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Abstract
Minority francophone youths in Canada are expected to carry the future of francophone communities but they are also attracted by the opportunities available within the dominants (Anglo-Canadian, North American) cultures. In the face of these assimilative pressures, regional and provincial francophone organizations in Ontario, Alberta and the maritime provinces sponsor annual summer games bringing together adolescents for a “French” weekend of sporting and cultural activities. The purpose of this ethnographic study of the Alberta Francophone Games, the Jeux de l’Acadie and the Jeux francophone ontariens is to further explore how minority francophone youths construct and express their identity. The analysis reveals that a sizeable proportion of participants reproduce it as a component of a hybrid identity. Hybridity in this context refers to teenagers’ integration of once distinct francophone and anglophone cultural identities into a new melting. Indeed, through interviews, drawings and questionnaires, adolescents give meaning to their sense of self and define themselves as “not just francophone.”

Résumé
On s’attend à ce que les jeunes des minorités francophones du Canada soient porteurs de l’avenir de leurs communautés, mais ils sont également attirés par les occasions que leur offrent les cultures (anglo-canadienne et nord-américaine) dominantes. Confrontés à ces pressions d’assimilation, les organismes francophones régionaux et provinciaux de l’Ontario, de l’Alberta et des provinces maritimes parrainent des jeux d’été annuels qui réunissent des adolescents pour un week-end d’activités sportives et culturelles « en français ». L’objectif de la présente étude ethnographique des Jeux francophones de l’Alberta, des Jeux de l’Acadie et des Jeux francophone ontariens est d’examiner de plus près la façon dont les jeunes des minorités francophones construisent et expriment leur identité. L’analyse révèle qu’une proportion importante des participants la reproduisent comme une composante d’une identité hybride. L’hybrideité dans ce contexte renvoie à l’intégration par ces adolescents de deux identités culturelles distinctes, les identités francophone et anglophone, dans un nouveau mélange. En effet, à travers les entrevues, les dessins et les questionnaires, ces jeunes confèrent un sens à leur représentation de soi et se définissent comme « pas juste francophone ».
Youth hybridity emerged as a significant and undeniable phenomenon in my research on the production of identities at the Alberta Francophone Games (Dallaire 1999; Dallaire and Whitson 1998). This annual event aims to promote and foster francophone pride and affiliation among French-speaking teenagers in Alberta. However, while the purpose of the study was to examine the reproduction of francophoneess, the empirical evidence revealed that many participants rejected a singular and unified francophone identity. They claimed to be both francophone and anglophone! That is, they were not only expressing their ability to speak both French and English, they were also identifying and claiming affiliation with both linguistic communities. Bilingualism was not merely a linguistic ability; it was an issue of belonging.

Studies of minority francophone youths have noted the increasing use of English in their everyday lives and the increasing frequency of bilingualism as a dimension of their identity. Much of this research has been geared toward explaining the linguistic shift of young francophones to a more predominant use of English as emblematic of the "problem of assimilation." For instance, the work of two influential researchers, Landry (Landry and Allard 1997; Landry 1995; Landry and Maggord 1992) and Bernard (1998, 1991), has focused on the deterministic impact of the family, school and social environments on francophone youths' linguistic practices. Hence, few scholars have attempted to theorize youths' self-definition as "bilingual" as a legitimate form of identity. Yet, Heller (1984) has provided some thoughts on the construction of a bilingual identity as youths' strategy to negotiate between their own diverse ethno-cultural backgrounds, their francophoneness and the dominance of English in most of their social interactions outside school and home. Nonetheless, Gérin-Lajoie (2001) observes that the emergence of the "bilingual" identity illustrates a more complex network of relationships to language than has yet been demonstrated in the research of francophone minorities. Furthermore, these emerging identities have not yet been examined as a mélange of both francophoneness and anglopheness. I thus turned to cultural studies and the concept of hybridity, drawing predominantly on Nederveen Pieterse's work (2001, 1997, 1994), to better understand minority francophone youth identities and their distinctiveness from other manifestations of francophoneness. This concept has provided the most salient ideas to inform the analysis as it allows a focus on the influence of youths' varied cultural experiences and the discursive environment in which they decide who they are and who they will be.

The study of francophone youth games in Canada has provided a rich empirical context to further explore how minority youth identities are produced and manifested. Francophones are a minority in Canada and this 6.8 million self-identified population represents 22.9% of the total Canadian population (Statistics Canada 2002). The greatest number of francophones (5.8 million or 85.5%) resides in Quebec, where they represent the majority (81.4%) of the province's population. The remaining 980,300 francophones (14.5%) live as minority groups in the other Canadian provinces and territories. These minorities are referred to as "francophone communities," must continually develop strategies to sustain francophone identifications among their younger generations constantly subjected to the homogenizing influences of English language popular culture and media. The Alberta Francophone Games (AFG), the Jeux de l'Acadie (JA) and the Jeux Francoontariens (JFO) are such attempts at community development and thus represent germane empirical sites to study teenagers' francophone identities. The purpose of this paper is to examine how francophoneness is in some cases reproduced as a component of hybrid identities, where youths integrate distinct francophone and anglophone subjectivities. The analysis uncovers the different manifestations of these hybrid identities in youths' self-definitions as "bilingual," "Canadian" and even "francophone."

Hybridity: Merger of Francophoneness and Anglopheneness

This study draws ideas about identity predominantly from cultural studies. Nelson, Treichler and Grossberg (1992) notice that cultural studies have recently "become increasingly concerned with the complex ways in which identity itself is articulated, experienced, and deployed" (p. 9). The theoretical dimension of the research is mostly informed by post-structuralism and, specifically, by the production of identity through discourse. Here, Foucault's (1984, 1983, 1976) discourse analysis offers a model for uncovering and understanding the linguistic and other symbolic practices through which affiliations are lived, and through which the social relationships that make up any collectivity are defined and publicly articulated. It thus offers theoretical tools to better understand how ways of talking and thinking contribute to the social construction of identity. These tools also help identify the kinds of affiliations produced, as well as the dynamics between multiple affiliations and the processes by which youths take on or resist francophone identities.

Butler's (1993, 1991, 1990) feminist adaptation of Foucault's discourse analysis has been helpful in developing an understanding of the francophone identity as performative—constituted through practices regulated by discourse. One becomes a francophone by "doing" the francophone. She argues that this performative dimension of identity refers to the "reiterative power of discourse to produce the phenomena that it regulates and constrains" (1993, p. 2). The francophone is produced through the regulatory practices in which she engages over and over again.
In fact, the performativity of identity presumes repeated acts. It is through doing the francophone that one's francophoneness is "established, instituted, circulated and confirmed" (Butler 1991, p. 18). It is also because identity is a repeated performance that it is unstable, open to contest and resistance.

