1. Introduction

Globalization and the rise of English as the lingua franca of international trade, science, technology and communication have contributed considerably to the endangerment of many minority languages. Moreover, there is a tendency for minority language communities to shift from their heritage languages to the socially, politically and economically more powerful tongues of their dominant neighbours. Minority languages in predominantly English-speaking contexts therefore face a double threat – and French in Québec is one of those cases. While French is the mother tongue of the majority of the population (approximately 80%) in the province itself, Québec francophones make up less than 25% of the total Canadian population – and in North America at large, they are a minority of just over 1%.

Much of Québec is linguistically rather homogeneous, with the French mother tongue concentration ranging from almost 80% in the Gatineau region to around 90% in Québec City. The province’s urban centre Montreal, however, constitutes a more complex linguistic setting: while the majority of its inhabitants are francophone (52.1%), the city is also home to comparatively large anglophone and allophone communities (13.5% and 32.9% respectively, as well as 1.5% who declared both French and English as their mother tongues). ‘Allophones’ is the term used in the Québec context to describe those individuals whose mother tongue is a language other than French or English, apart from the First Nations. Montreal’s allophone community is highly heterogeneous, comprising immigrants of different generations, from diverse countries of origin and with a vast variety of mother tongues. As a consequence of the city’s distinctive linguistic demography, it is generally assumed that this is where the future of the French language in Québec will be determined.
As Wright notes, ‘[l]aissez-faire policies mean that the languages of power and prestige will eventually take over in all situations of contact. Benign neglect […] is always de facto support for the language of the group that is already dominant.’ Since the 1960s, numerous language laws have thus been implemented in order to strengthen the position of French in Québec. Nevertheless, the language is still considered to be threatened and there are ongoing public and political debates regarding the need for further legislation to protect and promote it. Some of the most prominent language planning measures that have been proposed in the recent past relate to adolescents in education institutions. Education institutions are at the centre of many legal battles for linguistic minorities because they play a crucial role in the socialization of students as the next generation of minority language speakers. Moreover, they bring forward most of the minority language communities’ human capital. Consequently, ‘[l]anguage policy in education is integrally connected to patterns of language maintenance, language shift, and ultimately to group survival’. However, while such legislation does have the potential to contribute strongly to the protection of endangered languages, in order to do so, it needs to take account of the attitudes of those who will be affected by it – because language planning is rarely effective without support at the grassroots level. Yet it is unclear whether the planning measures proposed in Québec would indeed have the required attitudinal backing by adolescents in education institutions. The aim of this article is to elucidate this issue.

The article will begin by providing the theoretical background pertaining to language attitudes and language planning, as well as an overview of previous language planning measures in Québec and the aforementioned recent proposals. This will be followed by the description of a contemporary study of the attitudes that adolescent francophone, anglophone and allophone Montreal college students hold towards French compared to English. Finally,
the article will discuss the potential implications these attitudes can be seen to have for language planning measures that would affect Quebecers of this age group.

2. Language attitudes and language planning

Attitudes are generally assumed to be composed of three components: affect – that is, the feelings elicited by the attitude object; cognition – that is, the beliefs held about the attitude object; and conation – that is, the behaviour directed at the attitude object. Based on this understanding of attitudes in general, ‘language attitudes’ are defined as any affective, cognitive or conative index of evaluative reactions toward different languages or their speakers. Individuals’ language attitudes can manifest as a range of different behaviours – including the decision of which language(s) to learn, which language(s) to use as one’s main means of communication and which language(s) to pass on to one’s children. In multilingual societies, such decisions contribute to either language shift or maintenance.

Language attitudes are traditionally considered to have two main evaluative dimensions, namely status and solidarity. A language that is perceived to have much status is one that is associated with power, economic opportunity and upward social mobility. Attitudes on the status dimension are therefore linked with the utilitarian value of the language. By contrast, a language that is evaluated highly on the solidarity dimension is one that elicits feelings of attachment and belonging: it holds ‘vital social meaning and [...] represent[s] the social group with which one identifies’. Attitudes on the solidarity dimension are thus linked with social identities – that is, those parts of an individual’s self-concept that are based on their membership in particular social groups, and which are felt to be important and valued. As will be seen, the two dimensions of language attitudes relate to different types of language planning.
It should be noted that attitudes towards languages are based upon the knowledge of the social connotations that these languages hold for those who are familiar with them, upon ‘the levels of status, prestige, or appropriateness that they are conventionally associated with in particular speech communities’. Consequently, language attitudes cannot be said to reflect linguistic or aesthetic quality per se but they should rather be considered as expressions of social mores. This entails that such attitudes can change along with social conventions. As Baker puts it, an attitude serves a double function: ‘it provides a presage and a product variable, a predisposer and an outcome’. This is particularly important in the context of language planning.

