

**LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND  
DISCOURSES OF NATIONAL IDENTITY IN  
CANADIAN NEWSPAPERS:  
A CROSS-LINGUISTIC CORPUS-ASSISTED  
DISCOURSE STUDY**

by

**Rachelle Vessey**

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements  
of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

February 2013

School of Languages, Linguistics and Film  
Queen Mary, University of London

# DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the work contained in this thesis is original and has not previously been submitted to this or any other institution. The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and any information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Date

Signature

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank Queen Mary, University of London and more specifically the School of Languages, Linguistics and Film for awarding me a research studentship, which made it possible for me to come to London. In addition, departmental research funding and the Postgraduate Research Fund also enabled me to travel to numerous conferences, workshops, and seminars. I am also very grateful to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada for the Doctoral Research Award that enabled me to continue my studies.

I would like to thank my supervisors Leigh Oakes and Colleen Cotter for engaging with my research from the beginning, for their support and guidance throughout the PhD process, and for their encouragement in my academic endeavours that extended beyond the thesis itself. I would also like to thank Erez Levon and Devyani Sharma for their insightful comments and suggestions during the upgrade process, and to all department members for their interested and often challenging questions over the past three years; these ultimately strengthened my research. I am also very grateful to Sylvia Jaworska and Guillaume Gentil for their continued support and interest in my work. My research has also been enhanced by the SLLF sociolinguistics reading groups, postgraduate discussion groups, the annual postgraduate conferences, and the weekly nationalism workshops at the London School of Economics as part of the Association for the Study of Ethnicity and Nationalism.

I also feel very fortunate to have been provided such excellent university workspace. The “lab” proved to be a haven, and I feel so fortunate to have shared it with such excellent colleagues and friends. This environment provided invaluable support on a daily basis, and I would like to thank all of my fellow PhD students – especially Fryni, Philippa, Ahmad, Ruth, Barb, and James – for their incredible friendship. Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for all of their love and support. Thank you especially to my mum for being so generous and a continued source of inspiration. And a final thank you to Lee, for enabling me to become Dr. Vessey.

# ABSTRACT

The idea that Canada consists of “two solitudes” (MacLennan, 1945), according to which the two dominant (English and French) linguistic groups live in separate worlds with little interaction or communication, has also received attention in sociolinguistic circles (e.g. Heller, 1999). This thesis examines this claim further, by comparing the content of English and French Canadian newspapers. More specifically, the thesis compares how English and French serve different purposes in three coexisting conceptualisations of national identity in Canada: Quebec national identity, English Canadian national identity, and pan-Canadian national identity. In each corresponding national identity discourse, the nation and its language(s) are imagined differently.

With a corpus of 7.5 million words in English and 3.5 million words in French, the thesis employs corpus linguistics and discourse analysis tools to test the salience of these ideologies and discourses, as well as to compare and contrast findings across languages. Adopting the theoretical framework of language ideologies (e.g. Woolard, 1998; Milani and Johnson, 2008), it seeks to contextualise languages with regard to discourses of national identity. In other words, the thesis compares and contrasts language ideology findings within the three discourses examined. More specifically, three research questions are addressed: (1) How do the French and English Canadian media discursively represent languages and language issues in the news? (2) How do these representations differ? (3) How do the different representations relate to understandings of national identity in Canada? The findings indicate that French and English serve predominantly different purposes, thus helping to reinforce the image of a Canada comprising “two solitudes”.