If identity is a performance, disciplined francophone youths will perform the practices that define and produce francophones. However, discourses producing the francophone are competing with other discourses over youths' subjectivity. Indeed, identity is plural: these teenagers have multiple identities related to aspects of themselves other than their francophoneness such as gender, sexual orientation, social class and age. Identity is also hybrid: one can take on subject positions in different discourses within one identity category. For instance, this concept has been used to theorize cultural identities at the intersection of the global and the local (Kraidy 1999; Nederveen Pieterse 1997, 1994), modernity and tradition (Barth 1995) and the colonial and the colonized (Young 1995; Bhabha 1994). Studies on youth identities (Butcher and Thomas 2002; Kraidy 1999; Noble, Poynting and Tobar 1999) and on ethnicity (Meerwald 2001; Slabbert and Finlayson 2000; Romberg 1996) have also drawn on this concept to analyze diverse ethnic and linguistic border-crossing experiences.

Hybridity in this research specifically points to the combination of two subjectivities/identities within the cultural identity category, notably the merging of francophone and anglophone subjectivities. The hybrid cultural identities of minority francophone youths can be more complicated and complex in that they may also integrate, in addition to francophoneness and anglophoneness, other cultural affiliations. Indeed, the results of this research revealed that some of these teenagers declared various ethnic lineage such as African, Algerian, Armenian, Chinese, German, Greek, Italian, Lebanese, Norwegian, Scottish, Swiss and Ukrainian, to name but a few. However, the analysis of the hybridity of these youths is purposefully limited to an examination of the manifestation of their francophoneness and anglophoneness. This focus on identities related to French and English languages conveys the fact that participants primarily refer to related linguistic practices as core dimensions of their self-definition. This is not surprising as the point of francophone games is to provide a context in which adolescents will live "in French" to reduce or prevent their assimilation to the anglophone majority. French versus English linguistic practices are at the crux of the games, as they are in francophone minority identity discourses in Canada.

Hybridity thus designates the mixing of distinctive, but not fixed, cultural and linguistic identities into a new dual identity. It refers to the transgression of socially constructed cultural boundaries and the cross-border experience. Indeed, in response to the current anti-hybridity backlash (see Anthias 2001; Friedman 1999, 1997), Nederveen Pieterse (2001) provides a compelling argument for the salience of this concept as it problematizes essentialized boundaries. The author (2001, 1994) notes that while hybridity is based on the assumption of difference between cultures, paradoxically it also points to the similarities between them because they can be merged. This concept therefore simultaneously underlines the blending of cultures and their separateness. Young (1995, p. 5) explains that hybridity denotes the "intricate processes of cultural contact, intrusion, fusion and disjunction" while Papastergiadis (2000) reminds us that hybridity does not merely refer to the sum of the constitutive parts of identity. Indeed, to paraphrase him one could say that the hybrid identity young francophones claim is more than the addition of anglophoneness to a prior francophoneness and more than the conflict between them. It is, rather, the conjunction and juxtaposition of these two dimensions of identity, their collision and impossible reconciliation.

It is important to stress, however, that hybridity does not imply the merging of two stable cultures or identities (Bhabha 1994; Low 1991; Nederveen Pieterse 2001, 1994; Papastergiadis 2000; Young 1995). In this study, the concept of hybridity specifically refers to the intersection and transformation of two unstable identities into a new, again unstable, identity. It is heterogeneous and discontinuous. Bhabha (1994, p. 207) further explains that identities coming together into one are not previously settled into primordial polarities:

The margin of hybridity, were cultural differences “contingently” and conflictually touch, becomes the moment of panic which reveals the borderline experience. It resists the binary opposition of racial and cultural groups (...) as homogeneous polarized political consciousnesses.

Francophone and anglophone identities in Canada are certainly not produced from essential cultures nor are they static. They continually change and shift. What hybridity implies, however, is a disruption and integration of these two changing but distinct—historically constructed as opposed—identities. Francophone identity is contrasted with anglophone identity in identity discourses articulated within and outside francophone communities (Dallaire and Denis 2000). In such discourses, French mother tongue and speaking predominantly in French define francophones in opposition to anglophones who live in English. Despite francophones’ bilingualism, these discourses conceive English as a second language that remains less meaningful to self-identification.

In this context, francophone discourses provide the script to one’s performance of francophoneness, connectedness to French language and identification with francophone communities. However, young francophones take position not only in francophone discourses but also in other discourses linked to popular culture and Canadian nationalism; such discourses also organize and structure their identity practices. Together,
discourse analysis with the ideas of performative identities and hybridity provide for a more sophisticated understanding of the always fluid processes of identity formation in francophone communities.

**Francophone Youths' Hybridity**

Adolescents at the games expressed and gave meaning to their francophone identity through semi-directed interviews, drawings and questionnaires. I conducted 30-minute group interviews with 39 participants (28 girls and 11 boys) during the 1997 AFG. At the 2001 JA, two trained graduate students assisted me in conducting 36 group interviews with 175 participants (104 girls and 71 boys). During the 2001 JFO, 29 group interviews were conducted by the same research team with 107 participants (59 girls and 48 boys). Most respondents were interviewed in groups of three to six youths, but some individual interviews were also conducted. The same interview guide, slightly adapted for each of the games, was followed for all interviews and invited respondents to discuss the following: a) the games, b) how they conceived of their own identity and c) how they conceived of francophone identity and community (see Annex 1). All interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed.

After the group interviews, youths were provided with a pencil and an 8.5 x 11-inch sheet of paper and were asked to draw what they viewed as francophone identity or community (see the last item in Annex 1). This transposition of thoughts to picture complemented the statements and definitions provided in the interviews. Most respondents drew a sketch. In cases where youths declared being unable to visualize the francophone community or identity in terms of a picture, they were asked to write a statement describing it. A total of 26 drawings and statements were collected at the 1997 AFG, 112 drawings and statements at the 2001 JFO and 181 drawings and statements at the 2001 JA.

Short-answer questionnaires were also administered at the three games to collect demographic data as well as information about youths’ francophone identity, linguistic practices and involvement in community activities. The response rates from participants were high: 93% at the 1996 AFG, 91% at the 1997 AFG, 78% at the 2001 JA and 77% at the 2001 JFO.

While the interview and questionnaire covered various themes, the following analysis draws only from youths’ answers to the questions about identity and focuses on participants who manifestly produced themselves as hybrids in articulating “bilingual,” “Canadian” and even “francophone” identities. Indeed, these empirical data reveal that hybridization unquestionably shaped the francophoneseness of a sizeable proportion of adolescents at the games. In the case of these minority francophone youths, hybridity refers to their integration of an anglophone dimension into a new, combined francophones and anglophone identity. For instance, the following teenagers put forward different identity markers to emphasize their dual affiliation because existing identity discourses do not necessarily or explicitly construct or acknowledge hybrid identities.

**Chercheur – Si je vous demandais qu’elle identité vous êtes, vous me diriez quoi?**


B – Canadienne bilingue.

C – Oh... eh... Canadienne. Non. Anglaise-française. Non... Canadienne française. Non. Tu sais, les deux!

**Chercheur – Les deux?**

C – Canadienne Anglaise-française. (AFG/E4 1997)

Indeed, the first young girl refused the anglophone category, the second girl qualified her choice of “Canadian” and the third one considered various options and finally added a different qualifier to “Canadian.” In each case, they aimed to highlight their affiliation with both francophoneseness and anglophoneness. That they chose different identity markers to emphasize their hybridity demonstrates that current identity discourses and related identifiers do not, or at least not suitably, convey the meaning they wish to put forward.

