Thirty Years After Bill 101: A Contemporary Perspective on Attitudes Towards English and French in Montreal

Ruth Kircher
Liverpool Hope University

Abstract

This paper presents a 2007 study that was conducted amongst 147 young anglophone, francophone and allophone Montrealers in order to shed light on their attitudes towards English and French in terms of status and solidarity. The study made use of both a questionnaire and a matched-guise experiment. The findings indicate that while a certain amount of status was attributed to French, most likely as a result of language policy and planning measures such as Bill 101, significantly more status was attributed to English— most likely a result of the utilitarian value that the language holds as the global lingua franca. Regarding the solidarity dimension, it appears that while the respondents recognised the social desirability of having an affective attachment to the French language, at a more private level, they held more positive attitudes towards English. These can tentatively be explained in terms of the respondents' social identity.

Résumé

L'article ci-dessous présente une recherche menée en 2007 parmi 147 étudiants montréalais (anglophones, francophones et allophones) qui eut pour objectif d'examiner leurs attitudes envers l'anglais comparé au français en terme de statut et de solidarité. Un questionnaire et une étude des faux-couples furent utilisés comme méthodes de recherche. Les résultats indiquent qu'un certain statut est attribué au français, ce qui est probablement une conséquence des lois langagières comme la Loi 101. Néanmoins, un statut plus important est attribué à l'anglais, ce qui est probablement une conséquence de sa valeur utilitaire comme lingua franca globale. En ce qui concerne la dimension de la solidarité, bien que les jeunes montréalais semblent conscients de l'importance sociale de se sentir attachés à la langue française, lorsque l'on considère un aspect plus personnel, ils tendent à manifester des attitudes plus positives envers l'anglais. Ces attitudes plus positives envers l'anglais peuvent être expliquées comme résultats de différentes identités sociales.

**Thirty Years After Bill 101: A Contemporary Perspective on Attitudes
Towards English and French in Montreal**

Introduction

Montreal is the urban centre of Quebec, Canada's only province with a francophone majority. Most of Quebec is, linguistically and ethnically, relatively homogeneous. The French mother tongue concentration ranges from almost 80%, in the Gatineau region, to more than 90% of the population, in Quebec City (Statistics Canada, 2011). Montreal, on the other hand, is home not only to many francophones but also to comparatively large anglophone and allophone communities (52.1%, 13.5% and 32.9% respectively, as well as 1.5% who have both French and English as their mother tongues [Statistics Canada, 2011]), with *allophones* being the term used in the Quebec context to describe those individuals whose mother tongue is a language other than English or French.[i] These allophones are immigrants as well as individuals of immigrant descent, who tend to concentrate in the Montreal metropolitan region because it offers better economic opportunities than the rest of the province (see, e.g., Bourhis, 2001). While the allophones will here be referred to as a "mother-tongue group", it should be stressed that this term is used merely for brevity's sake: these individuals speak a vast variety of mother tongues and thus constitute a very heterogeneous community. Notably, the allophones are the group that has recorded the highest increase in its percentage share of Montreal's population since the beginning of the 21st century (Statistics Canada, 2001, 2011).

As a consequence of its linguistic and ethnic diversity, Montreal holds a special status within Quebec, and it is assumed by a number of specialists that it is in this city that the future of French in the province will be determined (see, e.g., Bourhis, 2001; Levine, 1997). Moreover, due to its diversity, Montreal has proved to be a fascinating and fruitful location for language attitudes research. Yet, while anglophone and francophone Montrealers' attitudes towards English and French were the subject of many studies between the late 1950s and the 1980s, there has been comparatively little research into the manner in which these attitudes have been affected by factors such as the ever-increasing globalisation that has been taking place over the last decades. The augmented mobility of individuals, goods and information has contributed to the rise of global "killer languages", such as English, at the cost of local minority languages (see, e.g., Fishman, 2002). Besides the status that English holds as the language of upward mobility in the rest of Canada and North America, its role as the global lingua franca thus now constitutes a major challenge to French in Quebec (see, e.g., Stefanescu & Georgeault, 2005; St-Laurent, 2008).

In addition to there being relatively little recent research into anglophone and francophone Montrealers' language attitudes, there have been very few systematic investigations of the attitudes that are held by the city's numerous allophones. This is particularly surprising since, due to the increase in this group's percentage share in Montreal's population, the allophones' language attitudes and their resulting language choices will evidently play a significant role in the determination of the city's linguistic future, and therefore the survival of French in Quebec (see, e.g., Oakes & Warren, 2007). Since the Parti Québécois' 2012 reelection as the province's ruling party, the protection and promotion of French has once again become an increased focus of heated political debates—thus making language attitudes research in Montreal particularly topical.

The purpose of the study presented here is to provide a contemporary perspective on the attitudes that anglophone, francophone and allophone Montrealers hold towards English and French, especially with regard to the two main evaluative dimensions of language attitudes, that is, status and solidarity. (Essentially, a language with high status is one that holds significant utilitarian value, while a language that is evaluated highly on the solidarity dimension is one that elicits strong feelings of attachment and belonging to a particular social group; see, e.g., Ryan, Giles, & Sebastian, 1982.) Since Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner and Fillenbaum (1960), this study is the first investigation amongst anglophone and francophone Montrealers to use a combination of direct and indirect methods of attitude elicitation, and to the author's knowledge it is the first investigation ever to do so amongst allophone Montrealers. This combination of methods can be assumed to lead to a more comprehensive understanding of the participants' attitudes than any one method on its own. It should be noted, however, that due to the non-representative nature of the participant sample, no claims are made regarding the generalisation of the findings to the Montreal population at large. The aim of this work is simply to gain an insight into the attitudes of the particular participant sample that was investigated, which can then serve as a basis for further, more representative research.

Following a brief overview of the sociohistorical background and some of the most important previous research, this article will describe the methodology and materials employed in the current study before presenting and discussing its results.

Background and Previous Studies

Due to the close link that exists between language and social identity (see, e.g., Giles & Coupland, 1991), most modern linguistic and social psychological research considers attitudes towards particular languages to be reflections of individuals' attitudes towards the speakers of those languages (see, e.g., Garrett, Coupland, & Williams, 2003). This is of particular interest in stratified societies in which different status and power positions are associated with different linguistic groups—and for many years, this was the case in Montreal: the "French and English lived in separate areas, formed different classes, engaged in different economic activities, had different religions, different languages, and different schools and other institutions" (Heller, 1985, p. 76). The differences between the city's anglophones and francophones were so pronounced that novelist MacLennan (1945) dubbed them the *two solitudes*. The English-speaking minority long constituted the economic elite which held a disproportionate number of well-paid jobs in the city's upper echelons, and from their Montreal head offices even controlled key sectors of the national Canadian industry and economy (see, e.g., Dickinson & Young, 2003). Consequently, for a long time, Montreal anglophones could live and work exclusively in English without ever needing to learn French; the city's francophones, on the other hand, were obliged to learn and use English in order to be able to advance economically (see, e.g., Bernard, 2008). This serves as an explanation for the anglophones' and francophones' much more positive attitudes towards English than towards French, in terms of status, that were evidenced by the findings of a number of voice evaluation studies in the 1950s and 1960s. Most importantly, these studies include the seminal research by Lambert et al. (1960), which was conducted in 1958-59 amongst 130 anglophone and francophone Montrealers with an average age of 18.5 years, and a follow-up study by Preston (1963), which was conducted in 1962 amongst 172 anglophone and francophone Montrealers with an average age of 17.8

years. The fact that subordinate groups frequently internalise a wider social evaluation of themselves as inferior (see, e.g., Tajfel & Turner, 1986) accounts for the fact that both of these studies found not only the anglophones but also the francophones to hold more positive attitudes towards English in terms of solidarity.

