

Living in Ontario French

Terry Nadasdi

University of Alberta

This article presents a variationist analysis of verbs meaning “reside” in Ontario French. Four lexical variants are examined: *demeurer*, *habiter*, *rester* and *vivre*. Results reveal that *rester* is used most often by unrestricted speakers and least often by those whose use of French is restricted. *Vivre* is found frequently in the speech of restricted speakers. This result is attributed to intersystemic transfer from English, due to the similarities between *vivre* and the English verb *live*. *Demeurer* is used most often in the minority community of Pembroke. Finally, *habiter* is almost never used in Ontario French. In addition, variation is shown to be conditioned by lexical priming.

Notre article présente une analyse variationniste des verbes qui expriment la notion de “avoir sa résidence” en français ontarien. Quatre variantes sont prises en considération : *demeurer*, *habiter*, *rester* et *vivre*. Nos résultats démontrent que *rester* s’emploie le plus souvent dans le parler des locuteurs non-restreints et le moins souvent dans celui des locuteurs restreints. Pour ce qui est de la forme *vivre*, on la trouve le plus souvent dans le parler des locuteurs restreints, ce qu’on attribue au transfert intersystémique de l’anglais. La variante *demeurer* s’emploie le plus souvent dans la communauté minoritaire de Pembroke, alors que la forme *habiter* ne s’emploie presque jamais en français ontarien. Finalement, nos résultats révèlent que le verbe utilisé par l’interviewer exerce une influence importante sur la variation.

Introduction

In the present study we conduct a variationist (Sankoff, 1988) analysis of lexical variation in Ontario French. The variable under study concerns verbs expressing the notion of “residing”, for example, *habiter* and *vivre*. First, we consider previous results on the variable and discuss the relative sociolinguistic status of the variants used in Montreal French (Sankoff, 1997). We then make several predictions based on the previous findings concerning the use of formal and informal variants in Ontario French. In particular, we examine the likelihood that the informal variant *rester* will be relatively rare in the speech of Franco-Ontarians who do not use French on a daily basis. We also examine the potential influence of English to account for the relatively frequent use of *vivre* by some speakers. Our analysis considers a number of linguistic and

Address for correspondence: Terry Nadasdi, 217A Old Arts Bldg., MLCS, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, T6G 2E6.

E-mail: terry.nadasdi@ualberta.ca.

social factors that influence variant choice. Results reveal that the most frequent variant used varies according to the particular community under study.

Data

The data examined in the following analyses are taken from Mougeon and Beniak's corpus which includes 117 adolescent speakers of French from four different localities in Ontario: Hawkesbury, Cornwall, North Bay and Pembroke. Ontario French has its origins in the spoken French of Quebec through various waves of immigration from Quebec during the last 150 years. Note that unlike the Montreal corpus, the Franco-Ontario corpus is limited to adolescent speakers; comparisons between the two corpora must be made with this in mind. The local percentage of Francophones varies according to the individual community (Hawkesbury: 85%; Cornwall: 35%; North Bay: 17%; Pembroke: 8%). All speakers have at least one parent who is a native speaker of Canadian French and all have received their education in one of Ontario's French-language schools. The unique aspect of this corpus is that speakers are categorized according to the extent to which they use French on a regular basis. Responses to a language-use questionnaire allow one to establish three categories of speakers according to language-use restriction:

- a) restricted, that is, those who use English more often than French;
- b) semi-restricted, that is, those who use English and French to similar degrees; and
- c) unrestricted, that is, those who use French more often than English on a daily basis.

Note that the speakers are also categorized according to gender and social class. Social class was determined by considering the professional activities of the speakers' parents (see Mougeon and Beniak, 1991).

The following analyses will consider the role of French language-use restriction on the use of the "reside" variable in Ontario French, as well as other relevant social and linguistic factors.