In talking about who and what they are, many youths spontaneously refer to speaking both French and English and belonging to more than the francophone community. The quotes show that participants take on subject positions not only in francophone discourses, they enunciate statements that produce them as anglophones as well, some slightly, others predominantly. Their identity narrative goes beyond merely describing their linguistic abilities; it relates their sense of belonging to not only the francophone community but to the larger Canadian context. In that sense, they refuse the “either or” perspective of the hegemonic dichotomy that opposes what it means to be a francophone or an anglophone. In other words, they draw on both francophone and anglophone/Canadian discourses to create a mixed identity. This is what distinguishes hybrid youths from others who also speak both French and English, yet draw only on francophone discourses to construct their sense of self.

Hybridity is a process and the analysis shows that, in some cases, youths are effectively producing integrated dual identities such as is shown in the first quote presented at the beginning of this paper. That teenager clearly states that he is not just a francophone, he is a francophone and an anglophone. The following quote expresses the same idea but in a way that shows that the term “bilingual” refers to more than a linguistic ability for some youths; it means that they identify with more than the francophone community:
questionnaires, “bilingual” was also provided as an example and, again, an equivalent proportion of youths chose it as their main identity (see table 2).

In some cases, youths chose the term “bilingual” because they did not share in the ethnic cultures predominantly associated to francophones:

Bilingue. Soit ça ou Acadien, Non, pas Acadien, je n’ai pas la parenté accadienne. J’aime mieux être bilingue.” (JA/E/K30#5 2001)

This young boy at the Jeux de l’Acadie felt he could not claim Acadian identity since he did not have Acadian roots, hence his preference for the term “bilingual.” However, the same identity was claimed by adolescents who did have francophone ancestry and had learned French as a first language but they chose it because they lived part of their lives in English:

J – Je m’identifie comme bilingue et mon père… Ma mère est francophone, mais mon père… il est francophone, mais plus bilingue, à cause qu’il parle plus l’anglais que le français. Mais il peut parler assez bien le français. Mais ma mère, depuis que je suis petite, je parle seulement le français avec ma mère. Et depuis ce temps, j’ai appris les deux langues également. Et je m’identifie comme bilingue à cause que je suis… On parle le français des fois à la maison, mais depuis… Puisque nous sommes dans une communauté anglophone plus ou moins…

(…) J – (…) Depuis que je suis jeune, je parle le français à la maison et alors je m’identifie comme bilingue à cause que je suis dans une communauté anglophone.” (JFO/E/C18#1, 2001)

Living and participating in anglophone communities is important in their identity construction. Other youths of Acadian or French-Canadian heritage who strongly associated with francophones added “bilingual” to highlight their knowledge of English, even though they lived in a predominantly francophone village or town. While their francophones was important to them, so was their bilingualism.

A – Acadien.
B – Acadien puis…
(…) 

Chercheur – B, tu disais Acadien puis…
B – On est bilingue aussi. On peut parler anglais et français.” (JAE/C29#1, 2001)

Je serais un Acadien bilingue. Je suis un Acadien, je parle français, mais il ne faut pas oublier aussi que je peux parler anglais. Ça vient en aide, des fois. Mais surtout Acadien parce que mes origines sont acadiennes.” (JAE/K30#5, 2001)

"Bilingual" as a Marker of Hybridity

Researchers have noted the emergence of the “bilingual” identity marker among minority francophone youths (Bernard 1998; Boissonneault 1996; Bouchard 1996; Gérin-Lajoie 2001; Gingras 1993; Hébert 1996; Marchand 1998). It is the most obvious expression of youth hybridity. This term was not provided as an example of identity on the 1996 AFG participant questionnaire, and no teenager suggested it as an alternative that best described them in the space provided for “other” identities. However, when it was introduced on the 1997 questionnaire, 16.8% of the participants chose it (see table 1). On the 2001 JFO and 2001 JA participant
The above two quotes are relevant in demonstrating that these young boys do not only assume subject positions in the Acadian ethnic discourse by referring to their lineage and cultural practices, they also combine a “bilingual” component to their identity because they want to underline their ability to speak English. In doing so, they articulate two different identity discourses in order to explain the importance of bilingualism in their identity construction, as opposed to youths who clearly and strictly enunciate francophone definitions to outline who they are. Hybrid youths are not rejecting francophones. But they underscore the anglophone component of their identity since monolingual francophones does not adequately represent their sense of self. Identity discourses in Canada are significant meaningful to linguistic practices. Since these youths recognize such discourses, they are aware that their own performativity—speaking both French and English—produces two different identities, francophone and anglophone. Indeed, some teenagers who clearly valued their francophones (still chose the term “bilingual” to identify themselves and state their knowledge of English.

Je dirais plus que je suis peut-être bilingue parce que ma langue maternelle est française, mais je parle beaucoup anglais aussi. Puis être bilingue, c’est vraiment important dans la société d’aujourd’hui parce que tu as un avantage sur tous les autres si tu es francophone et anglophone. Alors, tu as un avantage.”

(JFO/E/C21/# 3 2001)

Such quotes reveal that youths may predominantly identify as francophones yet still insist on showing that their identity construction is more complex and extends beyond their francophones. They participate in and affiliate with what are discursively constructed as two separate worlds, the French-speaking community and the English-speaking majority.

The results presented in table 6 further support the argument that hybrid identities are not only claimed by youths of linguistically mixed families. Indeed, a fairly large proportion of teenagers who identified as “bilingual” declared having only French as a first language and having Acadian or French-Canadian ancestry. Furthermore, the most frequent reason youths at the JA (77.1%) and at the JFO (70.1%) invoked to rationalize their chosen identity was their active bilingualism (see table 4). The fact that they actively spoke both French and English was also the most common reason provided by JA athletes (20.2%) and by JFO participants (18.4%) to explain their choice of identity, whatever term they chose as the most suitable expression of who and what they are (see table 2). Obviously, identifying as “bilingual” or adding it to express a combined identity was not merely related to one’s first language or ethnicity.

“Canadian” as a Marker of Hybridity

Youths’ choice of the “Canadian” identity was another manifestation of their hybridity. Interviews reveal that “Canadian,” according to teenagers, is synonymous with bilingualism and with involvement in both francophone and anglophone constituencies of Canadian society. Practically all youths interviewed at the three games viewed Canada as a bilingual nation, as opposed to a bi-national country as enunciated in AFOS organizers and Alberta francophone leaders’ discourses (Dallaire and Denis 2000). Indeed, youths perceived Canada as a nation with two official languages, presumably equal in political status. Thus, when asked to define themselves, they answered:

– C’est la même chose pour moi. Ce serait Canadien parce que les Canadiens, on est supposé être bilingue.” (J/A/E/V1#1 2001)

Moi, c’est Canadienne Franco-Ontarienne. Juste parce que le Canada, c’est français-anglais. N’oubliez pas, il y a le français dedans. Que tu sois n’importe où, en Ontario, en Colombie-Britannique, au Yukon ou au Nunavut, tu as le droit de parler français. C’est ton droit. La langue, les deux langues nationales, c’est français, anglais. Que je sois en Allemagne, que je sois au Portugal, que je sois n’importe où, je suis Canadienne Franco-Ontarienne.” (JFO/E/C19#1 2001)

In talking about their Canadian identity, participants underlined their knowledge of Canada’s two official languages. Even youths who had French as a first language and shared French-Canadian or Acadian ethnicity stressed the importance of their ability to speak English in the construction of their identity:

Chercheur – Quelles sont vos origines culturelles ?

