangers*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Murray, G., Gao, X., & Lamb, T. (Eds.). (2011). *Identity, motivation and autonomy in language learning*. Bristol ; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Mutonyi, H., & Norton, B. (2007). ICT on the margins: Lessons for Ugandan education. *Language and Education*, 21(3), 264–270.
- Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H., & Todesco, A. (1978). *The Good Language Learner*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- New Zealand Government. (2018). *International Education Strategy He Rautaki Mātauranga A Ao 2018-2030*. Wellington, New Zealand.

- Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *Tesol Quarterly*, 31(3), 409–429.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. New York: Longman.
- Norton, B. (2001). Non-participation, imagined communities and the language classroom. *Learner Contributions to Language Learning: New Directions in Research*, 6(2), 159–171.
- Norton, B. (2010). Language and identity. In S. McKay & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 349–369). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation* (2nd ed.). Bristol, New York, Ontario: Multilingual Matters.
- Norton, B., & De Costa, P. (2018). Research tasks on identity in language learning and teaching. *Language Teaching*, 51(1), 90–112.
- Norton, B., & Early, M. (2011). Researcher identity, narrative inquiry, and language teaching research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(3), 415–439.
- Norton, B., & Gao, Y. (2008). Identity, investment, and Chinese learners of English. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 18(1), 109–120.
- Norton, B., & McKinney, C. (2011). An identity approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition*. Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- Norton, B., & Morgan, B. (2013). Poststructuralism. In Carol A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing Limited.
- Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2001). Changing perspectives on good language learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(2), 307–322.

- Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 9–31.
- Nourry, M.-A. (2017, May 22). La Nouvelle-Zélande part à la conquête des étudiants européens. Retrieved August 22, 2018, from <https://www.letudiant.fr/educpros/enquetes/nouvelle-zelande-part-a-la-conquete-etudiants-europeens.html>
- Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 43–72). New York: Academic Press.
- Ochs, E. (1992). Indexing gender. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context* (pp. 335–358). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1993). Constructing social identity: A language socialization perspective. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26(3), 287–306.
- Ochs, E. (1996). Linguistic resources for socializing humanity. In C. Goodwin & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 407–437). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ogden, A. (2006). Ethnographic inquiry: Reframing the learning core of education abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 8, 87–112.
- Ortega, L. (1999). Language and equality: Ideological and structural constraints in foreign language education in the US. In T. Huebner, K. A. Davis, & J. L. Bianco (Eds.), *Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy and planning in the USA*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Ortega, L. (2018). Ontologies of language, second language acquisition, and world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 37(1), 64–79.
- Ortner, S. B. (1995). Resistance and the problem of ethnographic refusal. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 37(1), 173–193.
- Papastergiadis, N. (2000). *The turbulence of migration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Parey, M., & Waldinger, F. (2007). *Studying abroad and the effect on international labor market mobility: Evidence from the introduction of ERASMUS*. London: Centre for the Economics of Education, LSE.
- Pascale, C.-M. (2011). *Cartographies of knowledge: Exploring qualitative epistemologies*. Thousand Oaks California United States: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Patasiba, V. (2006). Study abroad and experiences of cultural distance and proximity: French Erasmus students. In M. Byram & A. Feng (Eds.), *Living and studying abroad: Research and practice* (pp. 108–133). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Patron, M.-C. (2007). *Culture and identity in study abroad contexts : After Australia, French without France*. Oxford, UK: Peter Lang AG.
- Pavlenko, A. (2003). “I never knew I was a bilingual”: Reimagining teacher identities in TESOL. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 2(4), 251–268.
- Pavlenko, A., & Norton, B. (2007). Imagined communities, identity, and English language learning. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 669–680). New York: Springer US.
- Pellegrino Aveni, V. A. (2005). *Study abroad and second language use: Constructing the self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pichler, P., & Eppler, E. (Eds.). (2009). *Gender and spoken interaction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Piller, I., & Takahashi, K. (2006). A passion for English: Desire and the language market. In A. Pavlenko (Ed.), *Bilingual minds: Emotional experience, expression and representation* (pp. 59–83). Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters.
- Plews, J. L. (2015). Intercultural identity-alignment in second language study abroad, or the more-or-less Canadians. In *Social interaction, identity and language learning during residence abroad* (pp. 281–304). European Second Language Association.

- Plews, J. L., & Misfeldt, K. (Eds.). (2018). *Second language study abroad: Programming, pedagogy, and participant engagement*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Polyani, L. (1995). Language learning and living abroad. In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 271–291). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Pomerantz, A. (2008). “Tú necesitas preguntar en Español”: Negotiating good language learner identity in a Spanish classroom. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 7(3–4), 253–271.
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants Part 1. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1–6.
- Rampton, B. (2007a). Linguistic ethnography, interactional sociolinguistics and the study of identities. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*, (43), 1–14.
- Rampton, B. (2007b). Neo-Hymesian linguistic ethnography in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(5), 584–607.
- Ramsay, S., Jones, E., & Barker, M. (2007). Relationship between adjustment and support types: Young and mature-aged local and international first year university students. *Higher Education*, 54(2), 247–265.
- Reay, D., Crozier, G., & James, D. (2011). *White middle-class identities and urban schooling*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire [England]; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Revis, M. S. (2015). *Family language policies of refugees: Ethiopians and Colombians in New Zealand* (Doctoral Dissertation). Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington.
- Ricento, T. (2005). Americanization, language ideologies and the construction of European identities. In C. Mar-Molinero & P. Stevenson (Eds.), *Language ideologies, policies and practices* (pp. 44–57). Basingstoke, Hampshire, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Roberts, C. (1997). Transcribing talk: Issues of representation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1), 167–72.

- Roberts, C. (2003). Applied linguistics applied. In S. Sarangi & T. Van Leeuwen (Eds.), *Applied Linguistics and Communities of Practice* (Vol. 18, pp. 132–149). London: Continuum.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54–67.
- Sarangi, S., & Candlin, C. N. (2003). Trading between reflexivity and relevance: New challenges for applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(3), 271–285.
- Sauntson, H. (2008). The contribution of queer theory to gender and language research. In K. Harrington, L. Litosseliti, H. Sauntson, & J. Sunderland (Eds.), *Gender and language research methodologies* (pp. 271–282). Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Schieffelin, B. B., Woolard, K. A., & Kroskrity, P. V. (Eds.). (1998). *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (1997). Theory and method in discourse analysis: what context for what unit? *Language & Communication*, 17(2), 75–92.
- Schilling, N. (2013). *Sociolinguistic fieldwork*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schippers, M. (2007). Recovering the feminine other: Masculinity, femininity, and gender hegemony. *Theory and Society*, 36(1), 85–102.
- Schneider, B. (2010). Multilingual cosmopolitanism and monolingual commodification: Language ideologies in transnational salsa communities. *Language in Society*, 39(5), 647–668.
- Scollon, R. (1998). *Mediated discourse as social interaction*. London: Longman.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2007). Nexus analysis: Refocusing ethnography on action. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(5), 608–625.

- Seals, C. A. (2019a). *Choosing a mother tongue: Sociolinguistic identity politics in contemporary Ukrainian discourse*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Seals, C. A. (2019b). Positive and negative identity practices in heritage language education. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1–20.
- Shin, H. (2014). Social class, habitus, and language learning: The case of Korean early study-abroad students. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 13(2), 99–103.
- Shively, R. L. (2011). L2 pragmatic development in study abroad: A longitudinal study of Spanish service encounters. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(6), 1818–1835.
- Shively, R. L. (2013). Learning to be funny in Spanish during study abroad: L2 humor development. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(4), 930–946.
- Shively, R. L. (2015). Developing interactional competence during study abroad: Listener responses in L2 Spanish. *System*, 48, 86–98.
- Showstack, R. E. (2017). Stancetaking and language ideologies in heritage language learner classroom discourse. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 16(5), 271–284.
- Siegal, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(3), 356–382.
- Silverman, D. (2011). *Interpreting qualitative data*. London: Sage.
- Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication*, 23(3–4), 193–229.
- Simon, J., & Ainsworth, J. W. (2012). Race and socioeconomic status differences in study abroad participation: The role of habitus, social networks, and cultural capital. *ISRN Education*, 2012, 1–21.
- Solnitt, R. (2017). *The mother of all questions*. Canada: Haymarket Books.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). *Culturally speaking: Culture, communication and politeness theory* (2nd ed.). London: Continuum.