The Variable: *rester, habiter, vivre, demeurer*

The variable under study is made up of those verbs that are used to indicate one's place of residence, "to reside". Four variants are used to fulfil this function in Canadian French, namely, *rester*, *vivre*, *demeurer* and *habiter* (Sankoff, 1997; D. Sankoff, Thibault and Bérubé, 1978). Each of these variants is illustrated in (1), taken from Mougeon and Beniak's corpus of Ontario French:

- (1) a. *Moi je reste sur la rue X.* (Cornwall-03)¹
'Me I live on X Street.'

- b. Non, ben ma soeur, elle *demeure* à Kirkland Lake. (Pembroke-02)
'No, well my sister, she lives in Kirkland Lake.'
- c. ... parce que ma soeur *vivait* à quarante milles de là. (North Bay-09)
'... because my sister lived forty miles from there.'
- d. Juste à côté d'école c'est là qui est plutôt les Anglais, sont tout heu *ils habitent* plutôt tout là. (Hawkesbury-15)
'Right beside the school, that's actually where the English are, uh, they're all, they all live there actually.'

Any study of lexical variation requires that one first eliminate instances of an item that, while formally similar to bona fide examples of the variable, do not convey the precise meaning of the variable. Concerning the "reside" variable, we note that both *vivre* and *rester* can be used with meanings other than "to have one's place of residence". For example, several instances of *vivre* found in our data convey the more general meaning of "to exist" (2a), while *rester* is often used in the sense of "stay", as shown in (2b):

- (2) a. Tu n'as pas besoin de l'argent pour *vivre*. (Cornwall 06)
'You don't need money to live.'
- b. ... Samedi soir ... m'a *rester* chez nous. (Pembroke-35)
'... Saturday night ... I'm going to stay at home.'

Note that several examples involving *rester* are ambiguous and can be interpreted as either "to stay" or "to reside". For example:

- (3) On est allé *rester* là deux mois. (Hawkesbury 11)
'We went and stayed/lived there for two months.'

Such cases were excluded from quantitative analysis since the precise meaning was unclear.

Previous research on the variable

The "reside" variable was first studied by D. Sankoff *et al.* (1978) using the Sankoff-Cedergren corpus of Montreal French. The variable was also analyzed by G. Sankoff (1997), who examined the distribution of variants in the French of Montreal Anglophones. The purpose of this latter study was to determine whether or not Anglophones in Montreal used the informal *rester* variant in a manner similar to Montreal Francophones. The distribution of variants in the speech of native speakers of Montreal French is presented in Table 1.

As shown in Table 1, the variant used in the clear majority of cases is *rester*, which is found in 64% of occurrences. While this does not correspond to standard written French usage (cf. *Le nouveau petit Robert*, 1996) and is thus a non-standard variant, it is clearly the dominant form in Montreal French and

Table 1: ‘Reside’ in Montreal French (from Sankoff, 1997)

corpus	<i>rester</i>	<i>demeurer</i>	<i>vivre</i>	<i>habiter</i>
Montreal L1	537/836 (64%)	167/836 (20%)	85/836 (10%)	47/836 (6%)

is used by all speakers. D. Sankoff *et al.* (1978) did find this variant to correlate with social class even though speakers from all social classes make use of this variant. Their results show that it is used most frequently by working-class speakers and least often by middle-class speakers. However there is no evidence that this variant is stigmatized. We therefore consider *rester* to be an informal variant in Montreal French. As Nadasdi *et al.* (2005) point out, while informal variants do not conform to the rules of standard French, they may be used in both informal and formal situations, they demonstrate considerably less social or gender stratification than do vernacular variants² and they are not stigmatized. Note that it is because *rester* is not stigmatized and is used by speakers from all social classes that we categorize this variant as “informal” in Montreal French.