(…)

R – (…) Mes parents… Je suis française, mais je suis Canadienne… Ça se peut, Canadienne bilingue ?

Plusieurs: Oui.

R – Je me dirais [Canadienne bilingue], parce que je parle le français, mais je parle aussi l’anglais égal, on dirait. Et puis, je ne sais pas, ma famille est française. Les deux bords de ma famille, leurs grands-parents et tout ça. Je suis de descente française, mais je ne me dirais pas juste française parce que je ne sais pas… Je suis anglaise aussi. Je dirais Canadienne bilingue.” (JFO/E/C19#1 2001)

It is in this perspective that they developed their identity as national—they were Canadians because they spoke both French and English. In this sense, youths did not necessarily choose “Canadian” as an identity to reject their
francophones, an ethnicity they took as a given but, rather, to specify their hybridity—they were “more” than francophones because the English language also played a significant role in their self-definition. Butcher and Thomas (2002) observed as well that Middle-Eastern and Asian youth in West Sydney expressed a strong attachment to their ethnic heritage while decidedly identifying as Australian. Noble, Poynting and Tobar (1999) also encountered this form of hybridity as Arabic-speaking male youths in Sydney described themselves as Lebanese-Australian to express, on one hand, an essentialized ethnicity they took for granted and, on the other hand, their participation in Australian society.

Other youths, however, identified as “Canadians” to emphasize the primacy of English in their lives. These participants were mostly from families in which neither of the parents spoke French and these youths had learned French in school as a second language.

Je dirais Canadienne parce que ma langue nationale est anglaise et dans ma maison c’est anglais. Et je ne veux pas comme abandonner cette langue pour la francophone parce que ce n’est pas vrai. Alors, je dirais que je suis Canadienne. (AFG/E2 1997)

Je dirais que je suis Canadienne, puis je suis plutôt [anglophone], mais je peux parler le français assez bien, so les deux. (JFO/E/K18/12 2001)

These girls were not at all denying their ability to speak French. They identified as Canadians because they had closer ties to the English language that, according to them, prevented them from primarily identifying as francophones, even if they were participating in an event that celebrated francophonesness. Thus, youths from the majority group may also reproduce themselves as hybrids, at least in a particular context that emphasizes the nation’s two official languages. While this paper focuses on francophone youths, the larger study of the production of francophonesness at the games reveals that young French-speaking anglophones at the AFG and at the JFO are also redefining their identity as hybrid, adding francophone subjectivity to their predominant anglophone subjectivity.

Identifying as Canadian became a strategy for other youths to manifest their mixed heritage and dual belonging. As Phoenix and Owen (2000) found in their study of young Londoners of black and white parentage, youths at the games from linguistically mixed parentage resisted being strictly associated with either the francophone or the anglophone group.

Canadien. Parce que si quelqu’un me demande quelle nationalité ou quelle identité, moi je suis Canadien à cause… Bien je suis fier de mon pays, mais aussi du fait que nous sommes officiellement bilingues. J’ai le droit de parler en anglais, j’ai le droit de parler en français, puis d’étudier dans la langue de mon choix. Et c’est pour ça. Parce que moi, je ne suis pas francophone au bout, mais je ne suis pas anglais au bout non plus. Et c’est pour ça, parce que le

Canada, c’est un pays multiculturel. Et moi, étant né d’une mère française et d’un père anglais, je suis directement bilingue. Et c’est pour ça que je dirais que je suis Canadien avant. (FESFO/E3/2001)

What appears obvious for all these young participants, regardless of their parentage, is that identifying as “Canadian” or as “bilingual” is an explicit refusal of singular cultural identities. Indeed, such identities become strategies to show their francophonesness but to underline that they conceive of themselves as anglophones as well.

“Canadian” was the AFG participants’ most frequently chosen identity (see table 1) but it was the third choice of JFO and JA youths (see table 2). Questionnaire results indicate that country of origin and national sense of belonging were the most frequent reasons JA and JFO youths provided for identifying as “Canadians” (see table 5). Interviews further clarify that, for youths, Canada’s defining trait is its two official languages. Questionnaire answers further support this interpretation because the second most frequent explanation provided for youths’ choice of “Canadian” as their main identity was their active bilingualism. In addition, affiliation to the Canadian nation was a close second in the overall most frequent reasons youths indicated to explain their identity (see table 2) and accounted for 14.5% of all explanations provided by JFO participants and 15.9% of those offered by JA athletes.

Not only does the analysis of interviews support the notion that youths chose “Canadian” to underline that they were more than just francophones, the comparison between the 1996 and 1997 AFG questionnaire answers also gives credence to this argument (see table 1). Indeed, once the example “bilingual” was added in 1997 to the question on identity, the frequency of the answer “Canadian” diminished. AFG youths then clearly chose “Canadian” to point to their dual connection to francophonesness and anglophonesness. The combined proportion of youths who declared Canadian and bilingual identities in 1997 (52%) was quite similar to the proportion of youths who chose only “Canadian” in 1996 (46.5%). Furthermore, the addition of “bilingual” on the 1997 AFG questionnaire did not change the proportion of total identities explicitly indicating francophonesness, which remained close to 45% for both 1996 and 1997.

Even “Francophone” Identities Can Be Markers of Hybridity

A third manifestation of youths’ hybridity emerged in their explanations of their francophonesness. In fact, youths’ bilingualism was significant in their self-definition even if they chose to identify as francophones.

Moi, je trouve que Franco-Ontarien, Ontarien bilingue, c’est pratiquement la même chose. Parce que Franco-Ontarien, ça sous-entend presque que tu parles le français et aussi l’anglais. C’est ça que c’est. Les Franco-Ontariens ne sont pas seulement
They do so because dominant discourses construct monolingual francophone identities and they insist on demonstrating their participation in more than francophone communities.

Nonetheless, despite the insistence of at least half of AFG participants and more than a third of JA and JFO youths on their dual affiliation in their questionnaire and interview answers, only one out of the total 315 drawings collected explicitly portrays hybridity. Only one girl at the JA produced an illustration that clearly indicated a hybrid version of Acadian identity (see figure 1). However, one boy at the JFO noted the bilingual character of francophones in Ontario (see figure 2) while four AFG participants specified that at least some members, if not all, of the francophone community speak both French and English (see, for instance, figure 3). 13

It is important to note that youths were not asked to depict their identity. They were instead instructed to draw or write a statement about what francophone identity and/or community meant to them (see the last item in Annex 1). Accordingly, youths most likely focused on illustrating "francophoneness" as a concept rather than portraying their own identity. Such instructions effectively explain why the drawings did not reflect youths' claimed hybrid identities; they were invited to draw francophone identity in general.