# CONTENTS

<b>DECLARATION .....</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>CONTENTS.....</b>	<b>IV</b>
<b>TABLES .....</b>	<b>VII</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.2 BRIEF HISTORY OF LANGUAGE IN CANADA .....	3
1.3 THE MEDIA IN CANADA .....	10
1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS .....	15
1.5 STRUCTURE OF THESIS.....	16
<b>2. THEORETICAL CONCEPTS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1 INTRODUCTION .....	17
2.2 IDEOLOGY .....	17
2.2.1 <i>Implicitness</i> .....	18
2.2.2 <i>Ideologies and power</i> .....	21
2.2.3 <i>Ideological semiotic processes</i> .....	23
2.2.4 <i>Language ideologies</i> .....	25
2.3 DISCOURSE.....	31
2.3.1 <i>National discourses and discourses of national identity</i> .....	35
2.3.2 <i>Language and nationalism</i> .....	39
2.3.3 <i>Ideology and nationalism in media language</i> .....	41
2.4 CONCLUSION .....	47
<b>3. CANADIAN DISCOURSES OF NATIONAL IDENTITY AND LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES .....</b>	<b>49</b>
3.1 INTRODUCTION .....	49
3.2 DISCOURSES OF NATIONAL IDENTITY IN QUEBEC.....	50
3.2.1 <i>Monolingual ideologies</i> .....	55
3.2.2 <i>Ideologies of French as a core value</i> .....	58
3.2.3 <i>Ideologies of standardised French</i> .....	61
3.2.4 <i>Ideologies of language endangerment</i> .....	63
3.2.5 <i>Conclusion</i> .....	66

3.3 DISCOURSES OF NATIONAL IDENTITY IN ENGLISH CANADA .....	67
3.3.1 <i>Unmarked monolingual ideologies</i> .....	71
3.3.2 <i>Ideologies of standardised Canadian English</i> .....	74
3.3.3 <i>Ideologies of instrumental English</i> .....	76
3.3.4 <i>Conclusion</i> .....	77
3.4 PAN-CANADIAN DISCOURSES OF NATIONAL IDENTITY .....	78
3.4.1 <i>Bilingual ideologies</i> .....	84
3.4.2 <i>Ideologies of languages and national identity</i> .....	87
3.4.3 <i>Ideologies of languages as commodities</i> .....	90
3.4.4 <i>Conclusion</i> .....	91
3.5 SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES: A SUMMARY .....	91
<b>4. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE .....</b>	<b>94</b>
4.1 A METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE TO STUDY IDEOLOGY .....	94
4.2 CROSS-LINGUISTIC CORPUS-ASSISTED DISCOURSE STUDIES .....	95
4.2.1 <i>Corpus linguistics</i> .....	96
4.2.1.1 Corpus linguistics theory .....	96
4.2.1.2 Corpus linguistics tools .....	98
4.2.1.2.1 WordList .....	99
4.2.1.2.2 Concord .....	100
4.2.1.2.3 KeyWord .....	104
4.2.1.3 Corpus linguistics and ideology .....	106
4.2.2 <i>Critical discourse analysis</i> .....	107
4.2.2.1 Micro-level tools .....	110
4.2.2.2 Macro tools .....	113
4.2.2.4 Corpus-assisted discourse studies .....	115
4.2.3 <i>Cross-linguistic studies</i> .....	116
4.3 CROSS-LINGUISTIC CORPUS-ASSISTED DISCOURSE STUDIES PROCEDURE .....	119
4.3.1 <i>Compilation of corpora</i> .....	119
4.3.2 <i>Compilation of primary corpora</i> .....	128
4.3.3 <i>Downsampling for cross-linguistic discourse analysis</i> .....	133
4.3.4 <i>Procedure</i> .....	135
4.4 SUMMARY .....	137
<b>5. DISCOURSES OF QUEBEC NATIONAL IDENTITY .....</b>	<b>138</b>
5.1 INTRODUCTION .....	138
5.2 QUEBEC NATIONALISM .....	140
5.3 MONOLINGUAL IDEOLOGIES .....	148
5.4 IDEOLOGIES OF LANGUAGE AS A CORE VALUE .....	158
5.5 IDEOLOGIES OF STANDARDISED FRENCH .....	163