- Starfield, S. (2010). Ethnographies. In B. Paltridge & A. Phakiti (Eds.), *Continuum companion to research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 50–65). London ; New York: Continuum.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2013). Census, Quickstats about culture and identity. Retrieved June 8, 2018, from <http://archive.stats.govt.nz/Census/2013-census/profile-and-summary-reports/quickstats-culture-identity.aspx>
- Steinberg, M. W. (1999). *Fighting words: Working-class formation, collective action, and discourse in early nineteenth-century England*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Stubbe, M., & Ingle, M. (1999). *Collecting natural interaction data in a factory: Some methodological challenges*. Presented at the Murdoch Symposium on Talk-in-Interaction, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Surtees, V. (2016). Beliefs about language learning in study abroad: Advocating for a language ideology approach. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 27, 85–103.
- Swain, M., & Deters, P. (2007). “New” mainstream SLA theory: Expanded and enriched. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(s1), 820–836.
- Swann, J., & Maybin, J. (2008). Sociolinguistic and ethnographic approaches to language and gender. In Kate Harrington, L. Litosseliti, H. Sauntson, & J. Sunderland (Eds.), *Gender and language research methodologies* (pp. 21–28). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Talbert, S., & Stewart, M. A. (1999). What’s the subject of study abroad?: Race, gender, and “living culture.” *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(2), 163–175.
- Talmy, S., & Richards, K. (2011). Theorizing qualitative research interviews in Applied Linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(1), 1–5.
- Tanaka, K. (2007). Japanese students’ contact with English outside the classroom during study abroad. *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 36–54.

- Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the self: The making of the modern identity*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Thomas, A. M., & Kitzinger, C. (1994). 'It's just something that happens': The invisibility of sexual harassment in the workplace. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 1(3), 151–161.
- Thomas, J. A. (forthcoming). Everyday African multilingualism as indigenous pedagogy: Teacher-led translanguaging across Swahili, Akan/Twi, and English with Ghanaian learners in Tanzania. In W. Diao & E. Trentman (Eds.), *The multilingual turn in study abroad*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Trentman, E. (2015). Negotiating gendered identities and access to social networks during study abroad in Egypt. In N. Tracy-Ventura, R. Mitchell, & K. McManus (Eds.), *Social interaction, identity and language learning during residence abroad* (pp. 263–280). Amsterdam: European Second Language Association.
- Trower, H., & Lehmann, W. (2017). Strategic escapes: Negotiating motivations of personal growth and instrumental benefits in the decision to study abroad. *British Educational Research Journal*, 43(2), 275–289.
- Twombly, S. (1995). Piropos and friendship: Gender and culture clash in study abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 1, 1–27.
- van de Mierop, D., & Schnurr, S. (Eds.). (2017). *Identity struggles: Evidence from workplaces around the world*. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- van Dijk, T. (1998). Editorial: Discourse and ideology. *Discourse & Society*, 9(3), 307–308.
- van Dijk, T. (2011). *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- van Dijk, T. (2018). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

- Victoria, M. (2011). *Building common ground in intercultural encounters: A study of classroom interaction in an employment preparation programme for Canadian immigrants* (Doctoral Dissertation). The Open University.
- Vine, B. (2018). Just and actually at work in New Zealand. In E. Friginal (Ed.), *Studies in corpus-based sociolinguistics* (pp. 197–218). New York; Abingdon: Routledge.
- Vine, B., Holmes, J., Marra, M., Pfeifer, D., & Jackson, B. (2008). Exploring co-leadership talk through Interactional Sociolinguistics. *Leadership*, 4(3), 339–360.
- Vine, B., & Marsden, S. (2016). Eh at work: The indexicality of a New Zealand English pragmatic marker. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 13(3), 383–405.
- Vitanova, G. (2010). *Authoring the dialogic self: Gender, agency and language practices*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Vitanova, G. (2016). Exploring second-language teachers' identities through multimodal narratives: Gender and race discourses. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 13(4), 261–288.
- Ward, D., & East, M. (2016). Is language learning languishing?: Stakeholders' perspectives on the provision of secondary school foreign language programmes in New Zealand. *The New Zealand Language Teacher*, 42, 44–62.
- Warner, M. (1991). Introduction: Fear of a Queer Planet. *Social Text*, (29), 3–17.
- Warner-Garcia, S. (2014). Laughing when nothing's funny: The pragmatic use of coping laughter in the negotiation of conversational disagreement. *Pragmatics*, 24(1), 157–180.
- Waters, M. (1990). *Ethnic options: Choosing identities in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wagh, L. (1982). Marked and unmarked: A choice between unequals in semiotic structure. *Semiotica*, 38(3/4), 299–318.

- Weedon, C. (1997). Language and subjectivity. *Feminist Practice & Poststructuralist Theory*, 71–103.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wernicke, M. (2016). Hierarchies of authenticity in Study Abroad: French from Canada versus French from France? *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(2), 1–21.
- Wilkinson, S. (1998). Study abroad from the participants' perspective: A challenge to common beliefs. *Foreign Language Annals*, 31(1), 23–39.
- Wilkinson, S. (2002). The omnipresent classroom during summer study abroad: American students in conversation with their French hosts. *Modern Language Journal*, 86(2), 157–174.
- Winch, P. (1958). *The idea of a social science and its relationship to philosophy*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Wodak, R. (2012). Language, power and identity. *Language Teaching*, 45(02), 215–233.
- Wodak, R., de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Liebhart, K. (2009). *The discursive construction of national identity* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wolcott, T. (2013). An American in Paris: Myth, desire, and subjectivity in one student's account of study abroad in France. In C. Kinginger (Ed.), *Social and cultural aspects of language learning in study abroad* (Vol. 37, pp. 137–163). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Wolcott, T. (2016). Introduction to the special issue: Study Abroad in the twenty-first century. *L2 Journal*, 8(2), 3–11.
- Woodhams, J. (2015). *A critical realist study of political identity in Aotearoa New Zealand: Materiality, discourse and context* (Doctoral Dissertation). Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington.

- Woolard, Katherine, & Schieffelin, B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23(1), 55–82.
- Woolard, Kathryn. (1985). Language variation and cultural hegemony: Toward an integration of sociolinguistic and social theory. *American Ethnologist*, 12, 238–248.
- Wortham, S. (2004). From good student to outcast: The emergence of a classroom identity. *Ethos*, 32(2), 164–187.
- Yakura, E. (2004). “Informed consent” and other ethical conundrums in videotaping interactions. In P. LeVine & R. Scollon (Eds.), *Discourse and technology* (pp. 146–150). Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Zhu Hua, & Li Wei. (2016). “Where are you really from?": Nationality and ethnicity talk (NET) in everyday interactions. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 7(4), 449–470.
- Zuengler, J. (1988). Identity markers and L2 Pronunciation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 10(1), 33–49.