The other three variants are used to a lesser degree and some have particular social connotations or correlations. For example, D. Sankoff *et al.*'s (1978) study points out that *habiter*, with a rate of occurrence of 6%, occurs in the speech of only a small number of individuals and is used first and foremost by highly educated women belonging to the professional class. Such a result strongly suggests that in Montreal French, *habiter* is a highly formal variant. As for *demeurer*, these same authors describe it as “a stylistic resource . . . particularly as a ‘high-style’ form for those who usually use *rester*” (p. 28). Note finally that *vivre* is also a minor variant in Montreal French, but it is not correlated with any of the social factors considered. However, Sankoff (1997) found that Anglophone Montrealers used *vivre* in French, associating it with *live* in English. This finding suggests that it could be considered a neutral variant. The relative social status of these variants in Ontario French will be examined in the present study.

Previous research on sociolinguistic variation in Ontario French

Given that our study will consider the effect of French-language-use restriction on the use of the variants that make up the lexical variable under study, we will first review findings on variation according to language-use restriction in Ontario. The main findings of research on this phenomenon reveal the following:

- a) restricted speakers make limited or no use whatsoever of vernacular variants;

- b) restricted speakers make infrequent use of informal variants relative to unrestricted speakers;
- c) restricted speakers make relatively infrequent use of some morphosyntactically complex variants; and
- d) restricted and semi-restricted speakers are the highest users of English-like variants; however this correlation is not always linear (Mougeon and Beniak, 1991; Nadasdi, 2005).

The rarity of vernacular features in restricted speakers' speech is illustrated by the absence of possessive *à* (for example, *la soeur à ma mère*, 'my mother's sister'). Although this variant is never used by restricted speakers of Ontario French, it is used approximately 20% of the time by semi-restricted and unrestricted speakers.

Concerning the correlation between language-use restriction and a reduction in the number of informal variants, this result has been documented in a variety of studies. However, one needs to bear in mind that while statistically significant differences have often been documented, the differences between restricted and unrestricted speakers is relatively modest. For example, Tenant (1995) found restricted speakers to use the informal [l] deletion variant in 90.5% of occurrences, while unrestricted speakers do so 99% of the time. A similar result obtained in Uritscu, Mougeon, Rehner and Nadasdi's (2004) study of schwa deletion. The distribution of this informal variant according to language-use restriction is as follows: restricted speakers (55%) and unrestricted speakers (73%). Note that a concomitant of this tendency (and that concerning vernacular variants) is that restricted speakers make relatively greater use of formal variants; for example, they retain schwa more often than do the unrestricted speakers.

The tendency of restricted speakers to make less frequent use of certain complex structures has been documented by Mougeon and Beniak (1995) in their analysis of third person plural verb regularization (for example, *ils disent* > *ils dit*, 'they say'). The authors note that, while the regularized variant is almost never used by unrestricted speakers, it occurs 19% of the time in the speech of restricted speakers. A similar result concerning grammatical regularization was studied by Nadasdi (2000), who found that restricted speakers display a greater tendency to use post-verbal, non-clitic locative pronouns (for example, *je vais là* vs. *j'y vais*, 'I go there'). Restricted speakers use a post-posed form in 93% of occurrences while unrestricted speakers do so 31% of the time.

The finding that there is a correlation between language-use restriction and an increased use of English-like variants has been reported in a number of studies.³ For example, restricted speakers use *sur la radio*, 'on the radio' 74% of the time, while it is used 18% of the time by semi-restricted speakers and

12% of the unrestricted ones. An even stronger correlation with language-use restriction is found in the case of *être peur* vs. *avoir peur*, ‘to be afraid’. The restricted speakers use this variant 52% of the time, while the semi-restricted and unrestricted speakers never use this form. Several counter-examples to this trend have also been documented. For example, semi-restricted speakers use the English variant *so* more often than either restricted or unrestricted speakers. For an explanation of this exception, see Mougeon and Beniak (1991).