Noteworthy is the disparity between participants' insistence on their proficiency in English during the interviews and its absence from the drawings produced immediately after the discussions. Based on such statements in interviews and on the fact that they themselves identify with the francophone community, one would have expected that more youths would have depicted francophones as having a dual affiliation or at least
described bilingualism as a characteristic of members of the francophone community. Youths act as hybrids or claim hybrid identities, but they reproduce dominant discourses about distinct and singular francophone and anglophone identities in illustrating francophoneness and the francophone community.

Conditions of Possibility of Francophone Youths’ Hybridity

What is remarkable about the questionnaire results concerning the explicit hybridity of francophone youths’ identity is that the same proportion (16.8-19%) of participants at the three games chose “bilingual” as the term that best represents them. While one would have expected adolescents with both French and English as first languages to choose this hybrid identity, the proportion of youths with French as a first language who preferred to identify as hybrids is surprising. Furthermore, youths’ performance of French varied: JA participants demonstrated the strongest francophone-

**Figure 2** – *Jeux franco-ontariens* youth drawing (JFO/EV/21#1a) identifying the dimensions of francophone identity/community: friends, language, [FESFO] forums, culture, constant struggle, fun, interesting, FESFO, bilingual, heritage, 8th games, social.

*La communauté francophone est un communiqué des deux personnes, c'est pourquoi que la personne du langage francophone sont une personne hybride, le français et le deuxième langage, l'anglais. Je pense que la communication, si tu es une partie de la communauté francophone, il est un grand honneur. Aussi, si tu es une partie de la communauté francophone, c'est plus facile à rencontrer des nouveaux personnes ou à parler deux langues.*

*Figure 3* – Alberta Francophone Games youth drawing (AFG/E8#25) specifying that members of the francophone community are of French mother tongue and speak English as a second language.

ness, AFG youths the weakest performance of francophoneness and JFO teenagers somewhere in between (Dallaire and Denis, in press). Despite the fact these youths live different minority circumstances, in which some practically live all their lives in French and others only live a diminishing part of their lives in French, there were as many “bilinguals” at each of the games. This indicates the dominance of discourses producing Canadian bilingualism in the production of francophone youth identities. These discourses, produced outside the borders of the francophone community and reproduced among francophones, become another resource youths use to give meaning to their practices and to themselves. The fact that affiliation to the Canadian nation was the second most frequent reason provided to explain youth identities, second to active bilingualism, further supports the notion that Canadian discourses influence the production of youth identities. Both rationalizations, active bilingualism and nationalism, draw on the same discourses about Canadian identity. A second and more explicit indication of the importance of Canadian discourses on youths’ sense of self is the use of the term “Canadian” to best define who and what they are.

Indeed, discourses depicting Canada as a bilingual country in which both French and English are official languages and are meant to have the same status play a critical role in the construction of youths’ hybrid identities. Championed, for instance, by the federal government and enacted through the legally-established linguistic rights regime including the *Canadian*
Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Official Languages Act, such discourses appeal to francophone youths as they draw on them in assuming that a Canadian speaks both languages. Thus, discourses on Canada's linguistic duality allow teenagers to identify with a presumed bilingual majority and to reproduce themselves as hybrids. This is an interesting phenomenon because, in other versions of the Canadian linguistic duality, the bilingualism of Canada means that one may communicate with the federal government in either French or English, and that Canadian institutions may offer services in both languages, but also that individual Canadians are not necessarily, nor should they have to be, bilingual. The domination of the discourse on the bilingualism of Canadians over youths' identities is furthermore noteworthy when, in reality, only 17.7% of Canadians can conduct a conversation in both official languages, and the proportion of bilingual francophones (43.4%) is five times higher than the proportion of bilingual anglophones (9.0%) (Statistics Canada 2002).

Why would minority francophone youths believe the fiction and myth of bilingualism as a criterion of Canadian identity rather than as a feature of the Canadian nation? Interviews demonstrate that youths are aware that there are unilingual anglophone Canadians. Indeed they interact with them often, if not daily, whether they are friends, neighbours or even parents (when youths come from anglophone families where children have learned French through French immersion programs). One explanation may be that bilingualism has slightly increased from 16% in 1991 to 17.7% in 2001 (Statistics Canada 2002), and that the proportion of bilingual 15- to 24-year-olds (24%) is higher than the rate of bilingualism among 25- to 64-year-olds (19%) (Statistics Canada 1997). Thus, more young people are bilingual. The higher rate of bilingualism in francophone communities (84%) (Statistics Canada 1997), which demonstrates that minority francophones are more likely to be able to speak English than francophones living in Quebec or are more likely to be bilingual than anglophones anywhere in the country, perhaps also contributes to youths' belief that Canadians speak both French and English. Young participants who live in francophone communities are most likely in contact with other francophones who, like them, are bilingual. Accordingly, in their minds, bilingualism is common.

While other researchers have noticed the significance of francophone youths' bilingualism in their identity construction, this research contributes to Canadian and francophone studies by showing that teenagers do not declare being "bilingual" to merely refer to linguistic abilities. They instead intend to show that they not only speak French and English, but that they belong to "more than" francophone communities. The use of discourse theory to further understand youth identity narratives reveals that what has so far been limited to an examination of "bilingual" identities can in fact be a manifestation of hybridity, a multi-faceted phenomenon. Youths express this duality not only through identifying as "bilingual," but also through their choices of "Canadian" and even "francophone" labels. This analysis, then, shows that while "Canadian" may represent a structural affiliation with the country (rather than with the province or the francophone community) and "francophone" labels can refer to a linguistic or cultural affiliation to francophones as was demonstrated in Boissonnault (1996), Théberge (1998) and Lafontant (2000), they can also implicate francophones when articulated in teenagers' identity narratives. That adolescents may attribute different meanings to identity markers compels a nuanced and tentative interpretation of the questionnaire results presented in tables 1 and 2. Youths may add an anglophone dimension to francophone labels just as they may include francophones in their understanding of Canadian identity. Questionnaire results illustrate whether youths predominantly and explicitly identify with francophones or whether they manifestly wish to show that they have other affiliations as well. But the number of youths who conceive of themselves as "more than" francophones may be higher than the combined number of youths who identify as "Canadian" and "bilingual."

Not only is francophone youths' hybridity complicated by its different manifestations, it is also complex in that adolescents produce themselves as hybrids for different reasons: non-francophone ethnic lineage, dual cultural heritage, performance of anglophone linguistic practices and perceived lack of francophones. Furthermore, this study shows that hybridity is not only reproduced by teenagers of linguistically mixed families or by French-speaking adolescents who predominantly and most spontaneously perform as anglophones, as has been argued in previous research on "bilingual" practices and identities. Indeed, other youths who perform mostly as francophones and who feel a strong emotional and pragmatic attachment to their francophones also construct themselves as hybrids.

The fact that these were teenagers willingly taking part in events aimed at promoting francophones, in addition to the fact that the first part of the interview focused on the francophone mandate of the games, makes youths' insistence on the anglophone dimension of their identity even more noteworthy. Indeed, if anything, the interview questions preceding the identity item had emphasized francophoneseness (see Annex I). Yet, rather than merely repeating francophone discourses to describe how they conceive of themselves, teenage participants construct themselves as hybrids. This is largely related to the minority character of francophone communities and youths' desire to assume full integration in Canadian society, enabled by their understanding of Canada as a bilingual nation. In this case hybridity is minority youths' strategy to associate with the majority without forsaking francophoneseness. Their drawings reveal that they may understand themselves as hybrids, but they reproduce singular francophone discourses in depicting the francophone community. They establish a clear distinction between who they are and the monolithic character of francophone communities. It is in this context that
subjectivities produced in Canadian identity discourses become more attractive to them.