As Spolsky notes, language policy and planning is a comparatively new field and no absolute consensus has emerged yet regarding the relevant terminology. For the purpose of this article, and following the example of Sallabank and others, ‘language policy’ is taken to refer to positions and principles while ‘language planning’ refers to concrete measures and practices. The focus here will be on the latter.

There are four types of language planning. Firstly, ‘corpus planning’ refers to measures that attempt to modify the forms and structures of a language by means such as standardization, graphization and modernization. Secondly, ‘status planning’ refers to the regulation of the role that a language has in a given context, for example as an official or national language, as well as the regulation of the domains in which it is used. Thirdly, ‘acquisition planning’ (which was originally included in Kloss’s conception of status planning but is now regarded as a separate type) refers to measures undertaken to encourage knowledge of a language. Finally, ‘prestige planning’ (which was also originally included in Kloss’s conception of status planning and is now also regarded as a separate type) refers to measures undertaken to promote positive attitudes towards a language – frequently with a focus on the solidarity dimension. In practice, these types of planning are rarely implemented without
overlap. For instance, the promotion of a particular language by means of status planning is
inextricably connected with the issue of which variety of that language should be advanced.
Moreover, Haarmann stresses the importance of prestige planning as a prerequisite for the
successful implementation of all other types of language planning: ‘Every planning effort […]
has to rely on a kind of psychological background which favors an effective implementation
of planning goals and which, ultimately, is the most crucial variable for a long-term success
of planning.’

It has long been recognized that language planning rarely achieves its intended aims if
it lacks attitudinal support at the grassroots level. Knowledge about language attitudes is thus
fundamental to the formulation of effective language planning measures – for without such
knowledge, it is impossible to predict which measures are likely to be implemented
successfully and which ones are destined to fail. As Lewis notes:

Any policy for language [...] has to take account of the attitudes of those likely to be affected.
In the long run, no policy will succeed which does not do one of three things: conform to the
expressed attitudes of those involved; persuade those who express negative attitudes about the
rightness of the policy; or seek to remove the causes of the disagreement.

As the following overview of language planning in Québec will show, in the past, those
legislative measures in the province that had attitudinal support at the grassroots level were
indeed the ones that were the most successful. Since this article deals with attitudes towards
French compared to English, the focus henceforth will be on status, acquisition and prestige
planning.

3. Language planning in Québec: a historical overview

For a long time, the anglophone minority in Montreal was Québec’s elite: they not only held a
disproportionate number of well-paid jobs in the city’s upper echelons but they were also
largely in charge of the entire province’s economy, and they even controlled key sectors of
the national Canadian industry. Consequently, Québec anglophones could live and work exclusively in English without ever needing to speak French, while the francophones were obliged to learn and to use English in order to achieve upward mobility. This led to high rates of language shift. Before the 1960s, these dynamics were rarely contested: ‘Cozy, back-channel political accommodation between Anglophone economic elites and Francophone politicians […] assured that vital English-speaking community interests were respected in Québec politics.’ However, from the 1960s onwards, this began to change as a result of the so-called Quiet Revolution – a period of intense socio-cultural and political change during which francophone Quebecers began to take greater control of their province with the aim of becoming maîtres chez eux. This aim inevitably politicized the issue of language since it could never be achieved while the anglophone elite held as much power as it did. The Quiet Revolution thus led to a movement to dislodge the anglophone elite and to ‘reconquer’ Montreal as the French-speaking metropolis of Québec. Much language legislation has been implemented since then.

The status planning measures that were suggested or implemented up until the mid-1970s were rather unsuccessful because in the eyes of the francophone population, they did not go far enough in protecting and promoting the French language. Notably, this includes Bill 22, passed in 1974 as the Official Languages Act. This made French the only official language of Québec but it was nevertheless ‘emphatically not a French unilingualist policy: although it mandated a form of French priority in most areas, English-language rights were explicitly written into the bill’. Moreover, its efficacy was limited inherently by its reliance on incentives rather than obligatory provisions to protect and promote the position of French in Québec.