Let us now consider the variable “to reside” in light of the above-mentioned findings in order to make hypotheses about the probable distribution of variants. We are particularly interested in the distribution of variants according to level of French language-use restriction. The first two findings mentioned above suggest that *rester* will be used most often by unrestricted speakers and least often by restricted ones, given the informal character of this variant. As mentioned, *rester* meaning “reside” is an informal variant in Montreal French, to which Ontario French is genetically related, and is not a variant in standard French. It is for these reason that we consider the variant informal in Ontario French. On the other hand, it can be predicted that the variants *demeurer* and *habiter* may be used more often by restricted speakers, given the formal status of these forms. The finding regarding a reduction in the use of complex variants is difficult to apply in the case of lexical variables since each variant is an individual item, as opposed to a complex relationship between say a sentential subject and a verbal morpheme. Furthermore, it is not obvious that one of the potential variants is simpler or more regular than the others. Finally, it can be hypothesized that the use of the variant *vivre* will increase with the level of language-use restriction. We make this claim based on the fact that it is similar to the English equivalent “live” in that both function as verbs of residency and as verbs of existence. This parallel might give rise to an increased use of this variant in the speech of the restricted speakers since they use English most frequently on a daily basis.

Linguistic factors

Previous research on the “reside” variable has not considered the variable influence of linguistic factors for this case of variation (aside, of course from absolute semantic considerations). There is, however an important linguistic constraint that strongly influences variant choice, namely that of lexical priming; that is, whether or not the interviewer asked a question using one of the variants, as in (4) (see Levelt and Kelter, 1982; Weiner and Labov, 1983).

- (4) Q: Est-ce que tu *restes* près d’ici.
 ‘Do you live near here?’
 R: je *reste* dans le nord de la ville.
 ‘No, I live in the north part of town.’ (Cornwall-09)

Not surprisingly, priming usually gives rise to the primed variant. However, there are a number of cases where priming does not result in the primed variant being used, either because the speaker simply answers ‘oui’ or ‘non’, or because one of the other variants is used, which we refer to as *cross-priming*, an example of which is provided in example (5).

(5) Q: Est-ce que ta famille a toujours *demeuré* dans le bout de North Bay?
 ‘Has your family always lived around North Bay?’

R: Non, on *restait* au Québec avant.

‘No, we used to live in Quebec before.’ (North Bay 15).

Sankoff’s (1997) study did not take priming into account since in her corpus priming always gave rise to the primed variant. However our results reveal that for the present variable, this factor exercises a *variable effect*, not a *categorical* one (see the Results section, below). Note that this is not always the case in Ontario French. For example, in their study of the variation in the use of words referring to motorized vehicles, Nadasdi, Mougeon and Rehner (2004) found that speakers always used the *auto* variant if the interviewer asked them a question containing this form.

Social factors

In our analysis of social factors, we will examine the effect of social class, gender, locality and language-use restriction.

Results

General results for the variable in Ontario French are presented in Table 2, which reveals that Franco-Ontarians make use of all four variants. Note first that *rester* is the most frequent of the variants in Ontario French, as is the case in the Montreal study. However, unlike in Montreal, *rester* is not used in the majority of occurrences in the speech of Ontario Francophones. Furthermore, it is apparent that there is a great deal of variation in the Ontario corpus. In particular, *demeurer* and *vivre* have much wider currency than in Montreal French. The prevalence of these forms in Ontario French will be examined below in our discussion of locality and language-use restriction.

Table 2: Distribution of variants meaning “reside” in the Ontario corpus

<i>rester</i>	<i>demeurer</i>	<i>vivre</i>	<i>habiter</i>
103/247	79/247	63/247	2/247
(42%)	(32%)	(26%)	(1%)

Priming in Ontario French

Table 3 reveals that lexical priming exercises a variable effect in Ontario French,⁴ not a categoric one, except in the case of *vivre*.