Both Lambert et al. (1960) and Preston (1963) made use of a method called the *matched-guise technique*, which was pioneered by the aforementioned Lambert and his associates (1960). In the basic setup of a matched-guise experiment, recordings are made of a number of bilingual speakers (in the Quebec context: English and French) who each read the same text twice, once in each of their languages. Prosodic and paralinguistic features of voice, such as pitch and speech rate, are kept constant as far as possible across the different recordings. The participants who then listen to these recordings remain unaware of the fact that they are hearing the same speakers twice, in matched guises, but they are instead under the impression that they are listening to a series of different speakers. They do know, however, that all speakers are delivering the same message. The effects of both the voices of the speakers and their messages are thus minimised, and other potentially influential factors such as physical appearance are excluded. Using voice cues only, the participants are then asked to rate personality characteristics of the speakers on semantic scales for certain traits (such as intelligence, dependability and kindness). To avoid the influence of social desirability biases, the real purpose of the experiment is withheld. Instead, the study is generally introduced as "an experimental investigation of the extent to which people's judgments about a speaker are determined by his voice" (Lambert et al., 1960, p. 44), as is done when trying to estimate the personality of an unfamiliar speaker on the radio or at the other end of a telephone. As the participants remain unaware that they are in fact hearing the same speakers twice, in matched guises, any differences in reaction to the two different recordings of the same speaker can be presumed to be based on the participants' attitudes towards the different languages spoken, and thus also towards the social groups with which these languages are associated. Since the matched-guise technique was first used in Quebec, it has been applied in a wide range of settings, including, for instance, Israel (Lambert, Anisfeld, & Yeni-Komshian, 1965), Brazil (El-Dash & Busnardo, 2002), Spain (Echeverria, 2005) and Hungary (Fenyvesi, 2010), and it has come to be accepted as an effective means of attitude elicitation. Its merits are discussed in more detail in the Methods section below.

As noted above, there is a paucity of research into the language attitudes held by Montreal allophones, and the author is not aware of any studies that elicited allophones' language attitudes in the 1950s and 1960s. However, their language choices suggest that just like the anglophones and francophones investigated by Lambert et al. (1960) and Preston (1963), the allophones, too, attributed more status to English than to French: at least from World War II up until the 1970s, allophone immigrants to Quebec overwhelmingly opted for English as their main language of public usage (see, e.g., Dickinson & Young, 2003; Gouvernement du Québec, 1972).

Before the 1960s, there had been no serious and sustained political debate about language rights in the city, but by the end of the decade, the language question had become the main issue to dominate Montreal's social and political life. This change began with what has come to be known as the Quiet Revolution, which was "an attempt to accelerate the socioeconomic development of French Canadian society to bring it into line with that of the rest of Canada" (d'Anglejan, 1984, p. 29). The central theme of the Quiet Revolution was the aim of the francophones to become *maîtres chez nous*—an aim that inevitably

politicised the issue of language since the francophones could never be masters in their own house while Montreal's anglophone elite held as much power as it did (see, e.g., Rocher, 2008). The theme of the Quiet Revolution thus led to a movement to dislodge this anglophone elite and "reconquer" Montreal as the French-speaking metropolis of Quebec (see, e.g., Levine, 1997). Much pro-French language legislation has been implemented since then—most importantly the Charter of the French Language, commonly known as Bill 101, which, in 1977, reinforced the status of French as the only official language of Quebec as well as stipulating that it was to become the main language of the workplace, of education, and of several other areas of public life in the province. This did eventually result in the francophones' economic "reconquest" of Montreal (see, e.g., Levine, 1997) and by the mid-1980s, the city's linguistic dynamics had been so much transformed in favour of French that the francophone community had acquired a sense of "relative linguistic security" (Monnier, 1983, p. 9). This serves to explain the findings of a matched-guise experiment by Genesee and Holobow (1989), which was conducted in 1984 amongst 111 anglophone and francophone Montrealers of approximately 16 years of age. Notably, the findings of this study showed that while both anglophones and francophones continued to attribute more status to English (see also Bourhis, 1984), the francophones had shifted to equally positive attitudes towards French and English in terms of solidarity.[ii]

However, the sense of linguistic security generated by Bill 101 did not last, and francophone Quebecers eventually began to fear that the future of French was threatened by such new realities as globalisation and the rise of English as the global lingua franca. Moreover, the integration of allophone immigrants into the francophone community in Montreal (which, as mentioned above, constitutes a crucial factor in ensuring the future of the French language in Quebec) remains an issue—especially as "some immigrants to Quebec do not intend to settle there permanently, using the province as a stepping-stone to other parts of Canada or even North America" (Oakes & Warren, 2007, p. 134). In 2000, the provincial government thus set up the *Commission des États généraux sur la situation et l'avenir de la langue française au Québec* (Gouvernement du Québec, 2001). The report tabled by the Commission stressed the importance of creating an affective attachment to the province of Quebec and the French language amongst Quebecers of all mother tongues and ethnic origins—with the overall aim being to make French the common public language of the province (see also Oakes, 2005). The report thereby "squarely places Quebec language policy and planning within the framework of the [province's] new civic approach to national identity which seeks to unite Quebecers of all ethnic origins" (Oakes & Warren, 2007, p. 2). Since the tabling of the report, the governmental efforts to create such an affective attachment to Quebec and the French language have been particularly noticeable with regard to allophone immigrants. The efforts are mirrored, for instance, in the official model that Quebec has adopted for the integration of these immigrants. Known as *interculturalism*, this model involves "the meeting of cultures, their mutual interpenetration and the reciprocal recognition of their respective contributions, within a common civic culture and a French-speaking framework" (Anctil, 1996, p. 143). In effect, this means that allophone immigrants to Quebec are welcomed without being expected to assimilate to the majority culture as long as they accept certain basic conditions, including the use of French in their public communications. As Oakes and Warren (2007) noted, Quebec as a host thus provides its guests with "the key to the house", that is, the French language, "so that they can make themselves totally at home" (p. 149) in the province. To a certain extent, this appears to have been effective. Pagé and Lamarre (2010) showed that many allophone

immigrants (as well as francophones and anglophones) now use French rather than English in the public sphere. However, they also noted that

> the majority of immigrants and their children feel it is important to know both English and French because they realize, as do most of the other people with whom they are in contact, that life in a modern Quebec society that is open onto the world requires knowledge of both languages. Immigrants' use of French is [thus] not as widespread as it could be. (Pagé & Lamarre, 2010, p. 2) [iii]

As noted above, there is a paucity of research conducted to investigate the language attitudes held by Montreal allophones. Only one study employed the matched-guise technique—namely Laur (2008), an experiment that was conducted in 2004 amongst 610 anglophone, francophone and allophone Montrealers of different age groups. Laur's findings suggest that in the early years of the 21st century, the allophones attributed more status to English than to French, and that on the solidarity dimension, too, they held more positive attitudes towards English. (See below for Laur's findings pertaining to the anglophones and francophones.) However, the outcomes of an interview study and a survey that were conducted at approximately the same time (Beaulieu, 2003; CROP, 2000) were indicative of more positive attitudes towards French in terms of solidarity. A recent report by the *Conseil supérieur de la langue française*, based on a 2010 survey study conducted amongst 6689 Quebecers of different mother tongue groups (Pagé & Olivier, 2012), also revealed that while allophones considered English and French equally important in terms of their function in obtaining economic success, they considered French to be more important than English at a social and societal level within the Quebec context. The discrepant results of Laur (2008), Beaulieu (2003), CROP (2000) and Pagé and Olivier (2012) necessitate further research for clarification of how Montreal's allophones really do feel about French and English.

It was mentioned above that the linguistic behaviour of Montreal's allophone immigrants has for some time now been acknowledged to constitute a crucial factor in ensuring the future of the French language in Quebec. However, as Oakes (2010) noted, Dufour's recent essay *Les Québécois et l'anglais : Le retour du mouton* (2008) gives a very different angle to the debate about the language situation in Quebec. Dufour (2008) argued that it is not the province's allophone immigrants that are going to determine the future of French, but that the fate of the language in fact lies in the hands of the francophones—and this is what concerns him, because so many francophones speak English in contexts in which it is not absolutely necessary. This, Dufour (2008) noted, goes as far as some francophones responding in bad English to non-francophones even when the former have been addressed in French. He complained:

> These francophones, who do not even have to impose their language on a reticent person, but merely have to use it with a fellow citizen who has paved the way for them, do not seem to realise what their attitude means for the future of their community. (Dufour, 2008, p. 22)[iv]

By means of the title of his essay, he likened these francophones to the sheep who unquestioningly accompanied John the Baptist, the patron saint of the French Canadians, and he warned that "the future of a language…plays out on a daily basis, in the corner store

as well as in the shopping mall" (Dufour, 2008, p. 111)—thus cautioning these francophones.