The first status planning measure to meet the demands of the francophones was the Charter of the French Language, commonly referred to as Bill 101, which was passed in
1977. A milestone in Québec language planning, this law not only reinforced the status of French as the province’s sole official language but it also stipulated that French was to become the main language of Québec legislature and courts, civil administration, semi-public agencies, commerce and business, as well as public signage and commercial advertising. To ensure the law’s efficacy, this time, the provisions were compulsory rather than optional. Since its implementation, Bill 101 has been subjected to a number of modifications, most of which were the result of Supreme Court rulings that declared certain provisions of the law invalid due to their incompatibility with the Canadian Constitution. Nevertheless, Bill 101 has brought about a considerable francization of public life in Québec. It has succeeded in increasing the utilitarian value of French in the province and in decreasing the necessity for language shift among francophones. It is thus considered ‘the embodiment of changing socio-cultural norms in Quebec’.34

Bill 101 also included important provisions regarding education, which can be argued to fall into the realms of both status and acquisition planning, thereby demonstrating the aforementioned overlap between the different types of language planning. Specifically, Bill 101 limited access to English-medium schools – firstly, to prevent francophone children from attending them and thereby to halt their high rates of language shift; and secondly, to put a hold on the anglicization of allophone immigrant children. Allophone immigrants constitute a growing percentage share of the province’s population and the majority of them tended to send their children to English-medium schools. Schools and other education institutions are crucial to the vitality of linguistic communities because ‘[i]t is there that languages are taught, cultural values are transmitted from one generation to another, [and] newcomers are integrated into a linguistic community’.35 The anglicization of allophone immigrant children was thus recognized as a serious threat to the future of the French language. Previous legislative measures to address this issue include Bill 85, which was proposed and then
withdrawn in 1968, and Bill 63, which was passed as the so-called Act to Promote the French Language in Québec, in 1969. However, despite ostensibly promoting French-medium education, both bills upheld free choice for Quebecers’ language of instruction and they were therefore met with strong francophone opposition.\textsuperscript{36}

To satisfy the francophones’ demands, Bill 101 originally stipulated that access to English-medium primary and secondary schools should be restricted to anglophone children whose parents had received their elementary education in English in the province. This was compatible with the Canadian Constitution Act of 1867, which continued to be in force at the time – however, it is incompatible with the repatriated Canadian Constitution Act from 1982, the relevant article of which was written expressly to counter Bill 101.\textsuperscript{37} Following a Supreme Court ruling, nowadays, English-medium primary and secondary education is permitted for any child of Canadian citizens who received their education in English anywhere in Canada, as well as to children whose parents or siblings received their education in English in Québec. Yet even despite the modifications to the law’s educational provisions, Bill 101 had the intended effect of channelling the vast majority of francophone and allophone children into French- rather than English-medium primary and secondary schools.

Prestige planning in Québec has largely targeted allophone immigrants. The socio-cultural changes that took place in the province in the mid-twentieth century, including urbanization and secularization, led to the formerly very high francophone birth rate dropping below replacement level and prognoses suggest that it is unlikely to increase again in the near future.\textsuperscript{38} The integration of the growing number of allophone immigrants – as well as their descendants – into the francophone community thus remains crucial for ensuring the future of the ‘French fact’ in Québec.\textsuperscript{39}

In addition to increasing the utilitarian value of French, as Bill 101 had done, Québec language planners soon became aware of the potential benefits in encouraging an affective
attachment to the language. This can constitute an additional source of motivation for learning French and using it as the ‘common public language’ – that is, the language employed by Quebecers of all linguistic backgrounds in their public communications.\textsuperscript{40} It has been assumed that an affective attachment to the French language is linked with a sense of belonging to the province of Québec itself.\textsuperscript{41} The aim thus became to engender a Québec-based social identity that encompasses French as the common in-group language.\textsuperscript{42} In the post-1995 referendum period, one of the most prominent ways proposed to generate this was a formalized Québec citizenship – to exist alongside Canadian citizenship and within Canadian nationality. As well as being a legal status that entails certain rights and responsibilities, citizenship also comprises an identity dimension, which ‘is fully realised when the attachment to a collectivity designated by citizenship status is of subjective importance to the individual’.\textsuperscript{43} This latter dimension was the most salient one in the Québec context. In the early twenty-first century, a committee was appointed to examine the feasibility of the Québec citizenship proposal. However, due to the politically sensitive nature of this proposal, including the possible links between citizenship and sovereignty, it was eventually rejected.\textsuperscript{44} Since then, reference to such a citizenship has become rare in official discourses. Nevertheless, the ultimate goal of creating a sense of allegiance to Québec and an affective attachment to the French language among Quebecers of all backgrounds remains.\textsuperscript{45}