Table 3: Lexical priming in Ontario French⁵

	<i>rester</i>	<i>demeurer</i>	<i>vivre</i>	<i>habiter</i>
primed	.815 (79%)	.474 (62%)	KO (100%)	NA NA
unprimed	.485 (40%)	.871 (31%)	KO (28%)	100%
cross-primed	.356 (33%)	.464 (21%)	NA	NA

A question asked by the interviewer using one of the variants clearly favours the same variant in the response, but it is by no means an absolute certainty. For example, in the case of *rester*, 33% of cross-primed still result in the use of the *rester* variant.

Social Class

While it was not possible to run regression analysis for social class because of empty cells, the percentages are very much in line with the expected social-class distribution for variables with standard and non-standard variants (Table 4).

Table 4: Role of social class in Ontario French

Social class	<i>rester</i>	<i>demeurer</i>	<i>vivre</i>	<i>habiter</i>
middle	9/28 (32%)	9/28 (32%)	9/28 (32%)	1/28 (4%)
lower middle	47/118 (40%)	39/118 (33%)	32/118 (27%)	0/118 (0%)
working	47/97 (48%)	28/97 (29%)	21/97 (22%)	1/97 (1%)

For example, if we consider use of *rester*, the distribution is: middle class 32%, lower-middle class 40%, and working class 48%, which supports the claim that *rester* is an informal variant in Ontario French. As such, its social status is similar to what is found in Montreal French. There is also some evidence that *vivre* is considered a relatively formal variant since it is the preferred

variant of middle-class speakers. Curiously, there is little difference between the three social classes in terms of *demeurer* usage, which, in Montreal at least, is a highly formal variant. This result leads us to conclude that, while general pattern of variant usage is similar in Montreal and Ontario (that is, *rester* is the most frequent, *habiter* is the least frequent), we cannot expect variants to always have the same socio-symbolic value in both communities. A similar result obtained in Nadasdi, Mougeon and Rehner's (2004) study of *char* in Ontario French. While Martel (1984) reports that *char* is a vernacular variant that correlates with working-class speech in Sherbrooke French, no such correlation is found in Ontario French.

Gender

Gender is also selected and the results are in line with previous work on this same corpus. Specifically, female speakers prefer more standard variants in comparison to males (Table 5).

Table 5: Effect of gender in Ontario French

	<i>rester</i>	<i>demeurer</i>	<i>vivre</i>	<i>habiter</i>
males	.597 (48%)	.375 (23%)	NS (29%)	0
females	.418 (37%)	.606 (40%)	NS (22%)	1%

For example, Mougeon and Beniak (1991) found that females make greater use of *alors*, as opposed to *ça fait que* (both meaning 'therefore') and use *je vais* more often than *je vas* (both meaning 'I go') when compared to male speakers. While this result doesn't always obtain, it is clearly the case for the "reside" variable since female speakers use the informal *rester* less often than the males and conversely make greater use of *demeurer*, as can be seen in Table 5.

Locality

Perhaps the most striking and interesting result of the present study has to do with the effect of locality, presented in Table 6.

The results presented in Table 6 suggest that there are very different community norms concerning the most common way of expressing the notion of "reside" in Ontario French. In Hawkesbury, we find a situation reminiscent of what obtains in Montreal French; namely, that *rester* is the form used in the majority of occurrences (73%). *Demeurer* and *habiter* are infrequent (there are only 2 occurrences of *habiter* in the entire Ontario corpus) and although there

Table 6: Effect of locality in Ontario French

	<i>rester</i>	<i>demeurer</i>	<i>vivre</i>	<i>habiter</i>
Hawkesbury	.769 (73%)	.163 (8%)	.344 (12%)	8%
Cornwall	.683 (44%)	.261 (11%)	.725 (45%)	0%
North Bay	.500 (58%)	.441 (25%)	.419 (16%)	0%
Pembroke	.331 (24%)	.772 (54%)	.439 (22%)	0%

are not enough tokens to examine gender and social class independently for Hawkesbury, it seems reasonable to suggest that if there were more tokens a correlation would be found, with *demeurer* and *habiter* being used most often by females and middle-class speakers. In other words, in Hawkesbury, these two forms probably have the same social connotations as they do in Montreal. Further research is necessary to confirm such a relationship.