5.6 IDEOLOGIES OF LANGUAGE ENDANGERMENT .....	171
5.7 CONCLUSION .....	190
<b>6. DISCOURSES OF ENGLISH CANADIAN NATIONAL IDENTITY .....</b>	<b>192</b>
6.1 INTRODUCTION .....	192
6.2 ENGLISH CANADIAN NATIONALISM .....	195
6.3 MONOLINGUAL IDEOLOGIES.....	205
6.4 IDEOLOGIES OF STANDARDISED CANADIAN ENGLISH.....	215
6.5 IDEOLOGIES OF INSTRUMENTAL ENGLISH .....	219
6.6 CONCLUSION .....	226
<b>7. DISCOURSES OF PAN-CANADIAN NATIONAL IDENTITY .....</b>	<b>228</b>
7.1 INTRODUCTION .....	228
7.2 PAN-CANADIAN NATIONALISM .....	229
7.3 BILINGUAL IDEOLOGIES .....	235
7.4 IDEOLOGIES OF LANGUAGES AND IDENTITY .....	240
7.5 IDEOLOGIES OF LANGUAGES AS COMMODITIES.....	245
7.6 CONCLUSION .....	258
<b>8. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>260</b>
8.1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS.....	260
8.2 CONTRIBUTIONS OF THESIS .....	266
8.3 LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	273
8.4 CONCLUSION .....	275
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>276</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>316</b>

# TABLES

Table 3.1: Schema of language ideologies and nationalism in Canada .....	93
Table 4.1: English Canadian daily newspapers with highest circulation	121
Table 4.2: French Canadian daily newspapers with highest circulation	122
Table 4.3: Regions of Canada with circulation figures in English and French	122
Table 4.4: Regions of Canada with daily newspapers in English and French	124
Table 4.5: English corpus with data sources by region	124
Table 4.6: French corpus with data sources by region	125
Table 4.7: English core query terms	129
Table 4.8: French core query terms	129
Table 4.9: Primary and comparator corpus breakdowns	130
Table 4.10: English and French comparator corpora, size	131
Table 4.11: English primary corpus content breakdown	132
Table 4.12: French primary corpus content breakdown	132
Table 4.13: Downsampled articles with highest proportion of CQTs	134
Table 4.14: Downsampled articles with lowest proportion of CQTs	135
Table 5.1: Top twenty French keywords .....	139
Table 5.2: Selected FPNC collocates of NATIONAL/E .....	141
Table 5.3: FPNC concordance lines with NATION and INNUE .....	143
Table 5.4: Language frequencies in the FPNC .....	148
Table 5.5: FPNC concordance lines with FRANÇAIS/E and QUÉBEC.....	149
Table 5.6: FPNC concordance lines linking FÊTE with FRANÇAIS.....	150
Table 5.7: EPNC concordance lines with ENGLISH-SPEAKING and CANAD* .	156
Table 5.8: FPNC concordance lines with HORS QUÉBEC .....	157
Table 5.9: FPNC concordance lines with RESTE DU CANADA.....	157
Table 5.10: FPNC collocations between FRANÇAIS/E and CANADIEN/NE/S ...	159
Table 5.11: FPNC frequency of linguistic labels .....	160
Table 5.12: FPNC concordance lines with NOTRE and LANGUE .....	161
Table 5.13: Selected FPNC concordance lines showing language endangerment...	171
Table 5.14: FPNC concordance lines negatively evaluating bilingualism .....	172
Table 5.15: FPNC concordance lines with FRANÇAIS and IMMIGRANTS .....	173



Table 5.16: Labelling of social groups in Bélair-Cirino, 2009 .....	177
Table 5.17: Jedwab quotes used to summarise the Leger-Marketing survey .....	182
Table 6.1: Top ten English keywords .....	193
Table 6.2: Composition and breakdown of components of the EPNC .....	196
Table 6.3: EPNC concordance lines with OUTSIDE and QUEBEC.....	197
Table 6.4: EPNC concordance lines with REST OF CANADA .....	197
Table 6.5: REST OF CANADA and OUTSIDE QUEBEC in ICE-CAN .....	198
Table 6.6: EPNC concordance lines with <i>NATIONALE</i> .....	200
Table 6.7: EPNC concordance lines with NATIONALIST.....	202
Table 6.8: EPNC concordance lines with NATIONAL and unity.....	204
Table 6.9: EPNC concordance lines with ONLY FRENCH .....	207
Table 6.10: Formula of ONLY + FRENCH .....	208
Table 6.11: EPNC concordance lines of ONLY + FRENCH .....	208
Table 6.12: Concordance lines of ENGLISH and ONLY.....	210
Table 6.13: EPNC concordance lines ANGLOPHONE/S, FRANCOPHONE/S ....	212
Table 6.14: EPNC concordance lines: fluency in English .....	217
Table 6.16: FPNC concordance lines, evaluations of English and French .....	220
Table 6.17: EPNC concordance lines of multilingualism.....	221
Table 6.18: EPNC concordance lines with ENGLISH and FRENCH + location....	223
Table 7.1: Selected EPNC collocates of NATIONAL.....	230
Table 7.2: FPNC concordance lines with BILING* and CANAD* .....	236
Table 7.3: EPNC concordance lines with OFFICIAL and FRENCH, CANAD* ....	238
Table 7.4: English keywords pertaining to education and literacy .....	247
Table 7.5: French keywords pertaining to education .....	250
Table 7.6: EPNC concordance lines highlighting fluency in French.....	253