The findings of the aforementioned study by Laur (2008) could be seen to confirm Dufour's (2008) fears for the future of the French language, because they suggest that francophones—as well as anglophones—not only still attribute more status to English than to French, but that both mother tongue groups also hold a preference for English in terms solidarity.[v] The findings of the aforementioned survey by Pagé and Olivier (2012), on the other hand, suggest that while anglophones and francophones considered English and French equally important in terms of their function in obtaining economic success, they considered French to be more important than English at a social and societal level. Another recent study is Oakes's (2010) survey, whose participants were 463 young francophones from Montreal, Sherbrooke and Quebec City. Oakes's (2010) findings suggest that young francophones' primary motivation for learning English nowadays is instrumental in nature.[vi] This confirms Laur's findings pertaining to the status dimension. However, the answers given in response to some of Oakes's (2010) questions indicate that young francophones' relationship with the French language is much more complex than Dufour assumed, and that they cannot simply be likened to lambs to the slaughter. For instance, while Oakes's (2010) respondents overwhelmingly agreed on a number of what can be seen as solidarity-related items, such as the notion that English provides access to an attractive culture for young people, they also indicated that they were very much aware of the risk that English poses to the predominance of French in Quebec, and that they were bothered by English public signage and by sales assistants who address customers in English. These findings would appear to contradict those of Laur. However, it should also be noted that, regrettably, Oakes's (2010) research only focused on francophones. Nevertheless, given the discrepant findings of Laur (2008), Pagé and Olivier (2012), and Oakes (2010), further research is desirable to clarify how Montreal's francophones and anglophones—as well as the allophones—really do feel about French and English.

The purpose of the study presented here was to update and expand the existing body of research in order to shed more light on the language attitudes held by young Montrealers of all linguistic backgrounds.

Method

The methods chosen for this study were one direct and one indirect method of attitude elicitation, namely a questionnaire and a matched-guise experiment. This choice was motivated by the fact that direct and indirect methods frequently yield rather different results since they pertain to different "levels of analysis" (Ryan, Giles & Hewstone, 1987, p. 1076). The purpose of direct methods of attitude elicitation such as questionnaires is typically recognisable, and as most individuals try (consciously or unconsciously) to put themselves in a good light by responding in an acceptable manner, findings obtained by means of direct methods tend to reveal what is considered to be socially 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 far less sensitive to reflection and social desirability biases. It can thus be assumed that in studies of this kind, much more private reactions will be revealed than in standard measures of attitudes such as questionnaires. Ryan et al. (1987) noted that if only one type of measurement is employed, it is rarely possible to make any definitive statements about language attitudes—yet apart

from Lambert et al. (1960), who also used a questionnaire and a matched-guise experiment, the author is not aware of any other studies in Montreal that employed both a direct and an indirect means of attitude elicitation. In the present study, it was therefore decided to use a combination of these methods in the hope that a comparison of the findings obtained by means of the questionnaire and those of the matched-guise experiment would enable a more complete understanding of the complexity of the social and linguistic situation in Montreal.

There are now many researchers in the humanities and social sciences who argue that a combination of quantitative and qualitative research allows for an even more comprehensive understanding of complex issues and problems (see, e.g., Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). *Mixed methods research*, as it is known, does indeed have many advantages. Because of this, the questionnaire employed in the study presented here sought both quantitative and qualitative data. However, a presentation of the qualitative data would go beyond the scope of this article, and therefore only the quantitative dimension of this study is presented here. For the qualitative dimension, see Kircher (2010).

Participants

Most previous research in Montreal was conducted amongst students, and for the sake of comparability, students were also decided upon as the participant sample for this study. All participants were enrolled at *Collèges d'enseignement général et professionnel*, commonly abbreviated to *CEGEPs*. The CEGEP is a type of postsecondary education institution exclusive to the province of Quebec, attendance of which is obligatory for those students who have completed primary and secondary education and who wish to enrol in a university. While there is an ongoing debate about extending Bill 101 to CEGEPs, current legislation in Quebec does not affect language choices at postsecondary level, and students can decide between French- and English-medium instruction. The participant sample for this study was drawn from different classes at two French- and two English-speaking CEGEPs. Usable data were collected from 147 students whose mean age was 18.3 years.[vii]

Based on Statistics Canada's definition of mother tongue (L1) as the first language a person learned at home in childhood and still understands, and taking into account that some respondents may declare that they learned two or more languages simultaneously (Statistics Canada, 2009), the students' self-evaluations were used to classify them into three groups: 44 whose L1 was English (and in some cases another language) (henceforth: anglophones), 55 whose L1 was French (and in some cases another language) (henceforth: francophones), and 48 whose L1 was a language/languages other than English or French (henceforth: allophones). The respondents from all L1 groups had good knowledge of both English and French. Ideally, each of the L1 groups should have been subdivided further. The allophones should have been subdivided into those who had a Romance language as their L1 and those who had a non-Romance language as their L1, because speakers of Romance languages have been found to be more likely to integrate into Quebec's francophone community and this integration pattern could be an indication of more positive attitudes towards French on their part (see, e.g., Girard-Lamoureux, 2004). The anglophones and francophones should have been subdivided further into those who had only either English or French as their L1, and those who had either English or French as well as another language as their L1s. Some might argue that the latter were in fact allophones, rather than anglophones or francophones. This argument can be refuted

because, as mentioned above, allophones are clearly defined as those individuals who have neither English nor French as their L1. Nevertheless, the author does acknowledge the weakness of the categorisation employed here. However, subdividing each of the L1 groups further would have resulted in much smaller subgroups, which in turn would have made the statistical analysis much more problematic. It was therefore decided to work with the same classification of L1 groups as Statistics Canada.

As noted above, many Montrealers have a recent migration background, and the participants were consequently also subdivided into 1st and 2nd generation immigrants as well as non-immigrants (27.8%, 36.1% and 36.1% respectively). However, few systematic patterns were revealed by an analysis of these three groups, and for reasons of space, the effect of the variable immigrant status is thus excluded from the discussion of the results. (See Kircher [in press] for a discussion of the language attitudes held by Montrealers of different migration backgrounds.) Moreover, the overall participant sample contained more females (70.1%) than males (29.9%). However, there was no evidence of significant non-orthogonality, and the influence of the variable sex is therefore also excluded from the discussion of the results.

Since the questionnaire did not inquire about the respondents' socioeconomic or ethnic backgrounds, the influence of these variables could regrettably not be ascertained. This is evidently another shortcoming of the present study. However, two reasons contributed to the decision to not include questionnaire items pertaining to these variables: firstly, the considerable amount of space and time that would have been taken up by the accurate assessment of the respondents' socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds during the data collection process, and secondly, the modifications the researcher was asked to make to the questionnaire during the ethical approval process on the part of the CEGEPs.

Given that the participants' sex did not have an effect on their attitudes, as well as the circumstance that the researcher was unable to obtain information regarding their socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds, the focus will thus be on the attitudes held by the three different L1 groups, that is, anglophones, francophones and allophones.

Procedure

Testing was conducted in different classes at two English-medium and two French-medium CEGEPs in the autumn of 2007. The research instruments were administered to all students in a given class at the same time, and the procedure took one lesson in total. At the English-medium CEGEPs, the researcher spoke to the students in English and administered all materials in English; at the French-medium CEGEPs, the researcher spoke French and administered all materials in French. At the beginning of the class, the matched-guise experiment was conducted in accordance with the standard procedure contrived by Lambert et al. (1960). By beginning with this, the researcher was able to ensure—as far as possible—the participants' ignorance with regard to the true purpose of the experiment, thereby uncovering more privately held attitudes. Following this, the participants were debriefed, and finally, the language attitudes questionnaire was administered. Debriefing the participants before distributing the questionnaire increased the likelihood of the respondents' answers to the questionnaire items revealing social desirability biases. This was a deliberate decision since, as noted above, the researcher wished to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of the complexity of the social and linguistic situation in Montreal.

Materials

Questionnaire

Once a preliminary version of the questionnaire had been developed, a pilot study was conducted amongst 12 anglophone, francophone and allophone university students from Montreal whose age was close to that of the actual participants. The results of this pilot study were used as a basis for the final version of the research instrument.

The background section of the questionnaire was designed to ascertain the participants' age, sex, L1, and immigrant status. The main section contained items that were designed to elicit attitudes towards English and French in terms of status and solidarity. These items were closed questions whose response options were five-point, interval, Likert-like scales (with 1 meaning *completely agree* and 5 *meaning don't agree at all*).