At the other extreme, one finds the speakers from Pembroke, where there exists a very different norm for the “reside” variable. Contrary to what is found in Montreal or in Hawkesbury, the most frequent variant is *demeurer*, which is used in a majority (54%) of occurrences in this locality. This appears to be the default form and is void of any particular stylistic or social connotation in this community. Note that Pembroke is the community with the lowest percentage of Francophones and it is here that opportunities to hear and use informal French are the fewest. While it is difficult to identify the path by which *demeurer* came to be the most frequent variant in Pembroke, one can surmise that is related to the use of this form in the local schools, given that the Franco-Ontarian speakers are adolescents enrolled in French-language schools.

Let us now consider the distribution of variants in Cornwall and North Bay, which are the middle communities in terms of local concentration of Francophones. Recall that in Cornwall, Francophones make up 35% of the population, while in North Bay they represent 17%. As such, the results are unexpected. Normally, one would expect greater use of *rester* in Cornwall, all other things being equal. For example, if we consider the vernacular form *ça fait que* mentioned earlier, Mougeon and Beniak (1991) report Cornwall speakers use this form in 40% of occurrences, while North Bay speakers do so only 14% of the time (the same is true of *m’as* which is a first person singular variant of the verb *aller* in periphrastic structures: Cornwall 56%, North Bay 7%). However, that is not what obtains for the “reside” variable. Cornwall speakers use the *rester* variant in 44% of occurrences, while North Bay speakers use

it 58% of the time. It should be mentioned that the reason one tends to find fewer vernacular forms in North Bay than in Cornwall is that there are more restricted speakers in North Bay. As such, a cross-tabulation was performed to determine the number of restricted speakers using the variants in each community. This cross-tabulation reveals that only three of the North Bay occurrences were produced by restricted speakers, while in Cornwall there were 21 from restricted speakers, and 41 in Pembroke. This explanation is also supported by results concerning language-use restriction, to which we now turn.

Language-use restriction

Results concerning the distribution of variants according to the extent to which speakers use French in their everyday activities are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Effect of language-use restriction on variant choice in Ontario French

	<i>rester</i>	<i>demeurer</i>	<i>vivre</i>	<i>habiter</i>
restricted	.326 (21%)	NS (37%)	.664 (40%)	0%
semi	.524 (42%)	NS (36%)	.470 (22%)	0%
unrestricted	.648 (62%)	NS (20%)	.372 (17%)	3%

Table 7 shows that the most frequent variant in the speech of the restricted speakers is *vivre*, used in 40% of occurrences for this group. While this is the only group for whom *vivre* is the most frequent, this result is not entirely surprising, given the hypotheses presented above. The reader will recall that we expected that the close overlap between *vivre* and English *live* (both function as verbs of residence and verbs of existence) would result in greater use of *vivre* by the restricted speakers. The reason this is relevant is that it is the restricted speakers who use English most frequently. As such, the preference for *vivre* by these speakers would constitute a case of covert interference, not unlike that documented by Mougeon and Beniak (1991) in their analysis of *chez* vs. *à la maison*, ‘at home’. That is, these speakers over-use a native-speaker variant that has an English equivalent (see Mougeon, Nadasdi and Rehner, 2005). A similar explanation can be found in Sankoff’s (1997) study of Anglo-Montrealers where she posits that overuse of *vivre* results from an association between *live* in bilinguals’ two languages. As for the other variants, it can be pointed out that *habiter* is never used by the restricted speakers, which strongly suggests that it never occurs in the Francophone schools that these students attend. On the other hand, *demeurer* is relatively frequent in the speech of the

restricted group, suggesting that this is a common variant in the school setting. Finally, the restricted speakers use *rester* less often than the unrestricted or semi-restricted speakers.