## FIGURES

Figure 1.1 Map of Canada.....	9
-------------------------------	---

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

In 2010, the Winter Olympics were held in Vancouver, a Canadian city perched on the edge of the Pacific Ocean. These Games were seen as an opportunity to showcase Canada to the world, and accordingly the Canadian government agreed to contribute financially to the opening ceremonies, provided that they reflect Canada's linguistic duality (Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, 2010a: 4). In order to fulfil their contractual language requirements, Olympics organisers included in the cultural section of the opening ceremonies one French song, French speakers who did not speak, and a French poem in English translation (Office of the Commissioner, 2010a: 42).

In the immediate aftermath, members of the public, politicians, and officials alike noted that the ceremonies contained insufficient French. These public statements, reported in the news, met with a backlash of commentary on news websites. In French, many of these commentaries expressed a lack of surprise at the marginal role of the French language and disdain towards official Canadian bilingualism. In English, while many of the commentaries lamented the lack of French, others expressed contempt towards what were seen as already generous concessions to the language in an English-dominant city where Mandarin speakers, for example, far outnumber French speakers. English commentaries in particular became so heated that many were removed by news website moderators because they were deemed "not consistent with guidelines" – an action that normally takes place if they have been reported as "abusive" by other readers.

The controversy over official languages during the Olympic opening ceremonies suggests the provocative nature of English and French in Canada. Although these are

## Chapter One: Introduction

both the official languages of the country, they are not spoken in equal numbers from coast to coast, nor do they share a history of equality. While open debates about the two languages are not everyday affairs, beliefs about the two languages are embedded and naturalised in day-to-day life in Canada; they arguably underpin Canadians' very understanding of the country and their place within it. Hence, the very nature of the Olympics as a high profile national event meant that the role of languages in the opening ceremonies would almost certainly be contentious. News stories and online commentary show how beliefs about languages became manifested and openly contested in discussions about the opening ceremonies (see Vessey, forthcoming).

However, the Olympics are not the only site for Canadians to air their beliefs about language and the nation, nor do these beliefs need to be expressed in the form of debates. Since beliefs about languages are embedded in discourse, they can be expressed in banal and routine ways in everyday talk. When these beliefs about languages are shared throughout a social group, they may serve to unite interlocutors in common identity. The theoretical framework of "language ideologies" is useful for explaining how language, identity, nationhood, and the state become interconnected in the social imaginary and represented in discourse. If beliefs about languages – or language ideologies – differ between French speakers and English speakers, then debates over the country's official languages may be inevitable. Moreover, since the vast majority (83%) of Canadians are not fluent in both official languages (Statistics Canada, 2011), then English and French speakers do not have full access to alternative perspectives voiced in the other language. Thus, if different language ideologies circulate within linguistic communities, then these may perpetuate the historic isolation of and misunderstandings between English and French-speaking Canadians. It is the objective of this thesis to examine and compare language ideologies in English and French newspapers in order to determine if these have broader connections to discourses of national identity in Canada.

This introductory chapter supplies some of the basis, context, and motivation for this study. It begins with some historical context on languages and nations in Canada, including how understandings about nations have been strongly affected by the media. The subsequent section of this chapter outlines some of Canada's media

history and explains how this history has shaped the current status of and differences between the English and French Canadian media. Then, some research gaps are presented and research questions are proposed to address these gaps. The chapter concludes with an outline of the structure of the thesis.