Appendix A Participants

Phase 1 – French and Caledonian Participants in New Zealand

Name, age, country	Summary
Hanna, 18, France	At the time of my study, Hanna was a 2 nd year Applied Languages student in La Rochelle. In New Zealand, her courses included Māori language and culture, Religion, and New Zealand Sign language (NZSL). Hanna is a keen actor and singer, and a huge Harry Potter fan. She positions herself as very independent. Hanna became friends with Victoria and had quite a wide social circle made up of both international students and New Zealanders.
Victoria, 21, New Caledonia	In New Caledonia, Victoria was in her second year of an English Language major. Courses she took in New Zealand included Pacific Studies, History and Classics. She was close to her family, particularly to her grandmother of whom she often spoke. When her mother and grandmother spoke Vietnamese at home, Victoria could understand it but not speak it. Both she and Hanna found the more 'autonomous' way of working at university level in NZ demanding. Victoria had the same friend group as Hanna, and grew to feel very comfortable in Wellington. She was pragmatic about this – recognising the strength of the friendships yet at the same time acknowledging that they were grounded in her New Zealand context. Victoria's confidence developed markedly during her exchange.
Hugo, 19, France	From a small town in Normandy, Hugo attended a prestigious university in Paris (with Jules, Pierre, and Félix). In Wellington, he was studying Management and Accounting, as well as Sociology, which he enjoyed the most. Hugo took pride in building his own life in Wellington, and whilst he enjoyed spending time with Jules, Pierre, and Félix, he was a peripheral member of this group. He worked part time in restaurants and was a committed member of his local Cross Fit club. Hugo's exuberance was contagious.
Jules, 20, France	Jules is from the north of France and studied Anthropology, among other 'interest papers' in Wellington. During conversations about Politics (which were numerous) between the four French boys in phase 1, Jules was often positioned as the 'extreme' lefty. Jules was extremely personable and enthusiastic and was well-liked by many. He is also passionate about cooking, and one of the reasons he initially selected New Zealand as his exchange destination was because of his admiration for Annabel Langbein, a New Zealand celebrity cook.
Félix, 19, France	Félix was the only participant out of the four boys who was from Paris. He lived in one of the surrounding banlieues (suburbs), known for being socioeconomically disadvantaged. His university offers an

	<p>'alternative route' in terms of entrance examinations for students from these areas, and it was through this (still highly competitive) avenue, that Félix was accepted. In Wellington, he was studying Economics and Maths papers, with a view towards furthering this Economics angle in his Masters in France. He often expressed his lack of confidence in his English, though he was highly proficient. Félix spoke Tamil at home with his family, with whom he was very close. During the long Christmas break, Félix was the only one to return home to France. Hugo, Jules, and Pierre went travelling in New Zealand and in South East Asia. He was the shyest member of the French group, and it was a pleasure to see Félix become more confident throughout his stay.</p>
Pierre, 20, France	<p>Pierre is from the wider Bordeaux area and, like Hugo, Jules, and Félix, is very interested in Politics. Pierre had the ability to see the funny side of things, even in stressful situations (such as when he had Visa trouble in New Zealand which required significant time and effort to rectify). His particular passion was cinema, a topic he spoke about with passion and knowledge. An ongoing source of humour was provided by his debates with Persephone over the merits of <i>La La Land</i> (a film which did well in the 2017 Oscars). In Wellington, Pierre was studying Cinema and Spanish, and enjoying the 'rest' from his more intense political subjects at his Paris University.</p>

Phase 2 - New Zealand Participants in France

Name, age, country	Summary
Persephone, 20, New Zealand	<p>Persephone is from Wellington and was completing a degree in International Relations at the time of her exchange. In Paris, she chose to study International Relations in English as well as French language papers. Her exchange aims were to improve her French language proficiency, meet people from all over the world, and develop an international perspective. Persephone was already friends with Athena, and developed a strong friendship with Viv too (perhaps laying the groundwork in Paris). She also became good friends with Jules, Pierre, Félix, and Hugo (in particular). At home in Wellington, Persephone speaks Gujarati with her family. This was her first time travelling abroad without her family (she had visited India before), and it was also the first time she had lived alone. Persephone is politically-minded and has a strong sense of social justice.</p>
Viv, 23, New Zealand	<p>Viv is from Auckland and was in the final year of her Law degree when she went to Paris on exchange. She had visited Paris briefly once before a few years prior, and had the most life experience of all of my participants. Her law papers in Paris were all in English, and were the final requirements for her degree. She had taken time out from her degree at one point and lived in Australia. Viv had also worked a minimum of two part time jobs during her time studying in Wellington. She found it difficult to return to a full time focus on</p>

	<p>study in Paris. Viv was extremely independent and pragmatic, and showed herself to be adept at navigating Paris with minimal French. An avid reader, Viv always had a paperback in her handbag. She is also a very talented portrait artist.</p>
<p>Athena, 20, New Zealand</p>	<p>Athena had already been in Paris for one semester when I met her. Of Zambian descent, Athena had moved to a small town in New Zealand at age seven. At home, she speaks Bemba with her family. During high school, she had also completed a year's exchange in France. She was proficient in French and was very much at home in Paris; in fact, she was perhaps the participant with whom my own feelings for Paris resonated the most strongly. She felt a sense of freedom in her exchange city, embracing the anonymity she felt it afforded her. She did not want to leave. At her exchange university, she was studying a mix of papers in English and French, with papers going towards her undergraduate degree in International Relations and French.</p>

Appendix B Human Ethics Memorandum

Phone 04-463 5480
Email susan.corbett@vuw.ac.nz

MEMORANDUM

TO	Shelley Dawson
COPY TO	Meredith Marra
FROM	AProf Susan Corbett, Convener, Human Ethics Committee
DATE	18 December 2015
PAGES	1
SUBJECT	Ethics Approval: 22516 Identity co-construction in study abroad contexts: Negotiating transitions

Thank you for your application for ethical approval, which has now been considered by the Standing Committee of the Human Ethics Committee.

Your application has been approved from the above date and this approval continues until 1 December 2018. If your data collection is not completed by this date you should apply to the Human Ethics Committee for an extension to this approval.

Best wishes with the research.

Kind regards

Susan Corbett
Convener, Victoria University Human Ethics Committee

Appendix C.1 Consent Form Key Participants

SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS & APPLIED LANGUAGE STUDIES Te Kura Tātari Reo
Incorporating DEAF STUDIES RESEARCH UNIT ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE NEW ZEALAND DICTIONARY CENTRE
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, PO Box 600, Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Phone +64-4-463 5800 Fax +64-4-463 5804 Email leis@vuw.ac.nz Web www.victoria.ac.nz/leis

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH (*key participants*)

Identity Experiences during Study Abroad

Researcher: Shelley Dawson, School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies,
Victoria University of Wellington

I have been given and have understood an explanation of this research project. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have understood the answers. I understand that any information I provide will be kept confidential to the researcher and the supervisors. I understand that the published results will not use my name, and that I will not be able to be identified. I understand that I can withdraw from the project at any time before the 11th March 2016 without having to give reasons, and that material I have provided will be returned to me and will not be referred to in the thesis. I understand that I can ask questions about the research at any time, and that I will be provided with a summary of the research findings at the end of the project.

I agree to have my voice recorded and I understand that my voice will be recorded five times in class, three times with my conversation partner, and three times in a group with other study abroad students. I understand that I can listen to these recordings at any time, and that the audio files will then be sent to me.

I understand that the researcher will observe my class three times and interview me twice during my exchange. I understand that the interviews will also be recorded. I agree to have the researcher spend approximately three hours with me at the beginning of my time in the new country.

☐ I agree to give the researcher access (e.g. by friend request on Facebook) to one social media account for the duration of my study abroad period.

☐ I do not agree to give the researcher access to one social media account for the duration of my study abroad period.

I agree to take part in this research.

Human Ethics Committee information

If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Victoria University HEC Convener, Associate Professor Susan Corbett.

Email: susan.corbett@vuw.ac.nz or telephone +64-4-463 5480.