The interview quotes presented in the above analysis demonstrate that in some cases youths express a reflexive and deliberate integrated dual identity. Yet, in other cases, they spontaneously and ambiguously enunciate statements produced in what are predominantly articulated as contradictory francophone and anglophone identity discourses in Canada. That they use different identity markers to illustrate their hybridity shows that there is no current identity discourse that clearly and unequivocally produces hybrid—francophone and anglophone—identities. Although youths draw on discourses of Canadian bilingualism, they sometimes feel the need to qualify their choice of a “Canadian” identity to explicitly underline dual affiliation to francophonesness and anglophonesness. Hence, even the Canadian discourse does not appear to completely satisfy their desire to stress the hybrid dimension of their sense of self.

Conclusion

Hybridity is a concept that appropriately describes contemporary minority francophone youth identities in Canada. Today’s youths may identify with more than one ethnic label since their parents and grandparents do not always share the same cultural origins. More importantly, teenagers take up practices of English language popular culture, regardless of their cultural heritage. Francophone youths engage, at the least, in practices associated with both francophonesness and anglophonesness. While this discussion of the hybridity of young francophones’ cultural practices was limited to a binary opposition between francophone and anglophone practices, their cultural practices should not be reduced to the French language versus English language dichotomy. In their everyday activities, they mix various cultural practices, creating their own sense of self as cultural and linguistic hybrids. Amit-Talai (1995, p. 231) also accurately reminds us that youth cultural activities draw “elements from home-grown as well as transnational influences, and intertwine with class, gender, ethnicity and locality with all the cultural diversity that such a multiplicity of circumstances compels.” In this sense, identity becomes more complex in the increasingly globalized world. Teenagers emphasize their loyalty to the francophone community yet at the same time engage in cultural practices that establish their participation in global, commercialized and mediated values and lifestyles.

Drawing on Thomas’s (2000) analysis of hybrid cultural artifacts, and in light of Butler’s concept of performative identities, it is argued that youths’ mixed linguistic practices are not merely markers of hybrid identities; they are also strategies that reproduce francophone, bilingual and Canadian identities in Canada today as hybrid identities. Indeed, alternating between French and English is not only an expression of anglophone and francophone hybridity, it is a performance, a discursive technology that creates these hybrid identities and a new Canadian context. Furthermore, this study shows that hybrid identities are not merely the enunciation of an intellectual elite or of “cosmopolitans” (Friedman 1997). Minority rural youths who have not experienced emigration or urbanity claim complex and multiple affiliations. The research shows that by identifying as “more than” an ethnicity that is taken for granted, these youths are strategically producing themselves as hybrids. This empirical evidence demonstrates that, as opposed to Friedman’s (1997) criticism, the point is not to define others as hybrids, but to reveal how they represent and articulate the hybrid identities they themselves construct and reproduce.

What is also significant of hybridity is that it generates agency and consciousness (Mujcinovic 2001). Like other minority youths (Butcher and Thomas 2002; Gauthier 1999; Noble et al. 1999; Stimpf 1997), francophone youths reproduce strategic and positional hybrid identities. This issue of youths’ agency, their active and conscious choices among possible subjectivities, is especially important in the context of francophone community building and it requires further analysis. Francophone youths in Canada tactically transgress the borders of francophonesness and anglophonesness in a continual movement between these different subjectivities, thus resisting and contesting the minority status of francophonesness, as they position themselves in the English-speaking Canadian majority. Francophone identity is, to a certain extent, a choice. Participants at the games were no different than other young people such as those interviewed by Phoenix and Owen (2000, p. 92) who “were clear that they made their own decisions about whether to accept or reject the constructions their parents, teachers and friends attempted to persuade them to use.” It is this agency that allows them to draw on different cultural practices to reinvent themselves as hybrids. Youths are not only active agents in the hybridization of cultures; they actually increase the pace of cultural change (Jordaan 1995). However, it should be emphasized that as “free” subjects youths can only choose from the discursive possibilities open to them. In the same way that particular circumstances limit young people’s choices in Kathmandu to mediated views of Nepali identity (Lucy Luchih 1995), young francophones’ reproduction of hybrid identities in Canada occurs in a specific discursive environment that opens some possibilities but restricts other alternatives. In this sense, their choice is constrained.

The francophone subject is particularly unstable, open to resistance and re-invention in today’s Canada and youths’ hybridity points to the strong influence of Canadian identity discourses produced outside the community. What does this mean for the future of francophone communities? To attract and retain younger generations among their ranks, francophone institutions must acknowledge youths’ rejection of a unified francophone identity and recognize their hybridity as a legitimate form of identity. As for the children
of immigrants in Quebec (Mirneault et al. 2002), minority francophone youths value their hybridity and see it as a considerable advantage, allowing them full access to the dominant society while retaining a measure of cultural specificity. The challenge, then, for francophone communities is to open up the discursive possibilities to ensure that youths will continue to reproduce themselves as francophones despite seeking other affiliations as well.

Understanding minority youth subjectivities as hybrid identities should not be viewed as a theoretical camouflage to ignore the real problem of francophone youth linguistic transfers currently undermining the future of francophone communities. Instead, hybridity allows a more sophisticated understanding of the complexity of these teenagers’ identity construction process. The concept of “assimilation” so far articulated in francophone studies assumes that youths “lose” a stable and monolithic francophone identity to adopt another fixed and singular anglophone identity. In conjunction with the concept of hybridity discourse analysis underlines the fluid and complicated process of identity construction and this paper has consequently demonstrated the shared muddled character of francophone youths’ hybrid identities at the Alberta Francophone Games, the Jeux de l’Acadie and the Jeux franco-ontariens. However, whether the production of hybrid identities is a necessary step to the complete linguistic transfers of minority youths to English remains to be explored. Canadian discourses do not exercise the same impact in all francophone communities. In fact, combined bilingual and Canadian identities were more pronounced at the AFG (total 51.6%) than at the JFO (37.3%) and at the JA (33.6%), while explicit francophone identities were more frequently chosen by JFO (55%) and by JA (54%) youths than among AFG youths (45%) in 1996 and in 1997. Furthermore, hybridity does not mean that francophones is equally, softly blended with anglophones. To better understand the context in which French-speaking teenagers constitute their identities, it is necessary to examine the discursive struggle between francophone and anglophone/Canadian discourses as well as the influence of the different demographic, social and political status of French language in the different Canadian provinces. Can hybridity have a stabilizing effect in allowing youths to maintain their francophones while claiming integration in the larger Canadian society? That is the topic of another paper on the comparative analysis of youths’ asymmetrical hybridities at the three francophone games (Dallaire and Denis, in press).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claimed Identity</th>
<th>1996 %</th>
<th>1997 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Canadian</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco-Albertan</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francophone</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albertan</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francophile</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Identity</th>
<th>JFO 2001</th>
<th>JA 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franco-Ontarian/Acadian</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Canadian</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francophone</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Canadian</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco-Canadian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for choosing overall identity</th>
<th>Overall reasons for “Franco-Ontarian/Acadian” as main identity</th>
<th>JFO 2001</th>
<th>JA 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active bilingualism</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is what I am</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francophoneness</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province/Acadie</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for choosing overall bilingual identity</th>
<th>Overall reasons for bilingual as main identity</th>
<th>JFO 2001</th>
<th>JA 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active bilingualism</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is what I am</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francophoneness</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of affiliation to or proficiency in French</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English is habitual/routine</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall reasons for Canadian as main identity</th>
<th>JFO 2001</th>
<th>JA 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active bilingualism</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is what I am</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francophoneness</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of affiliation to or proficiency in French</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English is habitual/routine</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of youths who declared “bilingual” as their main identity</th>
<th>JA 2001</th>
<th>AFG 1997</th>
<th>JFO 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Canadian</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acadian</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Canadian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French and English</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 1