## **1.2 BRIEF HISTORY OF LANGUAGE IN CANADA**

There is a Canadian cliché, drawn from a novel by Hugh MacLennan (1945), that Canada is composed of “two solitudes”, one of English speakers, and the other of French speakers. This, Heller (1999a: 143) explains, refers to

the seemingly insurmountable obstacles which keep Canada’s two major linguistic groups apart. And not just apart; alone, isolated one from the other, unable to share the other’s experience, and hence incapable of understanding the other’s point of view.

Still today, this phrase continues to be used to evoke the incongruity of Canada’s two dominant linguistic groups, which dates from the European colonisation of North America.

Canada was home to numerous indigenous groups prior to the arrival and establishment of permanent European settlements in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. The French were the first Europeans to set roots down on Canadian soil, establishing communities in areas of what is now Atlantic Canada and Quebec. The settlers of these communities inhabited the area for so long that when France ceded the majority of its claims to North America to Britain in the Treaty of Paris in 1763, many communities had little real attachment to France. Despite their mother tongue, many felt more connected to North America than to the land of their European forefathers (see e.g. Allaire, 2007: 30; C. Bouchard, 2002: 59-63; Conlogue, 2002: 50; Landry and Lang, 2001: 66-71). As a result, many French speakers chose to stay in Canada even after the territory was officially passed over to the British. Others, unfortunately, did not have a choice and were effectively abandoned by France when the territory was ceded to Britain. A predominantly English-speaking Britain thus came into possession of a vast territory that was inhabited by a majority of French

## Chapter One: Introduction

speakers until the 1830s (C. Bouchard, 2002: 79). Although increasing numbers of British colonialists, and later, other immigrants, came to occupy the land, the historical population of French speakers continued to flourish, and indeed continued to comprise a sizeable proportion of the Canadian population.

The French-speaking population was concentrated in the territory of what is now Quebec and disparate regions of Acadia (now Atlantic Canada). However, French speakers migrated away from these original heartlands, and pockets of French-speaking communities spread across the country. In fact, a “French belt” of communities extended from the St. Lawrence River, down the Great Lakes of Ontario, and into the United States (Conrick and Regan, 2007: 13). In the meantime, immigrants to Canada arrived in increasing numbers and tended to adopt the English language and assimilate into the English-speaking community, leaving French speakers largely apart, marginalised, and distinct from the rest of Canada (Conrick and Regan, 2007: 19-20). Fearing that Canada would follow the United States in a quest for independence, and that this would be spearheaded by French speakers’ discontent with British rule, Britain introduced the Quebec Act in 1774. This allowed the province to maintain its historic civil law code, system of land tenure, and Catholic tradition, all of which were diametrically opposed to the rest of Canada (C. Bouchard, 2002: 59; Fraser, 2006: 15).

The separation of the populations continued thus well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Indeed, although Canada modernised, progress was not uniform or consistent across the various sectors of its population. French speakers and indigenous groups notably continued to live as they had throughout the previous centuries. A change in the pattern only emerged when, in Quebec, French speakers were forced to move from the country into more urban areas because of a population boom that resulted in decreased availability of farming land (C. Bouchard, 2002: 72). The move by French speakers to urban areas resulted in large numbers of youths who were able to attain higher education. This unprecedented access to education gave rise to a generation of French speakers who began to bear witness to fundamental discrepancies in Canadian society (see Oakes and Warren, 2007: 9). Educated and freed from the commitment to agricultural work, they were nevertheless generally obliged to work for English-speaking industrialists who controlled the economy across Canada –

including in Quebec, where the vast majority of the population did not speak English (see e.g. Fraser, 2006: 21). French speakers were therefore dominated by English speakers, even in the territory where they formed the sizeable majority (Conrick and Regan, 2007: 35). An increasing awareness of the status quo amongst the new, educated French-speaking middle class resulted in general uprisings across Quebec in the 1960s and 1970s that came to be known as the Quiet Revolution (*la Révolution tranquille*).