Signed:

Name of participant:

Date:

Appendix C.2 French Consent Form Key Participants

SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS & APPLIED LANGUAGE STUDIES Te Kura Tātari Reo
Incorporating DEAF STUDIES RESEARCH UNIT ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE NEW ZEALAND DICTIONARY CENTRE
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, PO Box 600, Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Phone +64-4-463 5800 Fax +64-4-463 5804 Email ls@vuw.ac.nz Web www.victoria.ac.nz/ls

ACCORD DE PARTICIPATION (*participants principaux*)

Identity Experiences during Study Abroad

(Expériences d'identité dans le cadre d'un programme d'échanges)

Doctorante: Shelley Dawson, School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, Victoria University of Wellington

Je, soussigné(e), confirme avoir bien compris ce projet de recherche, avoir pu poser des questions et avoir bien compris les réponses. Il est entendu que je peux poser des questions sur cette recherche à tout moment et que je peux me retirer de ce projet avant le 11 mars 2016 sans devoir donner de raisons. Dans ce cas, il est également entendu que les informations fournies me seront retournées et ne feront pas partie de la thèse. Il est également entendu que seule la doctorante et ses deux directrices de recherche auront accès aux informations recueillies, que toutes les informations obtenues resteront confidentielles et qu'aucun participant ne pourra être identifié. Il est aussi convenu que le résumé des résultats de cette recherche me sera envoyé à la fin du projet.

Je consens à être enregistré(e) cinq fois en classe, trois fois dans un dialogue avec un locuteur natif, et trois fois dans un groupe avec d'autres étudiants participant à l'échange. Il est entendu que je peux demander d'écouter ces enregistrements à tout moment et que ces fichiers audio me seront envoyés.

Je consens également à ce que la doctorante observe trois fois une de mes classes. J'accepte par ailleurs être interviewé(e) deux fois pendant mon séjour, et je consens à ce que ces entretiens soient également enregistrés. Il est entendu que la doctorante passera environ trois heures avec moi au début de mon séjour.

☐ J'autorise la doctorante à accéder à un compte de médias sociaux convenu entre nous (e.g. être amis sur Facebook) pour la durée de mon séjour.

☐ Je n'autorise pas la doctorante à accéder à un compte de médias sociaux convenu entre nous pour la durée de mon séjour.

Je consens de mon plein gré à participer à ces recherches et j'accepte toutes les conditions citées ci-dessus.

Comité d'éthique humaine de l'Université Victoria de Wellington:

Si vous souhaitez de plus amples renseignements sur le projet vous pouvez contacter le Comité d'éthique humaine de l'Université Victoria de Wellington. Victoria University HEC Convenor: Associate Professor Susan Corbett
susan.corbett@vuw.ac.nz
+64-4-463 5480.

Signature :

Nom et prénoms du/de la participant(e) :

Date:

Appendix C.3 Consent Form Teachers and Conversation Partners

SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS & APPLIED LANGUAGE STUDIES Te Kura Tātari Reo
Incorporating DEAF STUDIES RESEARCH UNIT ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE NEW ZEALAND DICTIONARY CENTRE
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, PO Box 600, Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Phone +64-4-463 5000 Fax +64-4-463 5004 Email laio@vuw.ac.nz Web www.victoria.ac.nz/laio

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH *(for teachers and conversation partners)*

Identity Experiences during Study Abroad

Researcher: Shelley Dawson, School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, Victoria University of Wellington

I have been given and have understood an explanation of this research project. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I may withdraw from this project before March 11th 2016 without having to give reasons. I understand that material I have provided will be returned to me and will not be referred to in the thesis.

I understand that any information I provide will be kept confidential to the researcher, and the supervisors. I understand the published results will not use my name, and that no opinions will be attributed to me in any way that will identify me. I understand that my voice will be recorded and that I can listen to the recordings or ask questions about the research at any time.

I understand that the data I provide will not be used for any other purpose or be released to others without my written consent, and that I can ask to receive a summary of the results of the research when it is completed.

I agree to participate in this research.

Human Ethics Committee information

If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Victoria University HEC Convener, Associate Professor Susan Corbett.

Email: susan.corbett@vuw.ac.nz or telephone +64-4-463 5480.

Signed:

Name of participant:

Date:

Appendix C.4 Consent Form Class Members

SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS & APPLIED LANGUAGE STUDIES Te Kura Tātari Reo
Incorporating DEAF STUDIES RESEARCH UNIT ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE NEW ZEALAND DICTIONARY CENTRE
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, PO Box 600, Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Phone +64-4-463 5800 Fax +64-4-463 5804 Email info@vuw.ac.nz Web www.victoria.ac.nz/els

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH *(for class members)*

Identity Experiences during Study Abroad

**Researcher: Shelley Dawson, School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies,
Victoria University of Wellington**

I have been given and have understood an explanation of this research project. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have understood the answers. I understand that any information I provide will be kept confidential to the researcher and the supervisor. I understand that the published results will not use my name, and that I will not be able to be identified.

I understand that my voice may be recorded. I understand that I can ask to listen to these recordings at any time. I understand that I can ask questions about the research at any time, and that I and that I can ask to receive a summary of the results of the research when it is completed.

I understand that I can withdraw from the project at any time before the 21st March 2016 without having to give reasons and that this will be without any disadvantage. If my voice has already been recorded by this date, I understand that the researcher will delete my turns in the conversation.

I agree to take part in this research.

Human Ethics Committee information

If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Victoria University HEC Convener, Associate Professor Susan Corbett.

Email: susan.corbett@vuw.ac.nz or telephone +64-4-463 5480.

Signed:

Name of participant:

Date:

Appendix C.5 Information Sheet Key Participants

SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS & APPLIED LANGUAGE STUDIES Te Kura Tātari Reo
Incorporating DEAF STUDIES RESEARCH UNIT ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE NEW ZEALAND DICTIONARY CENTRE
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, PO Box 600, Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Phone +64-4-463 5000 Fax +64-4-463 5004 Email ls@vuw.ac.nz Web www.victoria.ac.nz/ls

INFORMATION SHEET *(for key research participants)*

Identity Experiences during Study Abroad

Researcher: Shelley Dawson, School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, Victoria University of Wellington

Hello everyone. I am a PhD candidate in Applied Linguistics at Victoria University in Wellington. As part of this degree I am doing research into the language learner's experience of study abroad and identity. Identity is how you see yourself and how others see you. People have many identities and they change in different contexts. I am interested in the relationship between the study abroad context and identity and how this contributes to learners' development. This research project has received approval from the Victoria University Human Ethics Committee (application number 0000022516).

As well as my researcher role, I am also an English teacher with 15 years' experience. During your time in Wellington, I would be very happy to meet with you regularly on an informal basis to practise your conversational English, if this is something you would like to do. If you decide to withdraw* from the project, we can still continue these meetings. I would also like to offer to accompany you on a tour of central Wellington in the first few weeks of your stay so that you can explore your new surroundings and begin to feel more familiar with them.

In terms of my study, I plan to make five audio recordings of small group classroom interactions, three with your conversation partner, and three with other study abroad students. This means that your voice will be recorded. I can send you these audio files if you would like to listen to them. Listening to yourself speaking in another language can be a valuable learning tool.

I will also observe some of your classes to get a better understanding of this context. Related to this, I would like to spend some time with you (approximately 3 hours) at the beginning of your time in New Zealand. This can take place in a setting of your choice (e.g. in the university context or in the city centre) and will involve informal discussion of what a typical day involves for you at this stage in the trimester. This will help me to understand your everyday experience of your new contexts. I would also like to interview you at the beginning and end of your course. These interviews will also be recorded and you may request access to these at any time.

Finally, I would like to have access to an existing social media account, if you have one that you are happy to share. This will allow me to see the relative importance of virtual communities such as Facebook during Study Abroad periods. Information from this source would not be the main source of data for my project but would provide background information. You can still take part in the study if you decide not to provide access to a social media account.

This data will help my research project and some of it will be used to write my thesis. All names will be anonymous*. It will not be possible for you to be identified personally. All material collected will be kept confidential*. Only my supervisors Dr. Meredith Marra and Dr. Corinne Seals and I will have access to the data.

The thesis will be submitted to the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies and deposited in the University Library. It is intended that one or more articles will be submitted for publication in scholarly journals. It is possible that the data collected will be used for follow-up study.

You can withdraw from the project at any time before the 11th March 2016. Just let me know at the time. If you decide to withdraw, I will return all interview data, notes, and recordings with your conversation partner. I will not refer to these sources in my thesis. If you have already been involved in a recorded interaction in the classroom or with other study abroad participants, your turns will be deleted. Withdrawal is without any disadvantage.