Participant interview guide for the Jeux de l’Acadie. This interview guide was adapted for the Alberta Francophone Games and the Jeux franco-ontariens.

1) Parlez-moi des Jeux de l’Acadie?
   - Qu’est-ce que ça représente pour vous?
   - Qui vous a parlé des Jeux de l’Acadie?
   - Comment étaient les Jeux régionaux dans lesquels vous avez été sélectionnés pour venir à la Finale ? Qu’est-ce que vous avez pensé de ces Jeux régionaux?
   - Pourquoi s’y impliquer cette année?
   - Si ce n’est pas votre première participation aux Jeux de l’Acadie, pourquoi y êtes-vous allé la première fois?
   - Que pensez-vous de la formule des Jeux?
   - Que pensez-vous des activités sociales aux Jeux? (cérémonies d’ouverture, concerts…)
   - Est-ce que vous encourageriez d’autres élèves de votre école à prendre part aux Jeux de l’Acadie?
   - Si oui, si vous deviez faire la promotion dans les écoles pour encourager d’autres jeunes à prendre part aux Jeux de l’Acadie, qu’est-ce que vous leur diriez?
   - S’il y avait quelque chose à changer/améliorer aux Jeux, ce serait quoi?
   - Aux Jeux, vous parlez généralement en français, en anglais ou les deux? Et les autres participants que vous avez croisés, ils parlent en français ou en anglais? Comment réagissez-vous à ça? Vous croyez que c’est important de parler en français aux Jeux?
   - C’est difficile de parler en français? Ça vous dérange?
   - Est-ce que c’est important d’avoir une cérémonie spirituelle aux Jeux de l’Acadie? (Il n’y a pas de messe catholique, mais il y aura une célébration quelconque)

2) Qu’est-ce qui est le plus important : l’excellence des compétitions sportives ou le caractère acadien des Jeux?
   - Est-ce plus important de se rencontrer et d’avoir du plaisir ou est-ce plus important de bien performer dans son sport?
   - Est-ce qu’on remet des prix et des médailles? C’est important de remettre des prix et des médailles?
3) Décrivez votre identité

Quelle étiquette vous représente le mieux? (Acadien, francophone, Canadien, bilingue, Canadien français...)

*Après que les jeunes ont expliqué comment ils s'identifient, passer aux questions suivantes.

-Informations démographiques: âge, lieu de naissance, langue maternelle...

-Vos parents parlent le français? C'est leur langue maternelle?

-Quelles sont vos origines culturelles? (ethniques: p. ex., Acadien, Canadien français pure laine, Perse, Haïtien, Irlandais, Britannique, Anglais...)?

-Vous parlez surtout en français à la maison?

-Pourquoi aller à l'école française?

-Durant vos périodes de loisirs, qu'est-ce que vous faites? (télé, radio, musique, sport, lecture, cinéma – en français ou en anglais?)

-Vous parlez surtout en français ou en anglais avec vos amis?

-À part les Jeux de l'Acadie, est-ce que vous participez à d'autres activités acadiennes, francophones ou en français? (club de théâtre, festivals, tinnamare...)

4) Définir l'identité « acadienne »/francophone: Qu'est-ce que c'est un « Acadien »? Qui est « Acadien »? ou « francophone » ou « Canadien »? (selon la façon dont les jeunes se définissent à la question précédente)

*Après que les jeunes ont expliqué comment ils définissent l'identité choisie, passer aux questions suivantes.

-Est-ce qu'il faut parler français pour être Acadien?

-Est-ce qu'il faut être de descendance acadienne (que nos ancêtres aient vécu la déportation) pour être Acadien? (par exemple, si je déménageais au Nouveau-Brunswick est-ce que je serais considérée « Acadienne » même si mes ancêtres ne sont pas de l'Acadie et qu'il n'ont pas vécu la déportation?)

-Est-ce que je peux être Acadien si je suis de descendance acadienne mais que je ne parle pas français?

-Est-ce qu'il faut être de langue maternelle française pour être « Acadien » ou « francophone »?

-Est-ce qu'il faut participer aux activités ou aux institutions de la communauté? (p. ex., lire le journal francophone, écouter la télé en français,

aller à l'école française, participer aux activités des organismes francophones...)

5) Quel est le rôle des Jeux de l'Acadie pour l'Acadie ou pour les Acadiens?

Quelle est la place des Jeux en Acadie? (c.-à-d., si vous dites que participer aux Jeux rend fier d'être Acadien, qu'est-ce qu'il y a aux Jeux qui développe cette fierté? Pourquoi on serait fier d'être « Acadien » quand on repart des Jeux?)

6) Faire un dessin de la communauté acadienne/francophone (comment représenteriez-vous la communauté acadienne/francophone sur papier?)

Ou écrire une définition de l'identité francophone/acadienne ou une définition de la communauté acadienne/francophone ou une définition de l'Acadie.
“Not Just Francophone”: The Hybridity of Minority Francophone Youths in Canada

includes such labels as Acadian, Franco-Albertan, Franco-Ontarian, French Canadian, francophone, francophone and bilingual. As in Butler’s (1990) work, this is an attempt to open the concept and consider all possible meanings. Yet, while I seek to broaden the meaning of francophoneness, research shows how members of the community produce definitions of the francophone that limit and restrict it. Indeed, there are different versions defining who is a “true” francophone (Dallaire and Denis 2000).

8. Francophone and Acadian communities have historically been constructed and conceived on the basis of French-Canadian or Acadian ethnicity (Juteau-Lee and Lapointe 1983; LeBlanc 1999; Trottier, Allaire and Munro 1980; Thériault 1999, 1994). Today, the once dominant cultural/ethnic discourse still has wide currency (Dallaire and Denis 2000), but it has been contested by the integration of French speakers of other ethnic origins and it is under pressure from the legally-established linguistic rights regime that reinforces francophone communities as linguistic communities (Bernard 1998; Cardinal, 1997; Cardinal and Lapointe 1990). Thus, linguistic practices have become the principal performance that produces youths as francophone or not.

9. For instance, previous research has demonstrated that French Canada and francophone minorities undergo continual reinvention (Bock 2001; Cardinal 1997; Juteau-Lee and Lapointe 1983; Langlois 1995; Thériault 1994). The dominant Canadian identity is also contested and in transformation (Bourque and Duchastel 1999; Langlois 2001; Rukzio 1997), even emerging as an ethnic category (Boyd 1999; Kalbach and Kalbach 1999).