A language that is perceived to have high status is defined as one that is, inter alia, associated with economic opportunity and upward social mobility (see, e.g. Echeverria, 2005). The items "Knowing English/Knowing French will increase my opportunities to find employment" were thus designed to elicit attitudes with respect to economic opportunity, and the aim of the items "English/French is a language that is important to know in order to get far in life" were to ascertain attitudes with respect to upward mobility. Based on the assumption that a language's suitability to modern society implies its usefulness, the items "English/French is a language that is well suited to modern society" sought to investigate the utilitarian value that Montrealers attribute to English and French—another important characteristic of languages that are associated with status and social recognition (see, e.g., Gardner & Lambert, 1959).[viii]

A language that is evaluated highly on the solidarity dimension, on the other hand, is one that "elicits feelings of attraction, appreciation and belonging" (Ryan et al., 1982, p. 9)—which is typically the case for the language of one's family life and intimate friendships since this "acquires vital social meaning and comes to represent the social group with which one identifies" (Ryan et al., 1982, p. 9). As it can be assumed that it is mainly in their family life and/or intimate friendships that people share their joys as well as their concerns, the items "English/French is a language that lends itself well to expressing feelings and emotions" sought to find out to what extent this is the case. The items "Knowing English/French is a significant part of Canadian cultural heritage" aimed to find out to what extent the languages elicit feelings of attachment and belonging to the English and/or French language communities, that is, at the level of group identity. In order to obtain a more complete picture, the items "Knowing English/French is an important part of my personal identity" were used to ascertain the extent to which the languages are important to Montrealers of different backgrounds at the level of individual identity.

Stimulus Recordings

The stimulus recordings employed for the matched-guise experiment were the same as those used in the aforementioned study by Genesee and Holobow (1989). They described their selection process as follows:

Recordings in each of three guises—Canadian English, Quebec French and European French—were made of five "trilingual" males…All speakers spoke middle class language varieties….The recordings were then presented in random order to 20 male and female undergraduate psychology students from McGill University who were asked to judge the first language and nationality of each speaker. These judgments were used to select three of the five speakers for inclusion in the study. The three speakers who were selected were judged to be native speakers in each of their guises by at least 85% of the students. The nine recordings (three speakers in each of their three guises) were arranged in triads so that no two guises from the same speaker and no two recordings of the same variety occurred consecutively. (pp. 23-24)

Two other samples from different speakers were added to the beginning, as practice voices (see Appendix A for the order). The reason that the study presented here employed recordings of each of the speakers in three different guises is that it constitutes part of a larger study that also investigated attitudes towards Quebec French compared to European French. Yet while there were differences in participants' attitudes towards these two different varieties of French (Kircher, 2012), the same evaluative pattern emerged for Quebec French compared to English as it did for European French compared to English. For the purpose of this article, the two varieties were thus combined, and the term *French* is used here in a sense that includes them both.

When the study was conducted, the participants were informed that the different languages/varieties were being used to give greater scope to the experiment. While the majority of Quebecers speak Quebec French, European French is also heard frequently as a consequence of both the presence of European immigrants as well as linguistically conservative Quebecers (see, e.g., Lockerbie, 2005). The fact that the same evaluative pattern emerged for Quebec French compared to English as it did for European French compared to English suggests that employing two recordings in French and one in English by each of the speakers did not confound the overall results. This notion is supported by the fact that even when the participants were asked directly whether they thought that there was anything unusual about the recordings (see below for more detail), nobody made any comments regarding either the higher number of French recordings or the fact that European French recordings were employed in addition to Quebec French ones.

While the recordings originated from the 1980s, their quality was very good, and even when the respondents were asked directly whether they thought that there was anything unusual about the voices (see below for more detail), nobody made any comments indicative of their not sounding current. This suggests that the age of the recordings was not overly noticeable or problematic.

The text employed in the matched-guise experiment originated from a bilingual airline magazine (F. Genesee, personal communication, September 13, 2006; for the English and French versions of the text, see Appendices B and C). While neither texts nor the topics they deal with are ever really neutral, this particular passage at least does not contain any socially, ideologically or politically charged information, and it is in no way language-related. It can therefore be hoped that the text had only a negligible influence upon the participants.

It should be noted that while the study presented here employed the same recordings as Genesee and Holobow (1989), it goes beyond being a mere replication of their work—particularly since it includes an additional research method.

Evaluation Sheet

The participants were asked to give their impressions of each language sample on 16-point scales with 0 meaning *not at all…* and 16 meaning *very* …. Five of the scales pertained to status-related traits: intelligence, dependability, education, ambition, and leadership. The other five scales pertained to solidarity-related traits: kindness, humour, warmth, likeability, and sociability. All of these evaluation traits had previously been employed in numerous other investigations of language attitudes in Montreal (e.g., Genesee & Holobow, 1989; Lambert et al., 1960). Since the matched-guise technique had been tried and tested many times, and even the particular traits and recordings had been used before, a pilot for the matched-guise experiment was deemed unnecessary.

On the final page of the evaluation sheet, the participants were asked for their opinion regarding the purpose of the study, and whether they thought that there was anything unusual about the voices they had heard. The purpose of these questions was to enable the researcher to ascertain whether any of the participants had guessed the actual aim of the experiment. Those who did indeed guess the real objective were removed from the study, resulting in the overall number of 147 participants (see also note vi).

Statistical Analyses

The interval data pertaining to English and French that had been obtained by means of the closed survey questions was analysed with the use of analyses of variance (ANOVAs) that used L1 and immigrant status as the independent, between-subject variables. Independent samples *t*-tests were subsequently performed to compare the respondents' evaluations of English and French, and to ascertain whether the resulting differences were statistically significant. After combining the ratings of the speakers, the matched-guise data were analysed by means of repeated measures ANOVAs that also used L1 and immigrant status as the independent, between-subject variables.

Results

Attitudes on the Status Dimension—Results of the Questionnaire

As evidenced by Table 1, regarding the status dimension, the ANOVAs that were performed on the interval data obtained by means of the questionnaire showed that the anglophones, francophones and allophones alike held positive attitudes towards English.

Table 1

Evaluations of English on the Status Dimension

Item	L1	N	Mean	F	df	sig.
English is a language that is well suited to modern society	English	42	1.2	1.569	(2, 135)	0.212
	French	54	1.5			
	Other	48	1.5			
Knowing English will increase my opportunities to find employment	English	42	1.6	2.195	(2, 135)	0.115
	French	54	1.1			
	Other	48	1.3			
English is a language that is important to know in order to get far in life	English	41	1.8	0.214	(2, 134)	0.808
	French	54	2.0			
	Other	48	1.8			

Note. Item, L1, absolute numbers (*N*), means, *F* value (*F*), degrees of freedom (*df*), level of significance (sig.). Means: 1 = *completely agree*, 5 = *don't agree at all*.

As evidenced by Table 2, all three L1 groups also had positive attitudes towards French in terms of status.

Table 2

Evaluations of French on the Status Dimension

Item	L1	N	Mean	F	df	sig.
French is a language that is well suited to modern society	English	42	2.2	0.285	(2, 135)	0.753
	French	54	2.3			
	Other	48	2.5			
Knowing French will increase my opportunities to find employment	English	42	1.4	0.247	(2, 135)	0.782
	French	54	1.8			
	Other	48	1.6			
French is a language that is important to know in order to get far in life	English	42	1.9	1.245	(2, 135)	0.291
	French	54	2.4			
	Other	48	2.5			

Note. Item, L1, absolute numbers (*N*), means, *F* value (*F*), degrees of freedom (*df*), level of significance (sig.). Means: 1 = *completely agree*, 5 = *don't agree at all*.

However, as shown by Table 3, the independent samples *t*-tests comparing the evaluations of the two languages on the status dimension revealed that the respondents' attitudes towards English were in fact much more positive than their attitudes towards

French. All three L1 groups considered English to be significantly better suited to modern society than French. Moreover, the francophones and the allophones deemed knowledge of English significantly more likely to increase their opportunities to find employment than knowledge of French, and the allophones also judged English to be significantly more important in order to get far in life.