If you have any questions or would like to receive more information about the project, please contact me at shelley.dawson@vuw.ac.nz or on 021 186 0449 or my supervisor Dr. Meredith Marra, at the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies at Victoria University 04 463 5636 or meredith.marra@vuw.ac.nz .

Human Ethics Committee information

If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Victoria University HEC Convenor, Associate Professor Susan Corbett.

Email: susan.corbett@vuw.ac.nz or telephone +64-4-463 5480.

Kind regards

Shelley Dawson

*Anonymous= not named or identified

*Confidential= secret or private

*Withdraw= to stop participating in something

Appendix C.6 French Information Sheet

Key Participants

SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS & APPLIED LANGUAGE STUDIES Te Kura Tātarī Reo
Incorporating DEAF STUDIES RESEARCH UNIT ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE NEW ZEALAND DICTIONARY CENTRE
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, PO Box 600, Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Phone +64-4-463 5800 Fax +64-4-463 5804 Email ls@vuw.ac.nz Web www.victoria.ac.nz/ls

FEUILLE D'INFORMATIONS (*participants principales*)

Identity Experiences during Study Abroad

(Expériences d'identité dans le cadre d'un programme d'échanges)

Docteurante: Shelley Dawson, School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, Victoria University of Wellington

Bonjour à tous,

Je suis docteurante en linguistique appliquée à l'Université Victoria de Wellington, en Nouvelle-Zélande. Je m'intéresse à l'expérience des étudiants de langues lorsqu'ils étudient à l'étranger dans le cadre d'un programme d'échange en relation avec la construction de leur identité. Les apprenants de langues présentent des identités multiples qui changent selon les contextes et je vise à examiner, dans le contexte des études à l'étranger, la façon dont l'apprenant se voit et la manière dont les autres le perçoivent, et les implications sur son développement. Ce projet de recherche a reçu l'approbation du Comité d'éthique humaine de l'Université Victoria de Wellington (numéro 0000022516).

Au-delà de mon rôle de docteurante, je suis également professeure d'anglais forte d'une expérience professionnelle de 15 ans. Pendant la durée de votre séjour à Wellington, je serais très heureuse de vous rencontrer régulièrement, sur une base informelle, pour pratiquer votre anglais conversationnel, si cela est quelque chose que vous aimeriez faire. Si vous décidez de vous retirer du projet, nous pourrions toujours continuer les séances de conversation. Je vous propose également de vous accompagner dans une visite du centre-ville de Wellington, dans les premières semaines de votre séjour afin que vous puissiez explorer votre nouvel environnement.

Dans le cadre de ce travail, je compte faire l'enregistrement audio de cinq interactions de classe en petits groupes, de trois dialogues entre chaque participant et un locuteur natif, et de trois échanges avec d'autres étudiants en échange. Je peux vous envoyer ces fichiers audio si vous souhaitez les écouter. S'écouter dans une autre langue est aussi un outil précieux d'apprentissage.

Pour obtenir une meilleure compréhension du contexte, j'ai l'intention d'observer certains cours et de faire deux entretiens personnels avec chaque participant, un au début et un autre à la fin du séjour. Ces entretiens seront également enregistrés et vous pourrez les écouter à tout moment. Pour mieux comprendre l'expérience quotidienne, je compte passer environ trois heures avec chaque participant au début du séjour. Cela pourra avoir lieu dans le cadre de votre choix (par exemple, à l'université ou au centre-ville) et impliquera une discussion informelle sur vos habitudes quotidiennes à ce stade au cours du trimestre.

J'aimerais également avoir accès à un compte de médias sociaux si possible et avec l'autorisation du participant. Cela m'aidera à voir l'importance des communautés virtuelles comme Facebook

au cours des périodes d'études à l'étranger. Les informations de cette source fourniront des renseignements de nature générale et vous pourrez toujours participer au projet même si vous décidez de ne pas donner accès à un compte.

Les données que j'obtiendrai, et qui m'aideront à écrire ma thèse, resteront anonymes et il ne sera pas possible d'identifier personnellement les participants. Tout le matériel recueilli sera conservé de manière confidentielle. Seules mes directrices de recherche, Dr Meredith Marra et Dr Corinne Seals, et moi-même aurons accès aux données. À la fin du projet, la thèse sera soumise au département de linguistique, et ensuite déposée à la bibliothèque de l'Université Victoria de Wellington. Il est aussi prévu qu'un ou plusieurs articles soient publiés dans des revues spécialisées. Il est possible que les données recueillies soient utilisées dans des études de suivi, mais seulement après avoir obtenu un nouveau consentement.

Si vous acceptez de participer à ce projet de recherche, vous gardez le droit de vous retirer du projet à tout moment avant la date du 11 mars 2016, sans aucune contrainte. Dans ce cas, les informations recueillies lors des entretiens, y compris les notes, et les enregistrements avec le locuteur natif vous seront retournées et ne feront pas partie de la thèse. Si vous avez été déjà impliqué dans une interaction enregistrée dans la salle de classe ou avec les autres participants, vos contributions à la conversation seront supprimées.

Si vous avez des questions ou si vous souhaitez de plus amples renseignements, vous pouvez me contacter à shelley.dawson@vuw.ac.nz ou au 021 186 0449, ou contacter ma directrice de recherche, Dr Meredith Marra à meredith.marra@vuw.ac.nz. Également, vous pouvez contacter le Comité d'éthique humaine de l'Université Victoria de Wellington (voir les informations ci-dessous).

Comité d'éthique humaine de l'Université Victoria de Wellington:

Victoria University HEC Convenor: Associate Professor Susan Corbett
susan.corbett@vuw.ac.nz
+64-4-463 5480.

Je vous remercie de votre considération.

Cordialement,

Shelley Dawson

Appendix C.7 Information Sheet Teachers and Conversation Partners

SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS & APPLIED LANGUAGE STUDIES Te Kura Tātari Reo
Incorporating DEAF STUDIES RESEARCH UNIT ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE NEW ZEALAND DICTIONARY CENTRE
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, PO Box 600, Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Phone +64-4-463 5000 Fax +64-4-463 5004 Email leis@vuw.ac.nz Web www.victoria.ac.nz/leis

INFORMATION SHEET *(for teachers and conversation partners)*

Identity Experiences during Study Abroad

Researcher: Shelley Dawson, School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies,
Victoria University of Wellington

Hello everyone. I am a PhD candidate in Applied Linguistics at Victoria University in Wellington, New Zealand. As part of this degree I am doing research into the language learner's experience of study abroad and identity. Identity is how you see yourself and how others see you. Everyone has multiple identities that change depending on the context. Language learners' identity experiences in a study abroad environment can have a significant impact on their overall trajectory, linguistic or otherwise. I am particularly interested in what happens during the transition period of the first four weeks, and how this contributes to learners' development. This research project has received approval from the Victoria University Human Ethics Committee (application number 0000022516).

As part of my research I plan to make five audio recordings of small-group classroom interactions, and three recordings of the study abroad students with their conversation partners. As well as this, I aim to interview the main classroom teacher and conversation partners at the beginning and end of the exchange programme. I would also appreciate the opportunity to observe three classes to gain a feel for this setting and inform my analysis. Although I have provisionally scheduled some dates, I will work around your timetables and availability. Should you feel the need to withdraw from the project, you can do so without question at any time before March 11th 2016. Just let me know at the time. If you decide to withdraw, I will return all interview data, notes, and recordings and will not refer to these sources in my thesis.

The data I collect from the above means will form the basis of my research project and will be put into a written report on an anonymous basis. It will not be possible for you to be identified personally. All material collected will be kept confidential. No other person besides me and my supervisors Drs. Meredith Marra and Corinne Seal will have access to the data. The thesis will be submitted for marking to the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies and deposited in the University Library. It is intended that one or more articles will be submitted for publication in scholarly journals. If you have any further questions or would like to receive further information about the project, please contact me at shelley.dawson@vuw.ac.nz or on 021 186 0449, or my supervisor Dr. Meredith Marra, at the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies at Victoria University 04 463 5636 or meredith.marra@vuw.ac.nz.