4. Language planning in Québec: recent proposals

Since the 1970s, language planning has aided the francophones considerably in the francization of Québec society. Yet this success is fragile. French in Québec may no longer be at peril due to English being the language of Montreal’s economic elite. Nevertheless, it continues to be threatened because English remains the language of upward mobility in the rest of Canada and in North America at large. Moreover, due to increasing globalization,
French now also faces the growing challenge of English as the global *lingua franca*. What is more, while French is stronger in Québec today than it was forty years ago, the province itself is getting demographically weaker as the percentage share it constitutes of the overall Canadian population is declining. It thus seems that French-speaking Quebecers are becoming an increasingly ‘isolated minority in the sea of English-speaking North America’.

Many Quebecers are concerned about the sufficiency of the existing language legislation in the current context, and there are ongoing debates regarding the need for further measures to protect and promote French. Some of the most prominent proposals in the recent past were status and acquisition planning measures targeting access to the *collèges d’enseignement général et professionnel*, typically abbreviated to *cégeps*. The *cégep* is a type of post-secondary education institution exclusive to Québec that offers pre-university programmes, which have to be attended by any Quebecer wishing to study at a university in the province, as well as technical career programmes, which prepare students more directly for the employment market. There are currently no legislative restrictions on access to post-secondary education institutions, which makes it possible for a growing number of francophones and allophones to attend English- rather than French-medium *cégeps*. Language choices at this juncture are assumed to have an even greater impact on individuals’ social and professional integration – and therefore on patterns of language shift or maintenance – than the medium of instruction at the primary and secondary school level. It is thus not surprising that education remains a contentious issue in Québec language planning.

One measure that has been proposed repeatedly is the extension of the provisions of Bill 101 to *cégeps*. Most recently, this was suggested by former Parti Québécois premier Bernard Landry and the party’s Comité national des jeunes in 2009. Subsequent to this most recent proposal, there were heated public and political discussions about the idea. These discussions were long-lasting and as late as 2011, then Parti Québécois leader Pauline Marois
said she remained committed to extending Bill 101 by making it obligatory for the majority of francophone and allophone adolescents to attend French-medium cégeps.\footnote{50}

In 2012, when the Parti Québécois introduced Bill 14, the document made no reference to this extension of Bill 101. However, it did contain another provision that was designed to channel francophones and allophones into French-medium cégeps: the bill proposed a restriction of access to English-medium cégeps by stipulating that these would have to prioritize anglophones before considering applicants with other mother tongues. This provision – along with the remainder of the bill – also sparked polarized debates among the Québéco population.\footnote{51}

In late 2013, Bill 14 died on the order paper and the Parti Québécois focused on other issues in their campaign for the 2014 provincial elections.\footnote{52} The Parti Québécois lost these elections to the Liberal Party, who have not yet proposed any new measures regarding access to post-secondary education institutions. However, given that the implementation of such measures has been discussed frequently in Québec politics in the past, regardless of which party was in power, it is highly unlikely that Bill 14 was the last instance of this.\footnote{53} Since language planning measures are rarely successful if they lack support at the grassroots level, the question is whether status and acquisition planning measures limiting access to English-medium cégeps would have the required attitudinal backing to be successful.
5. Language attitudes among adolescents in Montreal

5.1 The study

In order to shed light on this issue, this article will examine the findings of a study that was conducted in 2007 among 147 students from two French-medium and two English-medium cégeps in Montreal – for, as noted above, it is generally assumed that this is where the future of the French language in Québec will be determined. The participants’ mean age was 18.3 years. Based on Statistics Canada’s definition of mother tongue (henceforth: L1) as the first language a person learned at home in childhood and still understands, their self-evaluations were used to classify them into three groups: francophones (55), anglophones (44) and allophones (48). All participants had good knowledge of both French and English.