Table 3

Independent Samples t-test of the Different Mother Tongue Groups' Evaluations of English and French on the Status Dimension

Item	Language evaluated	L1	N	Mean	t	df[a]	sig.
… is a language that is well suited to modern society	English French	English	44 44	1.2 2.2	-5.841	60.502	0.000
	English French	French	55 55	1.5 2.3	-4.715	108	0.000
	English French	Other	48 48	1.5 2.5	-5.465	82.894	0.000
Knowing ... will increase my opportunities to find employment	English French	English	44 44	1.6 1.4	+0.979	86	0.330
	English French	French	55 55	1.1 1.8	-4.709	61.776	0.000
	English French	Other	48 48	1.3 1.6	-2.210	85.569	0.030
... is a language that is important to know in order to get far in life	English French	English	43 44	1.8 1.9	-0.455	85	0.650
	English French	French	55 55	2.0 2.4	-1.675	108	0.097
	English French	Other	48 48	1.8 2.5	-3.195	91.863	0.002

Note. Item, language evaluated, L1, absolute numbers (*N*), means, *t*-value (*t*), degrees of freedom (*df*), level of significance (sig.). Means: 1 = *completely agree*, 5 = *don't agree at all*.
[a]The fractional degrees of freedom are those calculated for unequal sample sizes.

        The survey results thus indicate that less status was attributed to French than to English. Moreover, the comments made by a number of participants in the margins of their survey forms also suggest that the status that they did attribute to French was restricted to French in Quebec rather than the language per se. One respondent, for example, had agreed completely that knowing French would increase one's opportunities to find employment, but had added, "it's relative: if it's in Quebec, yes." Similarly, two further respondents agreed completely that French is a language that is important to know in order to get far in life but both felt the need to clarify "in Quebec." Another respondent had used the phrase, "useful—in Quebec" to describe the French language.

Attitudes on the Status Dimension—Results of the Matched-Guise Experiment

        Table 4 presents the results of the repeated measures ANOVAs that were performed on the data obtained by means of the matched-guise experiment. As the respondents' L1 did not have a significant effect, only the total means are presented here. The findings clearly show the same trend as those of the questionnaire: anglophone, francophone and allophone participants alike evaluated English significantly more favourably than French on all five status traits, that is, intelligence, dependability, education, ambition, and leadership.

Table 4

Evaluations of Speakers in Different Guises in terms of Status Traits

Trait	*N*	Mean / English	Mean / French	*F*	*df*	sig.
intelligence	142	10.8	8.4	43.723	1(133)	0.000
dependability	133	10.3	8.0	34.135	1(124)	0.000
education	143	10.8	8.8	30.387	1(134)	0.000
ambition	143	8.7	7.3	15.274	1(134)	0.000
leadership	137	9.8	6.8	34.288	1(128)	0.000

Note. Trait, absolute numbers (*N*), means for guises (English, French), *F* value (*F*), degrees of freedom (*df*), level of significance (sig.). Means: 0 = *not at all*, 16 = *very*.

Attitudes on the Solidarity Dimension—Results of the Questionnaire

        As evidenced by Table 5, regarding the solidarity dimension, the ANOVAs that were performed on the interval data obtained by means of the questionnaire show that the anglophones, francophones and allophones alike held positive attitudes towards English.

Table 5

Evaluations of English on the Solidarity Dimension

Item	L1	N	Mean	F	df	sig.
English is a language that lends itself well to expressing feelings and emotions	English	42	1.5	5.583	(2, 135)	0.005
	French	54	2.8			
	Other	48	2.2			
Knowing English is a significant part of Canadian cultural heritage	English	42	1.7	4.697	(2, 134)	0.011
	French	53	2.6			
	Other	48	1.7			
Knowing English is an important part of my personal identity	English	42	1.5	1.510	(2, 135)	0.225
	French	54	2.8			
	Other	48	2.2			

Note. Item, L1, absolute numbers (*N*), means, *F* value (*F*), degrees of freedom (*df*), level of significance (sig.). Means: 1 = *completely agree*, 5 = *don't agree at all*.

As evidenced by Table 6, all three L1 groups also had positive attitudes towards French in terms of solidarity.

Table 6

Evaluations of French on the Solidarity Dimension

Item	L1	N	Mean	F	df	sig.
French is a language that lends itself well to expressing feelings and emotions	English	42	2.0	2.187	(2, 135)	0.116
	French	54	1.4			
	Other	48	1.9			
Knowing French is a significant part of Canadian cultural heritage	English	42	2.0	0.207	(2, 134)	0.813
	French	53	1.7			
	Other	48	2.0			
Knowing French is an important part of my personal identity	English	42	2.5	7.455	(2, 135)	0.001
	French	54	1.3			
	Other	48	2.6			

Note. Item, L1, absolute numbers (*N*), means, *F* value (*F*), degrees of freedom (*df*), level of significance (sig.). Means: 1 = *completely agree*, 5 = *don't agree at all*.

However, the independent samples *t*-tests that compared the evaluations of the two languages revealed that while the allophones did not exhibit a preference for either of the

languages, the anglophones held more positive attitudes towards English and the francophones held more positive attitudes towards French (see Table 7). The anglophones and the francophones each considered their L1 to lend itself significantly better to expressing feelings and emotions than the other language, and they deemed their own L1 to be significantly more important to their personal identity. Furthermore, the francophones judged French to be a significantly more important part of Canadian cultural heritage than English.

Table 7

Independent Samples *t*-test of the Different L1 Groups' Evaluations of English and French on the Solidarity Dimension

Item	Language evaluated	L1	*N*	Mean	*t*	*df*[a]	sig.
… is a language that lends itself well to expressing feelings and emotions	English French	English	44 44	1.5 2.0	-2.729	86	0.008
	English French	French	55 55	2.8 1.4	+7.078	96.776	0.000
	English French	Other	48 48	2.2 1.9	+1.735	94	0.086
Knowing … is a significant part of Canadian cultural heritage	English French	English	44 44	1.7 2.0	-1.459	86	0.148
	English French	French	54 54	2.6 1.7	+4.199	100.887	0.000
	English French	Other	48 48	1.7 2.0	-1.395	94	0.166
Knowing … is an important part of my personal identity	English French	English	44 44	1.5 2.5	-4.877	86	0.000
	English French	French	55 55	2.8 1.3	+6.540	81.565	0.000
	English French	Other	48 48	2.2 2.6	-1.559	94	0.122

Note. Item, language evaluated, L1, absolute numbers (*N*), means, *t*-value (*t*), degrees of freedom (*df*), level of significance (sig.). Means: 1 = *completely agree*, 5 = *don't agree at all*.
[a]The fractional degrees of freedom are those calculated for unequal sample sizes.

Attitudes on the Solidarity Dimension—Results of the Matched-Guise Experiment

The results of the repeated measures ANOVAs that were performed on the matched-guise data are shown in Table 8. Again, only the total means are presented as L1 did not have a significant effect. Unlike the questionnaire results, the matched-guise findings show that English was evaluated significantly more favourably than French in terms of all five solidarity traits, that is, kindness, humour, warmth, likeability, and sociability.

Table 8

Evaluations of Speakers in Different Guises in Terms of Solidarity Traits

Trait	*N*	Mean / English	Mean / French	*F*	*df*	sig.
kindness	143	10.3	8.6	18.862	1(134)	0.000
humour	144	8.7	6.3	33.800	1(135)	0.000
warmth	142	9.9	7.2	43.574	1(133)	0.000
likeability	140	10.6	8.1	43.469	1(131)	0.000
sociability	142	10.6	7.8	45.476	1(133)	0.000

Note. Trait, absolute numbers (*N*), means for guises (English, French), *F* value (*F*), degrees of freedom (*df*), level of significance (sig.). Means: 0 = *not at all*, 16 = *very*.

Discussion

It should be noted again that the results presented here might have looked different if each of the L1 groups had been subdivided further: the anglophones and francophones into those who had only English or French as their L1, and those who had English or French as well as another language as their L1s; and the allophones into those who had a Romance language as their L1 and those who had a non-Romance language as their L1. Nevertheless, the outcomes of this study are meaningful.

The findings suggest that a change has occurred in young Montrealers' perceptions of the French language with regard to its status. As noted above (and see, e.g., Bernard, 2008), before the passage of Bill 101 in 1977, English was the only language required for social and economic advancement in Montreal, while French had very little utilitarian value in the city. However, Bill 101 reinforced the status of French as the only official language of Quebec as well as officially making it the main language of the workplace, of education, and of several other areas of public life in the province—and as the results of the questionnaire show, 30 years down the line, the young anglophone, francophone and allophone Montrealers who took part in this study all considered French to be a language that is well suited to modern society, that increases their opportunities to find employment, and that is important to know in order to get far in life. These findings indicate that the

respondents attributed at least a certain amount of status to French—and while it is difficult to establish cause and effect relationships when evaluating the impact of language legislation on language attitudes, the status that the young Montrealers attribute to French does seem to suggest the (continuing) efficacy of measures such as Bill 101.