Human Ethics Committee information

If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Victoria University HEC Convener, Associate Professor Susan Corbett. Email: susan.corbett@vuw.ac.nz or telephone +64-4-463 5480.

Appendix C.8 Information Sheet

Class Members

SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS & APPLIED LANGUAGE STUDIES Te Kura Tātari Reo
Incorporating DEAF STUDIES RESEARCH UNIT ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE NEW ZEALAND DICTIONARY CENTRE
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, PO Box 600, Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Phone +64-4-463 5800 Fax +64-4-463 5804 Email la@s.vuw.ac.nz Web www.victoria.ac.nz/la

INFORMATION SHEET *(for class members)*

Identity Experiences during Study Abroad

Researcher: Shelley Dawson, School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies,
Victoria University of Wellington

Hello everyone. I am a PhD candidate in Applied Linguistics at Victoria University in Wellington. As part of this degree I am doing research into the language learner's experience of study abroad and identity. Identity is how you see yourself and how others see you. People have many identities and they change in different contexts. I am interested in the relationship between the study abroad context and identity and how this contributes to learners' development. This research project has received approval from the Victoria University Human Ethics Committee (application number 0000022516).

I plan to make five audio recordings of classroom interactions, which means that your voice may be recorded. This data will help my research project and some of it will be used to write a report. All names will be anonymous*. It will not be possible for you to be identified personally. All material collected will be kept confidential*. Only my supervisors (Dr. Meredith Marra and Dr. Corinne Seals) and I will have access to the data. You can withdraw* from the project at any time before the 21st March 2016. Just let me know at the time. Withdrawal will be without any disadvantage. If your voice has already been recorded by this date, I will delete your turns in the conversation and will not refer to them in my thesis.

If you have any further questions or would like to receive further information about the project, please contact me at shelley.dawson@vuw.ac.nz or on 021 186 0449 or my supervisor Dr. Meredith Marra, at the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies at Victoria University 04 463 5636 or meredith.marra@vuw.ac.nz.

Human Ethics Committee information

If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Victoria University HEC Convener, Associate Professor Susan Corbett.

Email: susan.corbett@vuw.ac.nz or telephone +64-4-463 5480.

Kind regards

Shelley Dawson

*Anonymous= not named or identified

*Confidential= secret or private

*Withdraw= to stop participating in something

Appendix D.1 Consent Form Key Participants

SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS & APPLIED LANGUAGE STUDIES Te Kura Tātari Reo
Incorporating DEAF STUDIES RESEARCH UNIT ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE NEW ZEALAND DICTIONARY CENTRE
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, PO Box 600, Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Phone +64-4-463 5800 Fax +64-4-463 5804 Email ls@vuw.ac.nz Web www.victoria.ac.nz/ls

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH *(for key participants)*

Identity Experiences during Study Abroad

Researcher: Shelley Dawson, School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, Victoria University of Wellington

I have been given and have understood an explanation of this research project. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have understood the answers. I understand that any information I provide will be kept confidential to the researcher and the supervisors. I understand that the published results will not use my name, and that I will not be able to be identified. I understand that I can withdraw from the project at any time before the 14th October 2016 without having to give reasons, and that material I have provided will be returned to me and will not be referred to in the thesis. I understand that I can ask questions about the research at any time, and that I will be provided with a summary of the research findings at the end of the project.

I agree to have my voice recorded and I understand that my voice will be recorded five times in class, three times with my conversation partner, and three times in a group with other study abroad students. I understand that I can listen to these recordings at any time, and that the audio files will then be sent to me. I understand that the researcher will observe my class three times and interview me twice during my exchange. I understand that the interviews will also be recorded. I agree to have the researcher spend approximately three hours with me at the beginning of my time in the new country.

☐ I agree to give the researcher access to one social media account (e.g. by friend request on Facebook) for the duration of my study abroad period.

☐ I do not agree to give the researcher access to one social media account for the duration of my study abroad period.

I agree to take part in this research.

Human Ethics Committee information

If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Victoria University HEC Convenor, Associate Professor Susan Corbett.

Email: susan.corbett@vuw.ac.nz or telephone +64-4-463 5480.

Signed:

Name of participant:

Date:

Appendix D.2 Consent Form Teachers and Conversation Partners

SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS & APPLIED LANGUAGE STUDIES Te Kura Tātari Reo
Incorporating DEAF STUDIES RESEARCH UNIT ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE NEW ZEALAND DICTIONARY CENTRE
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, PO Box 600, Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Phone +64-4-463 5000 Fax +64-4-463 5004 Email la@vuw.ac.nz Web www.victoria.ac.nz/la

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH *(for teachers and conversation partners)*

Identity Experiences during Study Abroad

Researcher: Shelley Dawson, School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, Victoria University of Wellington

I have been given and have understood an explanation of this research project. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I may withdraw from this project before the 14th October 2016 without having to give reasons. I understand that material I have provided will be returned to me and will not be referred to in the thesis.

I understand that any information I provide will be kept confidential to the researcher, and the supervisors. I understand the published results will not use my name, and that no opinions will be attributed to me in any way that will identify me. I understand that my voice will be recorded and that I can listen to the recordings or ask questions about the research at any time.

I understand that the data I provide will not be used for any other purpose or be released to others without my written consent, and that I can ask to receive a summary of the results of the research when it is completed.

I agree to participate in this research.

Human Ethics Committee information

If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Victoria University HEC Convener, Associate Professor Susan Corbett.

Email: susan.corbett@vuw.ac.nz or telephone +64-4-463 5480.

Signed:

Name of participant:

Date:

Appendix D.3 French Consent Form Teachers and Students

SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS & APPLIED LANGUAGE STUDIES Te Kura Tātari Reo
incorporating DEAF STUDIES RESEARCH UNIT ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE NEW ZEALAND DICTIONARY CENTRE
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, PO Box 600, Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Phone +64-4-463 5600 Fax +64-4-463 5604 Email lals@vuw.ac.nz Web www.victoria.ac.nz/lals

ACCORD DE PARTICIPATION (*professeurs et étudiants*)

Identity Experiences during Study Abroad

(Expériences d'identité dans le cadre d'un programme d'échanges)

**Doctorante: Shelley Dawson, School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies,
Victoria University of Wellington**

Je, soussigné(e) confirme avoir bien compris ce projet de recherche, avoir pu poser des questions et avoir bien compris les réponses. Il est entendu que je peux poser des questions sur cette recherche à tout moment et que je peux me retirer de ce projet avant le 14 octobre 2016 sans devoir donner de raisons. Dans ce cas, il est également entendu que les informations fournies me seront retournées et ne feront pas parti de la thèse. Il est également entendu que seule la doctorante et ses deux directrices de recherche auront accès aux informations recueillies, que toutes les informations obtenues resteront confidentielles et qu'aucun participant ne pourra être identifié. Il est aussi convenu que le résumé des résultats de cette recherche me sera envoyé à la fin du projet.

Je consens à être enregistré(e) et à être interviewé(e). Il est entendu que je peux demander d'écouter ces enregistrements à tout moment et que ces fichiers audio me seront envoyés. Je consens également à ce que la doctorante observe trois cours, en consultation avec l'enseignant(e).

Je consens de mon plein gré à participer à ces recherches et j'accepte toutes les conditions citées ci-dessus.

Comité d'éthique humaine de l'Université Victoria de Wellington:

Si vous souhaitez de plus amples renseignements sur le projet vous pouvez contacter le Comité d'éthique humaine de l'Université Victoria de Wellington.

Victoria University HEC Convener: Associate Professor Susan Corbett

susan.corbett@vuw.ac.nz

+64-4-463 5480.