To elicit the participants’ language attitudes, the study made use of a questionnaire and a matched-guise experiment. This choice was motivated by the fact that these methods pertain to different levels of analysis. The purpose of direct methods such as questionnaires is typically recognizable – and as most participants try to put themselves in a good light, the findings tend to reveal what is considered to be socially acceptable and desirable. The major strength of indirect methods such as the matched-guise technique, on the other hand, lies in the elicitation of spontaneous attitudes that are much less sensitive to social desirability biases. The technique was developed by Lambert et al. in the Montreal context and has, since then, become virtually standard in language attitudes research. In the basic set-up of a matched-guise experiment, recordings are made of a number of perfectly bilingual speakers – in this case: French and English – who each deliver the same text twice, once in each of their languages. The participants who then listen to these recordings are not informed of the real research purpose and they remain unaware of the fact that they are hearing the same speakers twice, in ‘matched guises’. Instead, they are under the impression that they are listening to a series of different speakers. Using voice cues only, the participants then have to evaluate the
speakers on semantic scales pertaining to various status- and solidarity-related personality traits. Any differences in reaction to the two recordings of the same speaker are presumed to be based on the participants’ attitudes towards the languages used. Indirect studies of this kind tend to reveal much more private reactions than direct methods such as questionnaires. A combination of these methods thus enables a more complete understanding of the participants’ language attitudes, revealing not only what they consider socially acceptable but also their more subconscious evaluations of the languages under investigation.\(^{58}\)

The research instruments were administered to all participants in a given cégep class at the same time, and the procedure took one lesson in total. At the beginning of the class, the matched-guise experiment was conducted. The recordings (of a short, neutral passage about the weather) as well as the status and solidarity traits used were the same as those that had previously been employed successfully by Genesee and Holobow.\(^ {59}\) Following the matched-guise experiment, the participants were debriefed and then the questionnaire was administered. This contained closed questions pertaining to both the status and the solidarity dimension. The questionnaire data were analysed by means of independent samples \(t\)-tests and the matched-guise data were analysed by means of repeated measures analyses of variance (ANOVAs).

### 5.2 Attitudes on the status dimension

Table I shows the questionnaire results, which indicate that both languages were evaluated positively in terms of the status dimension. However, the participants from all three L1 groups held even more positive attitudes towards English than towards French. All L1 groups considered English to be significantly better suited to modern society; moreover, the francophones and the allophones deemed knowledge of English significantly more likely to
increase their opportunities to find employment, and the allophones also judged English to be significantly more important to get far in life.

**Table I.** Independent samples t-test of the different L1 groups’ evaluations of English and French on the status dimension. Item, L1, language evaluated, absolute numbers (N), means, t-values (t), degrees of freedom (df), levels of significance (sig.). Means: 1 = completely agree, 5 = don’t agree at all. N.B. The fractional degrees of freedom are those calculated for unequal sample sizes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Language evaluated</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… is a language that is well suited to modern society</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-5.641</td>
<td>60.502</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-4.715</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-5.465</td>
<td>82.894</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing ... will increase my opportunities to find employment</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>+0.979</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-4.709</td>
<td>61.776</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-2.210</td>
<td>85.569</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… is a language that is important to know in order to get far in life</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-0.455</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-1.675</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-3.195</td>
<td>91.863</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table II.** Evaluations of speakers in different guises in terms of status traits. Absolute numbers (N), means for guises (English, French), F values (F), degrees of freedom (df), levels of significance (sig.). Means: 0 = not at all, 16 = very. N.B. As the respondents’ L1 did not have a significant effect, only the total means are presented here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>trait</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean / English</th>
<th>Mean / French</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intelligence</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>43.723</td>
<td>1(133)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependability</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>34.135</td>
<td>1(124)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>30.387</td>
<td>1(134)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambition</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>15.274</td>
<td>1(134)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>34.288</td>
<td>1(128)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As evidenced by table II, the matched-guise results support the notion that all three L1 groups held more positive attitudes towards English than towards French in terms of status.

All L1 groups evaluated the speakers significantly more favourably in their English guises.
than in their French guises on all five status traits that were employed – that is, intelligence, dependability, education, ambition and leadership.