However, while French now seems to hold a certain overt prestige, the results of both the questionnaire and the matched-guise experiment clearly indicate that the respondents' attitudes towards English were even more positive than their attitudes towards French on the status dimension—just as they had been found to be in the aforementioned previous matched-guise studies (i.e., Genesee & Holobow, 1989; Lambert et al., 1960; Laur, 2008; Preston, 1963). When interpreted in their sociohistorical context, these findings are not entirely surprising. As noted above, for a long time, the attraction of English lay in the fact that Montreal anglophones were traditionally a socioeconomically advantaged group, which led to English being the language of upward mobility. Since the late 1970s, status planning efforts on the part of the Quebec government have succeeded in increasing the utilitarian value of French so that Montreal is now no longer dominated—economically or linguistically—by its anglophone minority. However, English continues to be a pivotal language in public and private communication amongst many Montrealers, and due to its role as the global lingua franca of our times as well as its status as the language of socioeconomic advancement in the rest of Canada and the United States, it continues to exert a strong power of attraction—and particularly so amongst young people, many of whom still have to forge their way in the working world. The participants' more positive attitudes towards English than towards French on the status dimension can be interpreted as a reflection of this.

In light of the fact that French enjoys comparatively less utilitarian value worldwide than English does, it would not be surprising either if it was not the French language per se that was being rated positively on the status dimension. As some respondents' comments in the margins of their survey forms suggest, it might be the case that the favourable evaluations in this respect only applied to the Quebec setting. However, further research is necessary to ascertain whether this is indeed the case.

Regarding the solidarity dimension, the findings obtained by means of the different methods of attitude elicitation differed significantly. As noted above, the language a person evaluates most favourably on the solidarity dimension tends to be that of their family life and/or intimate friendships since this comes to represent the social group with which they identify. The outcome of the survey was therefore what the researcher had expected to find: the results suggested that the anglophones held more positive attitudes towards English while the francophones held more positive attitudes towards French—that is, each group exhibited a preference for their own L1, which can be assumed to also be the language that the group members use with their family (and probably also with their close friends). The allophones appeared to have equally positive attitudes towards both languages, which is unsurprising since neither is their L1 and they presumably use a different, third language to communicate with their family members (and possibly also with their close friends). The outcome of the matched-guise experiment, however, indicated that on the solidarity dimension, too, all three L1 groups held more positive attitudes towards English than towards French. This indicates that a change has occurred since the 1980s, when the findings of Genesee and Holobow's (1989) matched-guise study had shown the francophones to hold equally positive attitudes towards English and French in terms of solidarity. While the preference for English on the solidarity dimension amongst the non-

anglophones that was found in the present study might be unexpected, the same trend had previously also been attested by Laur (2008) in her matched-guise experiment (see above)—however, regrettably, Laur did not provide an explanation for this aspect of her findings.

As noted above, it is not uncommon for direct and indirect methods of attitude elicitation to yield dissimilar, and sometimes even contradictory results. Ryan et al. (1987) explained that this is by no means an issue of relative methodological merit, but that it is due to the fact that the different methods simply produce results at different levels of analysis: "direct and indirect methods lay claim to quite different layers of experience and as such manifest sometimes quite contradictory, yet highly rational, attitude constellations" (p. 1076). It is therefore not entirely surprising that the outcome of the survey and that of the matched-guise experiment should differ from each other—however, the question is what the rationale behind this difference might be.

As mentioned previously, findings obtained by means of direct methods of attitude elicitation such as questionnaires often reveal what the respondents consider to be socially desirable. It is thus possible that the survey results were caused by the francophones and the allophones feeling that they *should* hold these comparatively positive attitudes towards French in terms of solidarity. (Social desirability biases could also have affected the positive attitudes towards French on the solidarity dimension amongst francophones and allophones that had previously been attested by Beaulieu [2003], CROP [2000], Oakes [2010], and Pagé and Olivier [2012], since all of these studies had also used direct methods.) As noted above, it has for some time now been an important objective of the Quebec government to create an affective attachment to the French language amongst all Quebecers, with the overall aim of making it the common public language of the province. Young francophones and allophones might be especially susceptible to this: young francophones because they were brought up in the knowledge of how hard their parents' generation had to fight for their language rights, and young allophones because they are a particular focus of many of the current governmental efforts (see above). It is thus possible that the survey results pertaining to the francophones and the allophones were reflections of social desirability biases caused by such governmental efforts.

As mentioned previously, the major strength of indirect methods such as the matched-guise technique is assumed to lie in the elicitation of spontaneous attitudes that are less sensitive to reflection and social desirability biases than are directly assessed attitudes. Therefore, the underlying assumption is that in studies of this kind, much more private reactions are revealed. If the survey results were indeed indicative of social desirability biases, it remains to be explored what the more private reasons were that caused the respondents from all three L1 groups to evaluate English more favourably than French in the matched-guise study presented here (as well as in Laur [2008]). What follows are two possible explanations that could account for this, both of which assume that the underlying reason is a matter of social identity.

Firstly, it is possible that the more positive attitudes towards English than towards French in terms of solidarity are the result of a Montreal-based identity that encompasses English rather than French as the common in-group language. Labelle and Salée (2001) stipulated the development of such a Montreal-based identity—that is, a relatively new identity that is associated with the city's distinctly cosmopolitan character and its constitutive heterogeneity as opposed to "the narrow provincialism associated with the sovereignist vote and the rest of Quebec outside Montreal" (p. 297). Support for the notion

of such an identity comes from the interviews Labelle and Salée conducted with a number of Montrealers who were asked about their self-identifications, and whose responses included the following: "My first answer is Montrealer. I identify very closely with the city", and, "They won't say Quebecer, because they feel that Montreal has a distinct character vis-à-vis the rest of Quebec.… It's a way to demarcate themselves from the rest of the province. Since the [1995] referendum [on Quebec sovereignty], the Montrealer thing has become very strong" (Labelle & Salée, 2001, p. 297). The work of Lamarre, Paquette, Kahn, and Ambrosi (2002) also supports the notion of English as an important component of Montreal's linguistic identity. Moreover, Oakes (2010) found that his respondents from Montreal felt somewhat less Québécois than those from elsewhere in the province. Regarding the findings of the present study, it is thus possible that the anglophone, francophone and allophone respondents alike identified as Montrealers rather than as Quebecers and thus considered English rather than French to be their common in-group language. This would explain why they held more positive attitudes towards the former than towards the latter in terms of solidarity.

Secondly, it is possible that the outcome of the matched-guise experiment is a reflection of an international youth identity that is expressed with the help of English. It appears that young people in various countries nowadays use English for activities that have strong emotive associations. For example, in a study in Germany, Berns (1988) found that English creates a sense of solidarity amongst teenagers "by emphasizing the shared basis of familiar, although foreign, language elements, thus creating an anti-language which distinguishes 'us' [i.e. youngsters] from 'them' [i.e. anyone else]" (p. 45). Similarly, Preisler (1999) noted that informal use of English has become an inherent, and indeed a defining, aspect of youth culture in Denmark, and he explained that an important reason why young Danes employ English is "to symbolise subcultural identity or affiliation, and peer group solidarity" (p. 247). Based on such findings, Cheshire (2000) theorised that English is no longer necessarily associated with a specific English-speaking country, and she stipulated that that there might be a pan-European youth identity that is expressed with the help of the English language. Further support for this notion comes from other European countries such as Hungary, where young people have been found to hold very positive attitudes towards English in terms of solidarity (Fenyvesi, 2010). However, there is also evidence from other, non-European countries such as Brazil (El-Dash & Busnardo, 2002), which suggests that young people outside of Europe also have very positive attitudes towards English on the solidarity dimension. It is thus possible that the aforementioned youth identity is not restricted to Europe but that it is in fact international in scope. This would serve as another possible explanation for the young anglophone, francophone and allophone Montrealers' more positive attitudes towards English in terms of solidarity.

These two possible explanations for the findings of the matched-guise experiment— that is, a Montreal-based identity and an international youth identity, both of which encompass English as the in-group language—are not mutually exclusive, and either one of them or a combination of both could be what caused the respondents from all three L1 groups to hold more positive attitudes towards English on the solidarity dimension. However, regrettably, it is impossible to ascertain whether matters of social identity are indeed at the root of the findings of the matched-guise experiment since these findings had not been anticipated and the participants were therefore not asked to provide any information concerning their self-identifications.