Signature:

Nom et prénoms du/de la participant(e):

Date:

Appendix D.4 Consent Form Class Members

SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS & APPLIED LANGUAGE STUDIES Te Kura Tātari Reo
incorporating DEAF STUDIES RESEARCH UNIT ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE NEW ZEALAND DICTIONARY CENTRE
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, PO Box 600, Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Phone +64-4-463 5600 Fax +64-4-463 5604 Email ls@vuw.ac.nz Web www.victoria.ac.nz/ls

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH *(for class members)*

Identity Experiences during Study Abroad

**Researcher: Shelley Dawson, School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies,
Victoria University of Wellington**

I have been given and have understood an explanation of this research project. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have understood the answers. I understand that any information I provide will be kept confidential to the researcher, and the supervisor. I understand that the published results will not use my name, and that I will not be able to be identified.

I understand that I can withdraw from the project at any time before the 14th October 2016 without having to give reasons, and that this will be without any disadvantage. If my voice has already been recorded by this date, I understand that the researcher will delete my turns in the conversation.

I understand that my voice may be recorded. I understand that I can ask to listen to these recordings at any time. I understand that I can ask questions about the research at any time, and that I can ask to receive a summary of the results of the research when it is completed.

I agree to take part in this research.

Human Ethics Committee information

If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Victoria University HEC Convener, Associate Professor Susan Corbett.

Email: susan.corbett@vuw.ac.nz or telephone +64-4-463 5480.

Signed:

Name of participant:

Date:

Appendix D.5 Information Sheet

Key Participants

SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS & APPLIED LANGUAGE STUDIES Te Kura Tātari Reo
Incorporating DEAF STUDIES RESEARCH UNIT ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE NEW ZEALAND DICTIONARY CENTRE
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, PO Box 600, Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Phone +64-4-463 5800 Fax +64-4-463 5804 Email lels@vuw.ac.nz Web www.victoria.ac.nz/lels

INFORMATION SHEET *(for key research participants)*

Identity Experiences during Study Abroad

Researcher: Shelley Dawson, School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, Victoria University of Wellington

Hello everyone. I am a PhD candidate in Applied Linguistics at Victoria University in Wellington. As part of this degree I am doing research into the language learner's experience of study abroad and identity. Identity is how you see yourself and how others see you. People have many identities and they change in different contexts. I am interested in the relationship between the study abroad context and identity and how this contributes to learners' development. This research project has received approval from the Victoria University Human Ethics Committee (application number 0000022516).

In terms of my study, I plan to make five audio recordings of small group classroom interactions, three with your conversation partner, and three with other study abroad students. This means that your voice will be recorded. I can send you these audio files if you would like to listen to them. Listening to yourself speaking in another language can be a valuable learning tool.

I will also observe some of your classes to get a better understanding of this context. Related to this, I would like to spend some time with you (approximately 3 hours) at the beginning of your time in France. This can take place in a setting of your choice (e.g. in the university context or in the city centre) and will involve informal discussion of what a typical day involves for you at this stage in the trimester. This will help me to understand your everyday experience of your new contexts. I would also like to interview you at the beginning and end of your course. These interviews will also be recorded and you may request access to these at any time.

Finally, I would like to have access to an existing social media account, if you have one that you are happy to share. This will allow me to see the relative importance of virtual communities such as Facebook during Study Abroad periods. Information from this source would not be the main source of data for my project but would provide background information. You can still take part in the study if you decide not to provide access to a social media account.

This data will help my research project and some of it will be used to write my thesis. All names will be anonymous. It will not be possible for you to be identified personally. All material collected will be kept confidential. Only my supervisors Dr. Meredith Marra and Dr. Corinne Seals and I will have access to the data.

The thesis will be submitted to the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies and deposited in the University Library. It is intended that one or more articles will be submitted

for publication in scholarly journals. It is possible that the data collected will be used for follow-up study.

You can withdraw from the project at any time before the 14th October 2016. Just let me know at the time. If you decide to withdraw, I will return all interview data, notes, and recordings with your conversation partner. I will not refer to these sources in my thesis. If you have already been involved in a recorded interaction in the classroom or with other study abroad participants, your turns will be deleted. Withdrawal is without any disadvantage.

If you have any questions or would like to receive more information about the project, please contact me at shelley.dawson@vuw.ac.nz or on 021 186 0449 or my supervisor Dr. Meredith Marm, at the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies at Victoria University 04 463 5636 or meredith.marm@vuw.ac.nz.

Human Ethics Committee information

If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Victoria University HEC Convener, Associate Professor Susan Corbett.

Email: susan.corbett@vuw.ac.nz or telephone +64-4-463 5480.

Kind regards

Shelley Dawson

Appendix D.6 Information Sheet Teachers and Conversation Partners

SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS & APPLIED LANGUAGE STUDIES Te Kura Tātari Reo
Incorporating DEAF STUDIES RESEARCH UNIT ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE NEW ZEALAND DICTIONARY CENTRE
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, PO Box 600, Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Phone +64-4-463 5800 Fax +64-4-463 5804 Email la@s.vuw.ac.nz Web www.victoria.ac.nz/la

INFORMATION SHEET *(for teachers and conversation partners)*

Identity Experiences during Study Abroad

Researcher: Shelley Dawson, School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies,
Victoria University of Wellington

Hello everyone. I am a PhD candidate in Applied Linguistics at Victoria University in Wellington, New Zealand. As part of this degree I am doing research into the language learner's experience of study abroad and identity. Identity is how you see yourself and how others see you. Everyone has multiple identities that change depending on the context. Language learners' identity experiences in a study abroad environment can have a significant impact on their overall trajectory, linguistic or otherwise. I am particularly interested in what happens during the transition period of the first four weeks, and how this contributes to learners' development. This research project has received approval from the Victoria University Human Ethics Committee (application number 0000022516).

As part of my research I plan to make five audio recordings of small-group classroom interactions, and three recordings of the study abroad students with their conversation partners. As well as this, I aim to interview the main classroom teacher and conversation partners at the beginning and end of the exchange programme. I would also appreciate the opportunity to observe three classes to gain a feel for this setting and inform my analysis. Although I have provisionally scheduled some dates, I will work around your timetables and availability. Should you feel the need to withdraw from the project, you can do so without question at any time before October 14th 2016. Just let me know at the time. If you decide to withdraw, I will return all interview data, notes, and recordings and will not refer to these sources in my thesis.

The data I collect from the above means will form the basis of my research project and will be put into a written report on an anonymous basis. It will not be possible for you to be identified personally. All material collected will be kept confidential. No other person besides me and my supervisors Drs. Meredith Marra and Corinne Seals will have access to the data. The thesis will be submitted for marking to the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies and deposited in the University Library. It is intended that one or more articles will be submitted for publication in scholarly journals. If you have any further questions or would like to receive further information about the project, please contact me at shelley.dawson@vuw.ac.nz or on 021 186 0449, or my supervisor Dr. Meredith Marra, at the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies at Victoria University 04 463 5636 or meredith.marra@vuw.ac.nz.

Human Ethics Committee information

If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Victoria University HEC Convener, Associate Professor Susan Corbett.

Email: susan.corbett@vuw.ac.nz or telephone +64-4-463 5480.

Appendix D.7 French Information Sheet Teachers and Students

SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS & APPLIED LANGUAGE STUDIES Te Kura Tātari Reo
Incorporating DEAF STUDIES RESEARCH UNIT ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE NEW ZEALAND DICTIONARY CENTRE
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, PO Box 600, Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Phone +64-4-463 5800 Fax +64-4-463 5804 Email info@vuw.ac.nz Web www.victoria.ac.nz/laels

FEUILLE D'INFORMATION (*professeurs et étudiants*)

Identity Experiences during Study Abroad

(Expériences d'identité dans le cadre d'un programme d'échanges)

Doctorante: Shelley Dawson, School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies,
Victoria University of Wellington

Je suis doctorante en linguistique appliquée à l'Université Victoria de Wellington, en Nouvelle-Zélande. Je m'intéresse à l'expérience des étudiants de langues lorsqu'ils étudient à l'étranger dans le cadre d'un programme d'échange en relation avec la construction de leur identité. Les apprenants de langues présentent des identités multiples qui changent selon les contextes et je vise à examiner, dans le contexte des études à l'étranger, la façon dont l'apprenant se voit et la manière dont les autres le perçoivent, et les implications sur son développement. Ce projet de recherche a reçu l'approbation du Comité d'éthique humaine de l'Université Victoria de Wellington (numéro 0000022516).