5.3 Attitudes on the solidarity dimension

Table III shows the questionnaire results, which suggest that all three L1 groups evaluated both languages positively in terms of the solidarity dimension. Yet while the allophones did not exhibit a preference for either of the languages, the francophones held more positive attitudes towards French and the anglophones held more positive attitudes towards English. The francophones and the anglophones each considered their L1 to lend itself significantly better to expressing feelings and emotions than the other language, and they deemed their L1 to be significantly more important to their identity. The francophones also judged French to be a significantly more important part of Canadian cultural heritage than English.

Table III. Independent samples t-test of the different L1 groups’ evaluations of English and French on the solidarity dimension. Item, L1, language evaluated, absolute numbers (N), means, t-values (t), degrees of freedom (df), levels of significance (sig.). Means: 1 = completely agree, 5 = don’t agree at all. N.B. The fractional degrees of freedom are those calculated for unequal sample sizes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Language evaluated</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… is a language that lends itself well to expressing feelings and emotions</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-2.729</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>+7.078</td>
<td>96.776</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>+1.735</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing … is a significant part of Canadian cultural heritage</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-1.459</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>+4.199</td>
<td>100.887</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-1.395</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing … is an important part of my personal identity</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-4.877</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>+6.540</td>
<td>81.565</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-1.559</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table IV. Evaluations of speakers in different guises in terms of solidarity traits. Absolute numbers (N), means for guises (English, French), F values (F), degrees of freedom (df), levels of significance (sig.). Means: 0 = not at all, 16 = very. N.B. As the respondents’ L1 did not have a significant effect, only the total means are presented here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>trait</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean / English</th>
<th>Mean / French</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kindness</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>18.862</td>
<td>1(134)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humour</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>33.800</td>
<td>1(135)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warmth</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>43.574</td>
<td>1(133)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likeability</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>43.469</td>
<td>1(131)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sociability</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>45.476</td>
<td>1(133)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike the questionnaire results, the findings of the matched-guise experiment that are presented in table IV indicate that all three L1 groups held more positive attitudes towards English than towards French in terms of solidarity. All L1 groups evaluated the speakers significantly more favourably in their English guises than in their French guises on all five solidarity traits that were employed – that is, kindness, humour, warmth, likeability and sociability.

6. Potential lessons for language planning in Québec

Regarding the status dimension, the findings show that the participants from all L1 groups evaluated French positively. In fact, a comparison with other language attitudes studies in Montreal, such as Lambert et al. and Genesee and Holobow, indicates that the participants in the current study attributed much more status to French than previous participant samples of similar ages and educational backgrounds. It is difficult to establish direct cause and effect relationships when evaluating the impact of language legislation on language attitudes.

Nevertheless, it seems probable that this amelioration in attitudes on the status dimension is a consequence of the aforementioned status and acquisition planning measures, and especially Bill 101, which markedly increased the utilitarian value of French in the province. Québec is generally considered a success story of language planning, particularly because it shows that
‘sustained language planning can reverse language shift even relative to the most powerful language of this millennium: English’. The findings of the current study suggest that so far, Québec language planning has also been successful in bringing about attitude change on the status dimension.

However, as noted above, French in Québec remains threatened by English and concerns about the sufficiency of the existing language legislation have resulted in ongoing debates about the need for further measures to protect and promote the French language. As part of these debates, there have been repeated proposals to limit access to English-medium cégeps for francophone and allophone adolescents, with the aim of decreasing the likelihood of their social and professional integration into the anglophone community. But would such measures have the required attitudinal support to be successful? The findings of the current study suggest that this would not be the case. While the participants from all L1 groups held positive attitudes towards French on the status dimension, their attitudes towards English were significantly more positive – just as they had been in previous studies such as Lambert et al. and Genesee and Holobow. Moreover, the participants in the current study revealed their more positive attitudes towards English not only in the matched-guise experiment but also in the questionnaire. This indicates that in addition to holding these attitudes at a subconscious level, the participants also considered it socially acceptable to attribute more status to English than to French. This is likely to be a reflection of the fact that English remains a pivotal language in public and private communications among many Montrealers. Its role as the global lingua franca as well as its status as the language of upward mobility in the rest of North America mean that English continues to exert a strong power of attraction. This attraction is probably particularly strong among adolescents in education institutions, like the participants of the current study, since they still need to forge their way in the working world.
Examples from public discourses support the notion that language planning measures limiting access to English-medium cégeps would not have the necessary attitudinal support.