Whatever lies at the root of the findings of this study, the cause is likely to be a relatively recent development. As noted above, early matched-guise studies such as Lambert et al. (1960) had found not only Montreal anglophones but also francophones to hold more favourable attitudes towards English in terms of solidarity. In the historical context—that is, the elite status of Montreal anglophones and the resulting importance of the English language—these findings were explained as a result of subordinate groups frequently internalising a wider social evaluation of themselves as inferior. However, a change had occurred between the late 1950s and the 1980s, because the results of Genesee and Holobow's (1989) matched-guise study indicated that at least young francophones at that time held equally positive attitudes towards English and French on the solidarity dimension. Again, this should be interpreted in the historical context—that is, the increased sense of linguistic security felt by the francophones as a result of their "reconquest" of Montreal. Different aspects of the current social context—that is, globalisation, the internationalisation of youth identity, and the increasingly cosmopolitan nature of Montreal—could serve as an explanation of the most recent change attested by the findings of the study presented here.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it can be said that the young anglophone, francophone and allophone Montrealers who took part in the study presented here attributed at least a certain amount of status to the French language, and that this is likely to be the result of status planning measures such as Bill 101. However, English was still evaluated even more positively than French on the status dimension, which can most probably be attributed to its role as the global lingua franca as well as its function as the language of socioeconomic advancement in the rest of North America.

Regarding the solidarity dimension, the outcome of the survey suggested that the young anglophones held more positive attitudes towards English, the francophones held more positive attitudes towards French, and the allophones held equally positive attitudes towards both languages. The results of the matched-guise experiment, on the other hand, indicated more positive attitudes towards English amongst all three L1 groups. A possible explanation for these discrepant findings is that the survey results were influenced by social desirability biases, and that the findings of the matched-guise experiment were due to the respondents' social identities. Two forms of social identity were stipulated as the possible root of the findings: a Montreal-based identity and an international youth identity that is expressed with the help of English.

Since both of these interpretations are speculative and it was not possible to verify them based on the data collected for this study, further research is necessary to explore young Montrealers' language attitudes on the solidarity dimension, as well as the underlying reasons for these attitudes. In future work, a clear distinction should be made between individuals who have only either English or French as their L1, and those who have either English or French as well as another language as their L1s. Larger participant samples than in this study should be employed to ensure sufficiently large subgroup sizes. More work, with larger participant samples, is also desirable on the influence that variables such as socioeconomic and ethnic background have on individuals' language attitudes. Such investigations would enable a more complete understanding of language attitudes, not only in Montreal but also in general.

Acknowledgements

Correspondence should be addressed to Ruth Kircher.
Email: kircher@hope.ac.uk

Notes

i   Unlike previous censuses, the *2011 Census of Canada* (Statistics Canada, 2011) does not actually employ the terms *francophone*, *anglophone*, and *allophone*. The percentages provided here were thus calculated as follows, based on the *2011 Census* data: francophones = those who had either French or French and another language (other than English) as their mother tongue; anglophones = those who had either English or English and another language (other than French) as their mother tongue; allophones = those who had a language or languages other than French or English as their mother tongue(s). This is the same method of calculation that had been used in previous censuses.

ii   A number of other attitudes studies were conducted in Montreal in the 1970s and the 1980s, including the field experiments undertaken by Bourhis and his associates (summarised in Bourhis, Montaruli, & Amiot, 2007) as well as studies by Genesee and Bourhis (1982, 1988) that made use of the so-called *segmented-dialogue technique*, a variant of the matched-guise technique. However, since the primary focus of these studies was on evaluative reactions to language accommodation rather than evaluative reactions to the languages themselves, these studies are not discussed here.

iii   Further studies were conducted by Lamarre and her associates to investigate language usage amongst Montrealers of different mother tongue groups (see, e.g., Lamarre & Dagenais, 2004; Lamarre & Rossel Paredes, 2003). However, as these studies' main focus is on usage patterns, and the focus of this article is on evaluative reactions, these studies are not discussed here.

iv   All translations of Dufour (2008) are the author's translations.

v   Unlike the other voice evaluation studies mentioned, Laur (2008) employed both a male and a female speaker. For the sake of comparability with the other previous

studies as well as the study presented here, only the evaluations of Laur's male speaker are referred to in this article.

[vi]   As Gardner and Lambert (1972) explained, an instrumental motivation for language learning is based on the utilitarian value that the language holds, on "a desire to gain social recognition or economic advantages through knowledge of [that] language" (p. 14).

[vii]   Originally, data was collected from 164 participants. However, 13 participants claimed to have both English and French as their mother tongues and consequently constituted a separate mother tongue group—yet the size of this group was considered too small to produce reliable and meaningful results and these participants were therefore excluded from the final analysis. Four of the remaining participants guessed the objective of the matched-guise experiment—and as with matched-guise studies the participants' ignorance with regard to the methodology is crucial for the elicitation of valid results, these participants were also removed from the study, resulting in the overall number of 147.

[viii]   Retrospectively, the researcher realised that the manner in which the items were phrased had the disadvantage of not revealing whether the participants' evaluations in terms of the status dimension applied to English and French per se, or whether they actually only applied to these languages in the Quebec setting. Ideally, two sets of questions should have been included, one pertaining to the languages per se and one pertaining to them in Quebec. Nevertheless, a number of comments made by the participants elucidate this matter and suggest that the evaluations of at least the French language primarily applied to the Quebec setting.

References

Anctil, P. (1996). La trajectoire interculturelle du Québec : La société distincte vue à travers le prisme de l'immigration. In A. Lapierre, P. Smart, & P. Savard (Eds.), *Language, culture and values in Canada at the dawn of the 21st Century* (pp. 133-154). Ottawa, Canada: International Council for Canadian Studies/Carleton University Press.

d'Anglejan, A. (1984). Language planning in Quebec: A historical overview and future trends. In R. Y. Bourhis (Ed.), *Conflict and language planning in Quebec* (pp. 29-52). Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

Beaulieu, I. (2003). Le premier portrait des enfants de la loi 101 : Sondage auprès des jeunes Québécois issus de l'immigration récente. In M. Venne (Ed.), *L'annuaire du Québec 2004* (pp. 260-265). Saint-Laurent, Canada: Fides.

Bernard, A. (2008). Les repercussions sociales et politiques de la loi 101. In M. Plourde & P. Georgeault (Eds.), *Le français au Québec : 400 ans d'histoire et de vie* (pp. 360-368). Montreal, Canada: Fides.

Berns, M. (1988). The cultural and linguistic context of English in West Germany. *World Englishes, 7*, 37-49.

Bourhis, R. Y. (1984). The Charter of the French Language and cross-cultural communication in Montreal. In R. Y. Bourhis (Ed.), *Conflict and language planning in Quebec* (pp. 174-204). Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

Bourhis, R. Y. (2001). Reversing language shift in Quebec. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift, revisited: A 21st century perspective* (pp. 101-141). Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

Bourhis, R. Y., Montaruli, E., & Amiot, C. E. (2007). Language planning and French-English bilingual communication: Montreal field studies from 1977 to 1997. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 185*, 187-224.

Cheshire, J. (2000). What we are and where we're going: Language and identities in the new Europe. In P. Gybbins & M. Holt (Eds.), *Beyond boundaries: Language and identity in contemporary Europe* (pp.19-34). Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. London, United Kingdom: Sage.

CROP. (2000). *Les enfants de la loi 101 : Groupes de discussion exploratoires*. Quebec, Canada: Conseil Supérieur de la langue française.

Dickinson, J., & Young, B. (2003). *A short history of Quebec*. Montreal and Kingston, Canada: McGill and Queen's University Press.

Dufour, C. (2008). *Les Québécois et l'anglais : Le retour du mouton.* Sainte-Angèle-de-Monnoir, Canada: Éditeurs réunis.

Echeverria, B. (2005). Language attitudes in San Sebastian: The Basque vernacular as challenge to Spanish language hegemony. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 26*(3), 249-264.

El-Dash, L. G., & Busnardo, J. (2002). Brazilian attitudes toward English: Dimensions of status and solidarity. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*, 57-74.

Fenyvesi, A. (2010, October). *Language attitudes in a minority context: Minority Hungarian students' attitudes to their minority language, the state language, and English as a foreign language*. Paper presented at Multilingual Individuals and Multilingual Societies, Hamburg, Germany.