10. Interviewers asked youths to describe their identity and to explain which term best identified them. In many cases, participants spontaneously provided answers. In other cases, the interviewer offered examples: Acadian/Franco-Ontarian/Franco-Albertan, francophone, Canadian, bilingual, French Canadian or other. Youths were then invited to define the term they had chosen (i.e., What is an “Acadian”? Who is “Acadian”?) (see Annex 1). The analysis also includes answers to the last two questionnaire items: 18—Quel terme t’identifie le mieux? [Which term best describes you?] (exemples : Acadien(ne), francophone, Canadien(ne), bilingue, Franco-Canadien(ne), Canadien(ne) français(e) ou autre). Si tu choisis plus d’un terme, met les en ordre de priorité en commençant par le plus important et 19—Selon ta réponse à la question 18, pourquoi t’identifies-tu ainsi? [Referring to your answer to question 18, why do you identify as such?].

11. The analysis of the seemingly monolithic francophone identities other youths reproduced is the topic of another paper.

12. Such as the large majority of AFG organizers (Dallaire 1999).

13. A concern for including French-speakers who are not native speakers of French is particular of AFG drawings. Thus another four drawings explicitly construct a francophone community that includes people who speak French as a second language. They do not, however, specify that “francophones” speak English as well; rather, they illustrate that “anglophones” who speak French are members of the francophone community.

14. See footnote #3.

15. This category provides participant answers to the question: Which term identifies you best? The results provided here only include the term respondents identified as the most important. Answers that included more than one term without placing them in order of priority are excluded from this analysis.
16. The bilingual identity was added as an example of identity on the 1997
questionnaire.
17. The participant questionnaires at the 1997 AFG did not include a question on
ethnicity.

Translated quotes

i. “Because Canadian is not just francophone. It is francophone and anglophone.
And I am not only a francophone, I am both.” (AGF/E8 1977) [Unless otherwise
indicated, the English version of citations from documents and interviews are
given in the authors’ translations.]

ii. Researcher: “If I asked you what identity you are, what would you say?”
   – Canadian bilingual.
   – “Oh... eh... Canadian. No. English-French. No... French Canadian. No. You
know, both!”
   Researcher: “Both?”
   Canadian English-French.” (AGF/E4 1997)

iii. Researcher: “What label represents you best? Are you a francophone,
Franco-Ontarian, bilingual Canadian, French Canadian, Canadian-Ontarian or
whatever?”
   A: “Bilingual Canadian or Ontarian. I am completely bilingual. Right through
the middle.”
   Researcher: “If someone from the outside came and asked you: ‘What are you?
Who are you?’ You would say bilingual Canadian?”
   A: “Yes. I don’t know how I would say it, but I am Franco-Ontarian and I am
anglophone.”
   Researcher: “You really see yourself as both?”
   A: “Yes.” (JFO/EV/19#5 2001)

iv. “Bilingual. Either that or Acadian. No, not Acadian since my parentage is not
Acadian. I prefer to be bilingual.” (JAE/K30#5 2001)

v. J: “I identify as bilingual and my father... My mother is a francophone but my
father... He is a francophone, but more bilingual, because he speaks more
English than French. But my mother, since I am small, I only speak French with
my mother. And since then, I learned both languages equally. And I identify as
bilingual because I am... We sometimes speak French at home, but since... Because
we are in a more or less English community...”
   J: “...” “Since I am young, I speak French at home so I identify as bilingual
because I am in an English community.” (JEO/E/CI1#8 2001)

vi. Researcher: “You know that people identify in different ways. What are you?”
   A: “Acadian.”
   B: “Acadian and...”
   (...)
   Researcher: “B, you were saying Acadian and...”
   B: “We are bilingual too. We can speak English and French.” (JAE/C29#1
2001)

vii. “I would be a bilingual Acadian. I am Acadian, I speak French, but one should
not forget that I can also speak English. It helps, sometimes. But mostly Acadian
because my roots are Acadian.” (JAE/K30#5 2001)

viii. “I would say that I am perhaps bilingual because my first language is French, but I
speak English a lot too. And being bilingual is really important in today’s society
because you have an advantage over others if you are a francophone and
anglophone.” (JEO/E/C21#8 2001)

ix. X: “I would say Canadian. Yes. But bilingual, two languages.”
   Y: “It is the same thing for me. It would be Canadian because Canadians, we are
supposed to be bilingual.” (JAE/V1#1 2001)

x. “For me, it is Canadian Franco-Ontarian. Because Canada is French-English. Do
not forget that there is French in there. Where you are, in Ontario, in Quebec,
in British Columbia, in Yukon or in Nunavut, you have the right to speak French.
It is your right. The language, the two national languages are French, English.
Whether I am in Germany, in Portugal, wherever, I am Canadian Franco-
Ontarian.” (JEO/E/C19#1 2001)

xi. Researcher: “What are your cultural origins?”
   R: “My parents... I am French, but I am Canadian... Is it possible to be
bilingual Canadian?”
   Many: “Yes.”
   R: “I would call myself a [bilingual Canadian] since I speak French, but I also
equally speak English, it seems. And, I don’t know, my family is French. Both
sides of my family, their grandparents and all that. I am of French descent, but I
would not only call myself French because I am not... I am also English. I am a
bilingual Canadian.” (JEO/E/C19#1 2001)

xii. “I would say Canadian because my national language is English and in my house
it is English. And I do not want to abandon this language for the francophone one
because it is not true. So, I would say that I am Canadian.” (AFGE/2 1997)

xiii. “I would say that I am Canadian, and I am mostly [anglophone] but I can speak
French fairly well, so both.” (JEO/E/C18#2 2001)

xiv. “Canadian. Because if someone asks me my nationality or my identity, I am
Canadian since... Well, I am proud of my country, but also of the fact that we are
officially bilingual. I have the right to speak English, I have the right to speak
French, and to study in the language of my choice. And that is why: Because I am
not totally francophone, but I am not totally English either. And that is why,
because Canada is a multicultural country. And I, with a French mother and an
English father, I am directly bilingual. And that is why I would first say that I am
Canadian.” (FESOE/3 2001)

xv. “I think Franco-Ontarian, bilingual Ontarian, it is practically the same thing.
Because Franco-Ontarian, it almost assumes that you speak French and also
English. That is what it is. Franco-Ontarians are not only French. They do not
only speak French. They speak French and English.” (JEO/EV21#8 2001)

xvi. “I identify as a Franco-Ontarian which includes a second language. That has a
second language, English.” (JEO/EV19#8 2001)

xvii. “When I say [Franco-Albertan], I do not want to say French Canadian
because when I think of French Canadian, I think of Quebec. I think of people who
only speak French. I do not only speak French, and I’m proud of that. I would not
want to speak only French. I like to have both languages because...”
   (...)
   “If we speak only French, we are of no use. Well, we can be of use, but we are
no better than others. And if we only speak English, we have no advantage either.
But if we have both languages, we have plenty of advantages.” (Edmonton/E
1997)
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