For instance, former cégep student Grégory Pélissier wrote an open letter to Pauline Marois, which was published in *Le Devoir* and in which he states:

Because of globalisation, English is no longer simply optional or an asset in the society we live in. It is a necessity! [...] Of course we need to protect our language and our culture. But we cannot close our eyes to the globalisation that expands every day, and to the importance of the English language in our society.\(^{64}\)

The same tenor can be found in an op-ed piece written by another former cégep student, Jean-François Garneau, for the *Montreal Gazette*:

To me, a francophone, Bill 101 is a symbol of the force and pride of French-Canadian culture. However, I also believe that one should have the right to choose the language in which one studies at college level. [...] The ability to speak both languages is crucial in fields such as law, business, and the sciences, to name just a few.\(^{65}\)

Public discourses also suggest that an important factor which motivates francophone and allophone adolescents to enrol in English-medium cégeps is their dissatisfaction with the English skills they acquire in the French-medium school system. The adolescents are concerned about their ability to compete in a labour market where good knowledge of English is a prerequisite for success, and they see post-secondary education in English as a means of improving their language skills.\(^{66}\)

The findings of the current study as well as the evidence from public discourses indicate that the drawing power of English in the globalized world cannot be ignored – especially given Québec’s location on the North American continent. These findings thus suggest that status and acquisition planning measures limiting access to English-medium cégeps would likely be unsuccessful. Moreover, it has to be borne in mind that while young Quebecers’ attitudes towards French have improved over time, these adolescents have retained significantly more positive attitudes towards English on the status dimension even throughout
the monumental changes brought about by Bill 101. Consequently, the feasibility of further improving their attitudes towards French on this dimension is highly questionable.

Oakes and Warren note that nowadays, the power of attraction exerted by English is a factor of which Québec language planners need to take account if they do not wish to run counter to the aspirations of the province’s population: if they are to be successful, ‘language planning measures that seek to promote national languages need to be consistent with policies that promote knowledge of a lingua franca that will allow members of the population in question to compete in the global market’.67 This is particularly pertinent in the case of measures that affect adolescent Quebecers who still need to find employment and build a career. Any measures that limit acquisition of competence in English would most likely simply be flouted.68 There is already an exodus of young anglophones from Québec.69 If young francophones and allophones were denied the right to study at English-medium cégeps, they might just follow suit and also leave Québec to study or work in another province.

Québec thus finds itself in the difficult position of having to strike a balance between promoting French while also enabling young Quebecers to acquire sufficient knowledge of English. Acquisition planning measures aiming to improve the quality of English teaching in French-medium schools would seem a sensible starting point with regard to the latter issue. Such measures might even lead to lower numbers of francophone and allophone adolescents feeling the need to attend English-medium cégeps to improve their language skills. The effective promotion of French, by contrast, is a much more challenging issue. Yet given the lacking attitudinal support for the aforementioned status and acquisition planning measures limiting access to English-medium cégeps, it would seem that prestige planning is the most feasible means of promoting French among adolescents. As noted above, prestige planning is linked with attitudes on the solidarity dimension.
Regarding the solidarity dimension, the outcomes of the two methods employed in the current study differ markedly from each other. On the one hand, the questionnaire results suggest that the francophones held more positive attitudes towards French, the anglophones held more positive attitudes towards English, and the allophones held equally positive attitudes towards both languages. On the other hand, the findings of the matched-guise experiment reveal more positive attitudes towards English among all three L1 groups. It is, in fact, not uncommon for direct methods such as questionnaires and indirect methods like matched-guise experiments to yield discrepant results. Ryan et al. explain that they ‘lay claim to quite different layers of experience and as such manifest sometimes quite contradictory, yet highly rational, attitude constellations’. Given the differential advantages of the methods as outlined above, a plausible explanation is that the questionnaire results were influenced by social desirability biases. The francophones and the allophones could have felt that they should hold comparatively positive attitudes towards French – possibly as a result of the Québec government’s aforementioned efforts to create an affective attachment to the French language. By contrast, the findings of the matched-guise experiment will have revealed the participants’ more privately held attitudes. As noted above, there is a close link between attitudes on the solidarity dimension and social identities. Elsewhere, the author thus posits two forms of shared social identity as the possible root(s) of the findings: firstly, a Montreal-based identity that encompasses English as the common in-group language; and secondly, an international youth identity that is expressed through English. There is support for both of these in the literature and it should be noted that they are not mutually exclusive. However, these interpretations are speculative. Further research is necessary to confirm the underlying reasons for the participants’ more positive attitudes towards English as revealed by the matched-guise experiment. Yet whatever lies at their root is likely to be a relatively recent development. Lambert et al. had also found anglophones and francophones alike to hold more
positive attitudes towards English on the solidarity dimension.\textsuperscript{74} (At that time, due to the socio-historical circumstances, this was most likely because subordinate groups frequently internalize wider social evaluations of themselves as inferior.) However, the outcome of Genesee and Holobow indicates that while adolescent anglophones in the 1980s held more positive attitudes towards English, young francophones at that time held equally positive attitudes towards both languages.\textsuperscript{75} (There were no allophone participants in either of these studies.)