The Quiet Revolution led to a number of socio-political changes in Quebec and across Canada. In Quebec, the elected conservative *Union Nationale* government fell, and subsequent government parties sought to equalise the power structure of Quebec society. Government changes to the social landscape included the nationalisation of the power corporation (Hydro-Québec) and language policies that, above all, made French the official language of the province (see e.g. Ignatieff, 1994: 113; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 84-91). The success and popularity of these changes, alongside a newfound recognition of difference from the rest of the country, fostered a national movement wherein the plausibility of forming a separate, distinct, French-speaking nation-state became possible. This national movement, primarily linguistic and cultural in essence, was at the basis a reinterpretation and reformulation of the historic French Canadian nation (Oakes and Warren, 2007: 26-32). However, the nationalist movement was also territorial and defined according to the provincial boundaries of Quebec. As a result, French speakers living outside Quebec were, for the most part, not included in the nationalist movement. New categories of belonging evolved: from what were once known as “the French Canadian nation” and “French Canadians” categorically emerged the Quebec nation and the *Québécois* (see e.g. Pelletier, 2003: 38), French Ontario and French Ontarians (*franco-Ontariens*), French Manitoba and French Manitobans (*franco-Manitobains*), and so on (Bouthillier, 1997: 117). Charland (1987: 134) notes that with the renaming of Quebec, a “national identity for a new type of political subject was born, a subject whose existence would be presented as justification for the constitution of a new state”. In other words, the new identity label “Québécois” emphasised an allegiance to an emerging Quebec nation-state, which was an alternative to the label “French Canadian” that presupposed allegiance to Canada (McRoberts, 1997: 183; Robinson, 1998: 28).

## Chapter One: Introduction

Quebec's nationalist movement resulted in Canada becoming indexed by language and geography with new and ideological categories of belonging. Indeed, the link between language and community – if not nation – has become largely essentialised to the extent that identity labels in Canada tend to be linguistic (see Giampapa, 2001; Heller, 1999a: 144; Karim, 1993; Labelle and Salée, 2001; Patrick, 2007: 44). According to Karim (1993), it is common to use a “tripartite linguistic distinction” in Canada to distinguish between identity categories: francophones (French speakers), anglophones (English speakers), allophones (those whose first language is neither English nor French<sup>1</sup>) (see also Bouthillier, 1997: 83-4, 117). This heuristic is a simplistic way of conceptualising Canada's diverse population of 33.5 million, but is nonetheless indicative of the ways social groups in Canada tend to be indexed by language (Molinaro, 2005: 98). Indeed, what the label “Canadian” suggests, then, is an ideal authentic identity, whereas hyphenated identity labels, for instance, suggest an identity that is less authentic because of regional and/or linguistic particularities that are seen to detract from a purist national identity (Giampapa, 2001; Karim, 1993; King and Wicks, 2009; Resnick, 1995: 82; Trudeau, 1968: 199). Being “English Canadian”, “French Canadian” or “Italian Canadian” is sometimes perceived as being less authentic than simply “Canadian”. What is important in these labels are the various ways in which the peoples of Canada are conceptualised as having different identities within the country (Charland, 1987: 135; Heller, 2003c: 24; Hillmer and Chapnick, 2007; Karim, 1993).

The rise of Quebec nationalism and its related secessionist movement forced the Canadian federal government to make major adjustments to the political landscape. Then Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau made it his priority to stem the tide of nationalism flowing from Quebec and to make Quebec an integral part of a pan-Canadian nation. Indeed, in his view, nationalism is passionate, emotional, irrational behaviour that contrasts with “cold, unemotional rationality” (Trudeau, 1968: 202-3, emphasis in original):

---

<sup>1</sup> First Nations and aboriginal peoples are notably not part of the tripartite distinction, and are not considered “allophones”. Also, Statistics Canada has moved away from this simplistic tripartite distinction in the most recent Census of Canada (Marian Scott, 2012).

## Chapter One: Introduction

nationalism cannot provide the answer [...] It is possible that nationalism may still have a role to play in backward societies where the *status quo* is upheld by irrational and brutal forces; in such circumstances, *because there is no other way*, perhaps the nationalist passions will still be found useful to unleash revolutions, upset colonialism, and lay the foundations of welfare states.