Turning to the other two categories of language-use restriction—unrestricted and semi-restricted—we note simply that as is the case in Hawkesbury and Montreal, the most frequent variant is *rester*. There is some use of *demeurer* in both groups of speakers, particularly in the case of the semi-restricted speakers. These results suggest once again that *rester* is an unmarked variant with wide currency in the Franco-Ontarian classroom.

Conclusion

Let us now summarize the main findings of our study. We note first that as in Montreal French, the most frequent variant found in Ontario is *rester*, which is used in 42% of occurrences. Still, unlike what is found in Montreal, *rester* is not used in the majority of occurrences. The reason for this is that the other variants are used widely by some of the subgroups of speakers. For example, both *demeurer* and *vivre* are used frequently in the the minority communities under study. As for *habiter*, it is almost never used in any of the four communities. In fact, the only speakers of French in Canada who use *habiter* frequently are non-Francophones who learn French in an educational setting (Nadasdi and McKinnie, 2001).

Several linguistic and social factors were shown to correlate with variant choice. One linguistic factor, that of lexical priming, was shown to exercise a strong, variable effect on variant choice: a question asked with one of the variants strongly favours this same variant in the reply. Still, instances of cross-priming do occur. Several social factors were also examined. Not surprisingly, it was shown that *rester* is favoured by male and working-class speakers. This result underscores the fact that *rester* is an informal variant in Ontario French. Still, the high frequency of *rester* suggests that this is not a highly stigmatized form.

We also examined the variable according to language-use restriction and found a linear correlation with the use of the informal variant *rester*: the higher the level of language-use restriction, the less one finds this variant. Our consideration of language-use restriction also leads us to suggest that a case can be made for intersystemic transfer in relation to the variant *vivre*, following Mougeon, Nadasdi and Rehner (2005). It is possible to accept or reject a claim of external influence by answering four basic questions:

- a) Is there a parallel for the feature in the contact language?
- b) Can the feature be attributed to intrasystemic regularization?

- c) what is the distribution of the feature in L2 speech and in other varieties of L1 speech?
- d) is there a clear correlation with language-use restriction?

In the case of *vivre*, the answer to most of these questions lend support to the claim that English has played a role in the speech of some individuals.

- First, as suggested, English uses the same verb, *live*, to express existence and residence.
- Second, there is no evidence that preference for *vivre* can be attributed to internal reasons, for example it is not more regular than the other variants.
- Third, *vivre* is relatively infrequent in the speech of L1 Francophones in Montreal where it is used only 10% of the time. Conversely, Anglophone L2 learners make relatively frequent use of this variant. For example, Sankoff (1997) found that Anglophones in Montreal used *vivre* 25% of the time when speaking French while Nadasdi and McKinnie (2001) documented a rate of usage of 40% among Anglophone immersion students in Toronto.
- Finally, the correlation with language-use restriction in the present study is linear; that is, the more English one speaks on a daily basis, the more likely it is that an individual will use *vivre* as a verb of residency.

It was noted above that in some studies, semi-restricted speakers are the most frequent users of an English-like variant, while in others it is the restricted speakers. In light of this finding and the findings from the present study, it seems reasonable to suggest that English-like lexical variants are used most frequently by restricted speakers only when there is a semantic similarity (like that between *live* and *vivre*), not a formal one (like that between *car* and *char* or between English *so* and the use of *so* in the speech of Franco-Ontarians). Conversely, semi-restricted speakers will be the most frequent users of such forms when the similarity is both formal and semantic. Further research will allow us to verify the extent to which this claim may be generalized.

Notes

I would like to thank Raymond Mougéon and three anonymous reviewers for providing helpful comments.

- ¹ The number after the name of the city or town indicates the subject's identification number.
- ² We consider as "vernacular" those variants that do not conform to the rules of standard French, are typical of informal speech, are inappropriate in formal settings, are associated with speakers from the lower social strata, and are usually stigmatized.