Dans le cadre de ce travail, je compte faire l'enregistrement audio de cinq interactions de classe en petits groupes, et de trois échanges entre chaque participant et un locuteur natif. Pour obtenir une meilleure compréhension du contexte, j'ai l'intention d'observer certains cours et de faire deux entretiens personnels avec les professeurs et les locuteurs natifs, un au début et un à la fin du séjour. Ces entretiens seront également enregistrés et vous pourrez les écouter à tout moment. Cela va de soi que je vais travailler autour de votre disponibilité.

Les données que j'obtiendrai, et qui m'aideront à écrire ma thèse, resteront anonymes et il ne sera pas possible d'identifier personnellement les participants. Tout le matériel recueilli sera conservé de manière confidentielle. Seules mes directrices de recherche, Dr Meredith Marna et Dr Corinne Seals, et moi-même aurons accès aux données. À la fin du projet, la thèse sera soumise au département de linguistique, et ensuite déposée à la bibliothèque de l'Université Victoria de Wellington. Il est aussi prévu qu'un ou plusieurs articles soient publiés dans des revues spécialisées. Il est possible que les données recueillies soient utilisées dans des études de suivi, mais seulement après avoir obtenu un nouveau consentement.

Si vous acceptez de participer à ce projet de recherche, vous gardez le droit de vous retirer du projet à tout moment avant la date du 14 octobre 2016, sans inconvénient. Dans ce cas, les informations fournies des entretiens, y compris les notes, et les enregistrements vous seront retournés et ne feront pas parti de la thèse.

Si vous avez des questions ou si vous souhaitez de plus amples renseignements, vous pouvez me contacter à shelley.dawson@vuw.ac.nz ou au 021 186 0449, ou contacter ma directrice de recherche, Dr Meredith Marna à meredith.marna@vuw.ac.nz. Également, vous pouvez

contacter le Comité d'éthique humaine de l'Université Victoria de Wellington (voir les informations ci-dessous).

Comité d'éthique humaine de l'Université Victoria de Wellington:

Victoria University HEC Convenor: Associate Professor Susan Corbett

susan.corbett@vuw.ac.nz

+64-4-463 5480.

Je vous remercie de votre considération.

Cordialement

Shelley Dawson

Appendix D.8 Information Sheet

Class Members

SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS & APPLIED LANGUAGE STUDIES Te Kura Tātari Reo
Incorporating DEAF STUDIES RESEARCH UNIT ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE NEW ZEALAND DICTIONARY CENTRE
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, PO Box 600, Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Phone +64-4-463 5000 Fax +64-4-463 5004 Email info@vuw.ac.nz Web www.victoria.ac.nz/leis

INFORMATION SHEET *(for class members)*

Identity Experiences during Study Abroad

Researcher: Shelley Dawson, School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, Victoria University of Wellington

Hello everyone. I am a PhD candidate in Applied Linguistics at Victoria University in Wellington. As part of this degree I am doing research into the language learner's experience of study abroad and identity. Identity is how you see yourself and how others see you. People have many identities and they change in different contexts. I am interested in the relationship between the study abroad context and identity and how this contributes to learners' development. This research project has received approval from the Victoria University Human Ethics Committee (application number 0000022516).

I plan to make five audio recordings of classroom interactions, which means that your voice may be recorded. This data will help my research project and some of it will be used to write a report. All names will be anonymous*. It will not be possible for you to be identified personally. All material collected will be kept confidential*. Only my supervisors (Dr. Meredith Marra and Dr. Corinne Seal) and I will have access to the data.

You can withdraw* from the project at any time before the 14th October 2016. Just let me know at the time. Withdrawal will be without any disadvantage. If your voice has already been recorded by this date, I will delete your turns in the conversation and will not refer to them in my thesis.

If you have any further questions or would like to receive further information about the project, please contact me at shelley.dawson@vuw.ac.nz or on 021 186 0449 or my supervisor Dr. Meredith Marra, at the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies at Victoria University 04 463 5636 or meredith.marra@vuw.ac.nz.

Human Ethics Committee information

If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Victoria University HEC Convener, Associate Professor Susan Corbett.

Email: susan.corbett@vuw.ac.nz or telephone +64-4-463 5480.

Kind regards

Shelley Dawson

*Anonymous= not named or identified
*Confidential= secret or private
*Withdraw= to stop participating in something

Appendix E.1 Poster Phase 1

TRIMESTER 1, 2016 **SEEKING PARTICIPANTS FOR PHD STUDY**

French students' experiences during study abroad in Wellington

My name is Shelley Dawson and I am completing a PhD in Applied Linguistics. My background is in teaching and I have 16 years' experience as a language teacher.

In terms of my research, I am interested in your experiences (regarding language and identity) as you transition to the New Zealand context during your trimester abroad. If you decide to participate in my study, you will not be identified in any way. Outside of the research, I would also like to offer you the chance to participate in regular conversation sessions where you will be able to choose the topics and practise your language around areas of interest to you. Soon after your arrival, I would like to introduce you to Wellington by taking you on a tour of the central city. Please email me if you would like to know more. I would be happy to explain my study in more detail!

Shelley.Dawson@vuw.ac.nz

Ethics application number: 0000022516

**Are you from
France (or another
French-speaking
country)? Are you
enrolled to study
at Victoria
University,
Wellington in
Trimester 1, 2016?**

**Seeking participants
for PhD study**
*French students'
experiences of Study
Abroad in Wellington*

**I'm interested in
your experiences!**

SHELLEY DAWSON

**PhD Candidate
School of Linguistics and
Applied Language Studies**

Shelley.Dawson@vuw.ac.nz

Phone: 021 186 0449

Appendix E.2 Poster Phase 2

TRIMESTER 2, 2016 **SEEKING PARTICIPANTS FOR PHD STUDY**

Victoria students' experiences during study abroad in France

My name is Shelley Dawson and I am completing a PhD in Applied Linguistics. My background is in teaching and I have 16 years' experience as a language teacher.

In terms of my research, I am interested in your experiences (regarding language and identity) as you transition to the French context during your trimester abroad. If you decide to participate in my study, you will not be identified in any way and you can decide to withdraw at any time.

Please email me if you would like to know more. I would be happy to explain my study in more detail!

Shelley.Dawson@vuw.ac.nz

Ethics application number: 0000022516

**Are you going to
France (or another
French-speaking
country) to study
in trimester 2,
2016?**

**Seeking participants
for PhD study
*Victoria students'
experiences of Study
Abroad in France***

**I'm interested in
your experiences!**

SHELLEY DAWSON

**PhD Candidate
School of Linguistics and
Applied Language Studies**

Shelley.Dawson@vuw.ac.nz

Phone: 021 186 0449

Appendix F Transcription Conventions

Following Holmes, Marra, & Vine, 2011

[]:	Paralinguistic and editorial information in square brackets; colon indicates start and finish
+	Untimed pause of approximately one second
++	Untimed pause of approximately two seconds
+++	Untimed pause of approximately three seconds
(4)	Pause over three seconds
//here\	Simultaneous or overlapping utterance of 'first' speaker
/here\\	Simultaneous or overlapping utterance if 'second' speaker
¹ // \ ¹	Speaker is overlapped more than once during a turn
()	Untranscribable or incomprehensible speech
(think)	Transcriber's best guess at an unclear utterance
-	Cut off utterance
AND	Emphatic speech
[]	Untranscribable noises not covered by another convention