Fishman, J. (2002). Endangered minority languages: Prospects for sociolinguistic research. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies, 4*(2), 270-275.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology, 13*(4), 266-272.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Garrett, P., Coupland, N., & Williams, A. (2003). *Investigating language attitudes: Social meanings of dialect, ethnicity and performance*. Cardiff, United Kingdom: University of Wales Press.

Genesee, F., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1982). The social psychological significance of code switching in cross-cultural communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 1*(1), 1-27.

Genesee, F., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1988). Evaluative reactions to language choice strategies: The role of sociostructural factors. *Language and Communication: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 8*, 229-250.

Genesee, F., & Holobow, N. E. (1989). Change and stability in intergroup perceptions. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 8*(1), 17-39.

Giles, H., & Coupland, N. (1991). *Language: Contexts and consequences*. Milton Keynes, United Kingdom: Open University Press.

Girard-Lamoureux, C. (2004). *La langue d'usage public des allophones scolarisés au Québec*. Quebec, Canada: Gouvernement du Québec.

Gouvernement du Québec. (1972). *La situation de la langue française au Québec. Livre I: La langue de travail. La situation du français dans les activités de travail et de consommation des Québécois.* Report of the Commission d'enquête sur la situation de la langue française et sur les droits linguistiques au Québec. Quebec, Canada: Gouvernement du Québec.

Gouvernement du Québec. (2001). *Le français, une langue pour tout le monde.* Report of the Commission des États généraux sur la situation et l'avenir de la langue française au Québec. Quebec, Canada: Gouvernement du Québec. Retrieved from: http://www.pierrelemieux.org/COM1-021_Rapport_final.pdf

Heller, M. S. (1985). Ethnic relations and language use in Montreal. In N. Wolfson & J. Manes (Eds.), *Language of inequality* (pp. 75-90). Berlin, Germany: Mouton.

Kircher, R. (2010). *Language attitudes in Quebec: A contemporary perspective* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom.

Kircher, R. (2012). How pluricentric is the French language? An investigation of attitudes towards Quebec French compared to European French. *Journal of French Language Studies, 22*(3), 345-370.

Kircher, R. (in press). Quebec's shift from ethnic to civic national identity: Implications for language attitudes amongst immigrants in Montreal. In D. Evans (Ed.), *Language and identity*. London, United Kingdom: Bloomsbury.

Labelle, M., & Salée, D. (2001). Immigrant and minority representations of citizenship in Quebec. In T. A. Aleinikoff & D. Klusmeyer (Eds.), *Citizenship today* (pp. 279-315). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Lamarre, P., & Dagenais, D. (2004). Linguistic representations of trilingual youth in two Canadian cities. In C. Hoffman & J. Ytsma (Eds.), *Trilingualism in family, school and community* (pp. 53-74). Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

Lamarre, P., & Rossel Paredes, J. (2003). Growing up trilingual in Montreal: Perceptions of young college students. In R. Bayley & S. Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 68-80). Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

Lamarre, P., Paquette, J., Kahn, E., & Ambrosi, S. (2002). Multilingual Montreal: Listening in on the language practices of young Montrealers. *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Études ethniques au Canada, 34*(3), 47-75.

Lambert, W. E., Anisfeld, M., & Yeni-Komshian, G. (1965). Evaluational reactions of Jewish and Arab adolescents to dialect and language variations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2*(1), 84-90.

Lambert, W. E., Hodgson, R. C., Gardner, R. C., & Fillenbaum, S. (1960). Evaluational reactions to spoken language. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *60*(1), 44-51.

Laur, E. (2008). *Contribution à l'étude des perceptions linguistiques : La méthodologie des faux-couples revisitée.* Montreal, Canada: Office québécois de la langue française.

Levine, M. V. (1997). *La reconquête de Montréal*. Montreal, Canada: VLB éditeur.

Lockerbie, I. (2005). The debate on l'aménagement du français in Québec. In I. Lockerbie, I. Molinaro, K. Larose, & L. Oakes (Eds.), *French as the common language in Québec: History, debates and positions* (pp. 15-65). Quebec, Canada: Éditions Nota bene.

MacLennan, H. (1945). *Two solitudes*. Markham, Canada: Fitzhenry & Whiteside.

Monnier, D. (1983). *La question linguistique*. Quebec, Canada: Conseil de la langue française.

Oakes, L. (2005). French as the 'common public language' in Québec. In I. Lockerbie, I. Molinaro, K. Larose, & L. Oakes (Eds.), *French as the common language in Québec: History, debates and positions* (pp. 153-194). Quebec, Canada: Éditions Nota bene.

Oakes, L. (2010). Lambs to the slaughter? Young francophones and the role of English in Quebec today. *Multilingua, 29*, 265-288.

Oakes, L., & Warren, J. (2007). *Language, citizenship and identity in Quebec*. Basingstoke, United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pagé, M., & Lamarre, P. (2010). *L'intégration linguistique des immigrants au Québec*. Montreal, Canada: Institut de recherche en politiques publiques.

Pagé, M., & Olivier, C.-É. (2012). *Importance et priorité du français pour la population québécoise : Une étude exploratoire*. Quebec, Canada: Conseil supérieur de la langue française.

Preisler, B. (1999). Functions and forms of English in a European FL country. In A. R. Bex & R. J. Watts (Eds.), *Standard Englishes: The widening debate* (pp. 239-267). London, United Kingdom: Routledge.

Preston, M. S. (1963). *Evaluational reactions to English, Canadian French and European French voices* (Unpublished master's thesis). McGill University, Montreal, Canada.

Rocher, G. (2008). La politique et la loi linguistique du Québec en 1977. In M. Plourde & P. Georgeault (Eds.), *Le français au Québec : 400 ans d'histoire et de vie* (pp. 339-353). Quebec and Montreal, Canada: Conseil supérieur de la langue française/Fides.

Ryan, E. B., Giles, H., & Hewstone, M. (1987). The measurement of language attitudes. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, & K. J. Mattheier (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: An international handbook of language and society* (pp. 1068-1081). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.

Ryan, E. B., Giles, H., & Sebastian, R. J. (1982). An integrative perspective for the study of attitudes towards language variation. In E. B. Ryan & H. Giles (Eds.), *Attitudes towards language variation: Social and applied contexts* (pp. 1-19). London, United Kingdom: Edward Arnold.

St-Laurent, N. (2008). *Le français et les jeunes*. Quebec, Canada: Conseil supérieur de la langue française.

Statistics Canada. (2001). *2001 Census of Canada*. Retrieved from: http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census01/home/Index.cfm

Statistics Canada. (2009). *Mother tongue of person: Definition*. Retrieved from: http://www.statcan.gc.ca/concepts/definitions/language-langue01-eng.htm

Statistics Canada. (2011). *2011 Census of Canada*. Retrieved from: http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/index-eng.cfm?HPA

Stefanescu, A., & Georgeault, P. (2005). Conclusion. In A. Stefanescu & P. Georgeault (Eds.), *Le français au Québec : Les nouveaux défis* (pp. 589-608). Montreal, Canada: Fides.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Wochel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.

Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research: Integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches in the social and behavioural sciences*. London, United Kingdom: Sage.

Appendix A

Order of Stimulus Recordings in the Matched-Guise Experiment

S2—European French, S3—English, S1—Quebec French, S3—European French, S2—Quebec French, S1—English, S3—Quebec French, S1—European French, S2—English

Appendix B

Text Employed in the Matched-Guise Experiment—English Version

On a cold January day when the temperature was minus twenty degrees Celsius, a thirteen-year-old girl was buried under debris when the heating system of her parents' home exploded. When firemen arrived on the scene, she was soaked with water and waited two hours before she could be rescued and taken to hospital. Her body temperature was well below thirty-three degrees Celsius and she was shivering violently. She had lost her sense of balance, spoke incoherently, and was suffering from extreme fatigue.

Appendix C

Text Employed in the Matched-Guise Experiment—French Version

Un froid matin de janvier, par une température de moins vingt degrés celsius, une jeune fille de treize ans se trouva enfoui sous les débris produits par l'explosion du système de chauffage de ses parents. Lorsque les pompiers arrivèrent sur les lieux, elle était trempée jusqu'aux os et il a fallu deux heures à ses sauveteurs pour la sortir de là et la conduire à l'hôpital. La température de son corps était au-dessous des trente trois degrés celsius ; de plus, elle était secouée de violents frissons, avait perdu le sens de l'équilibre, parlait de façon incohérente et souffrait de fatigue extrême.