- ³ The question of English interference is a complex one. The variants that I am attributing to English influence in this section have been the object of in-depth analysis in previous research; see in particular Mougeon, Nadasdi and Rehner (2005).
- ⁴ Note that for the GoldVarb runs, each variant was run against the three others, given that GoldVarb is limited to binary variables. For example, when examining the distribution of *rester*, it was compared with the combined results for *demeurer*, *vivre* and *habiter*.
- ⁵ In this table (and those that follow), we have provided percentages and factor weights produced by GoldVarb. These factor weights are the product of regression analysis; numbers greater than .500 favour a variant, while those below .500 disfavour it. KO indicates a knock-out factor, which precludes regression analysis.

References

- Levelt, W. and S. Kelter. 1982. Surface form and memory in question answering. *Cognitive Psychology*, 14, pp. 78–106.
- Martel, P. 1984. Les variantes lexicales sont-elles sociolinguistiquement intéressantes? Sociolinguistique des langues romanes. *Actes du XVIIème Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romanes. Aix-en-Provence, 29 août–3 septembre 1983*, pp. 183–193.
- Mougeon, R. and É. Beniak. 1995. Le non-accord en nombre entre sujet et verbe en français ontarien: un cas de simplification? *Présence Francophone*, 46, pp. 53–65.
- Mougeon, R. and É. Beniak. 1991. *The linguistic consequences of language contact and restriction: The case of French in Ontario, Canada*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mougeon, R., T. Nadasdi and K. Rehner. 2005. Contact-induced linguistic innovations on the continuum of language use: The case of French in Ontario. *Journal of Bilingualism and Cognitive Studies*, 8, 2, pp. 1–17.
- Nadasdi, T. 2005. Le français en Ontario. In A. Valdman, J. Auger and D. Piston-Hatlen (eds.), *Le français en Amérique du Nord*. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, pp. 99–116.
- Nadasdi, T. 2000. *Variation grammaticale et langue minoritaire: le cas des pronoms clitiques en français ontarien*. Munich: LINCOM Europa.
- Nadasdi, T. and M. McKinnie. 2001. Living and working in immersion French. *Journal of French Language Studies*, 13, pp. 47–61.
- Nadasdi, T., R. Mougeon and K. Rehner. 2005. Learning to speak everyday (Canadian) French. *Canadian Modern Language Journal*, 61, pp. 543–563.
- Nadasdi, T., R. Mougeon and K. Rehner. 2004. Expression de la notion de “véhicule automobile” dans le parler des adolescents francophones de l'Ontario. *Francophonies d'Amérique*, 17, pp. 91–106.
- Sankoff, D., P. Thibault and H. Bérubé. 1978. Semantic field variability. In D. Sankoff (ed.), *Linguistic variation: Models and methods*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 23–43.

- Sankoff, G. 1997. Deux champs sémantiques chez les Anglophones et les Francophones de Montréal. In J. Auger et Y. Rose (eds.), *Exploration du lexique*. Québec: Centre interdisciplinaire de recherche sur les activités langagières (CIRAL), Université Laval, pp. 133–146.
- Sankoff, G. and P. Thibault. 1977. L'alternance entre les auxiliaires *avoir* et *être* dans le français parlé à Montréal. *Langue française*, 34, pp. 81–108.
- Tennant, J. 1995. Variation morphophonologique dans le français parlé des adolescents de North Bay (Ontario). Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.
- Uritescu, D., R. Mougeon, K. Rehner, and T. Nadasdi. 2004. Acquisition of the internal and external constraints of variable schwa deletion by French Immersion students. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 42, pp. 349–364. Thematic issue: *Variation in the interlanguage of advanced second language learners*, R. Mougeon and J.-M. Dewaele (eds.).
- Weiner, J. and W. Labov. 1983. Constraints on the agentless passive. *Journal of Linguistics*, 19, pp. 29–58.