Genesee and Holobow stipulate that it is easier to change attitudes on the solidarity dimension than those on the status dimension.\textsuperscript{76} Moreover, the francophone and allophone adolescents in the current study at least did not consider their preference for English on the solidarity dimension to be considered socially acceptable. These factors indicate that prestige planning is a more feasible means of promoting the French language among young Quebecers than status or acquisition planning. Indeed, as Cargile et al. note, ‘in some ways irrespective of its status connotations, the association of a strong sense of in-group solidarity with particular language varieties may be a crucial determinant for why certain minority languages persist’.\textsuperscript{77} Admittedly, the findings of the matched-guise experiment indicate that the Québec government has not been successful with its previous efforts to engender a strong affective attachment to the French language among adolescents of all linguistic backgrounds. However, that is not to say it would not be possible to do so – at least among young francophones and allophones. Both first as well as second languages can play a significant role in individuals’ social identities.\textsuperscript{78} Yet as language planning is rarely successful without support at the grassroots level, the precise nature of future prestige planning measures aimed at adolescents should be based on a representative overview of this age group’s language attitudes, and it should be informed by further knowledge about the underlying reasons for these attitudes.
7. Conclusion

Due to the non-representative nature of the participant sample employed in the current study, no claims are made regarding the generalization of the findings. The aim of the study was simply to gain an insight into the attitudes of this particular participant sample, which can then serve as a basis for further, more representative research.

Yet while they are not representative, the findings are nevertheless meaningful. They indicate that by increasing the utilitarian value of the French language in Québec, previous status and acquisition planning measures have succeeded in ameliorating young Montrealers’ attitudes towards French on the status dimension. However, the findings also show that the participants from all L1 groups attributed even more status to English than to French, suggesting that this is a continuing trend among adolescents. Given the role of English as the global lingua franca as well as Québec’s proximity to the world’s largest anglophone markets, the feasibility of further improving these adolescents’ attitudes towards French on the status dimension is questionable. Consequently, the findings of the current study indicate that the proposed status and acquisition planning measures targeting access to English-medium cégeps would most likely not have the necessary attitudinal support to be successful.

In these circumstances, it would seem that prestige planning is the most feasible means of promoting French among adolescents. Prestige planning is linked with attitudes on the solidarity dimension – and while this study’s findings indicate that the participants from all L1 groups held more positive attitudes towards English at a more private level, at least the francophones and the allophones did not consider these attitudes to be socially acceptable. What is more, attitudes on the solidarity dimension are considered more easily changeable than those on the status dimension. Consequently, the fostering of an affective attachment to the French language by means of prestige planning can be seen to hold more potential for success than the aforementioned status and acquisition planning measures.
Québec is not alone in having to find the right balance between promoting a minority language while also enabling its population to acquire sufficient knowledge of the global *lingua franca*. Moreover, there are numerous other minority languages – such as Irish and Scottish Gaelic, Welsh, Hawaiian and Maori – which also exist in predominantly English-speaking contexts. They therefore face the same double threat as French in Québec – for, as mentioned above, there is a tendency for minority language communities to shift from their heritage languages to the more powerful tongues of their dominant neighbours. A representative exploration of young Quebecers’ language attitudes – as well as the underlying reasons for these attitudes – could therefore allow for more general lessons to be drawn for language planning that aims to protect and promote minority languages in this day and age of globalization.
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