While in office, some of Trudeau's most notable initiatives included the reformulation of new Canadian linguistic, and later cultural, policies. French and English were made the official languages of the federal government in a move to show how French speakers in Quebec, along with minority French speakers in the rest of Canada, could, like their English-speaking counterparts, communicate with their elected representatives (see Webber, 1994: 58). Later, the multiculturalism policy made all cultures equal in Canada; in other words, "multiculturalism" was made the official culture rather than any single culture. The idea was to show privilege to no one community over any other. In the words of Trudeau himself (1968: 5), "Canada must become a truly bilingual country in which the linguistic majority stops behaving as if it held special and exclusive rights, and accepts the country's federal nature with all its implications". Society was to be de-stratified according to language and culture, and instead, individuals were to be equal. Not showing privilege also meant not recognising any particular status for Quebec (see Vipond, 1996).

Quebec is not the only province that is home to French speakers, and minority French-speaking communities exist in other provinces, including Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Ontario, and the Atlantic provinces (Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and to some extent Newfoundland and Labrador). Faced with English majorities, though, these minority French speakers have struggled throughout history (see e.g. C. Bouchard, 2002; Hayday, 2005; MacMillan, 1998: 45). Although the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (commonly known as the "B&B Commission") made recommendations, based on in-depth research, to protect French speakers, many of these were not adopted at either federal



## Chapter One: Introduction

or provincial levels (see e.g. Innis, 1973; Fraser, 2006; Haque, 2012; Hayday, 2005). Ontario, for instance, resisted pressure to declare itself officially bilingual despite a sizeable and historic French-speaking population, and Quebec went the other direction, declaring French the official language despite a substantial population of English speakers. However, New Brunswick and the National Capital Region of Ottawa (Ontario) and Gatineau (Quebec) were made officially bilingual. Indeed, reactions to the Commission varied from province to province, and in some cases these provincial differences can be attributed to the subjectivity of individual provinces' own historic relationship with French-speaking minorities. In sum, there are fundamental political and historical divides in Canada that tend to be marked by language.

Simon (1992: 159) argues that social categories based on class in the United Kingdom and race in the United States are comparable to language in Canada. Language marks a national divide by serving as both the medium and the message (i.e. the subject) in ideological debates in Canada. Language is a distinctive feature of Quebec, the home to and representative of the majority of Canada's French speakers; Quebec continues to seek recognition of its distinctiveness and autonomy over both its internal and international affairs, particularly with regard to language. Other Canadian provinces are English-dominant; many have adopted policies that tend to either condone or condemn French speakers. For example, while a policy of bilingualism in New Brunswick supports the minority French-speaking community, Ontario's resistance to a policy of official bilingualism arguably avoids the recognition of French speakers as a historical founding people of the province (for a discussion of alternative Ontarian language legislation, see Boileau, 2011). Each province has a unique historical, political and cultural relationship with language. While most Canadian provinces are English-dominant, many have sizeable French minorities (Ontario, 4% of the population or 499 000 people are mother tongue French speakers; New Brunswick, 31% of the population or 238 090 people are mother tongue French speakers), and still others, like Nova Scotia and Manitoba, have historic French-speaking populations (Statistics Canada, 2011). Quebec is also home to a large and active English-speaking minority. Thus, the population of Canada consists of a web of historically-founded relationships that tend to be indexed by language. Not only are there province-internal dynamics specific to

## Chapter One: Introduction

different language communities, there are also dynamics between French-speaking minorities and French-dominant Quebec and dynamics between English-dominant provinces and Quebec (see Figure 1.1).



**Figure 1.1 Map of Canada**

Since it has been illustrated how Canadians have, throughout history, been indexed by language, it is a logical assumption that not only have understandings about language been the basis of relationships between Canadians, but also the relationships between Canadians have informed, produced, and reified beliefs about language. The fact is that, in Canada, language does not simply refer to a means of communication; it also refers to a way of belonging in the nation. Canada consists of an immense territory, a dispersed population, and a complex history; and beliefs about language are not uniform across the country. Canada remains, therefore, fragmented not only by colonial history and disparate geography, but also by abstract, fundamental, systematic understandings about languages and their role in society.

### **1.3 THE MEDIA IN CANADA**

The media have played an important role in creating connections between the diverse areas and people of Canada (Raboy, 1991; J. Smith, 1998: 3). Vipond (2012: 12) remarks that networks of communication, fostered by the mass media, have been central to “both the material and mythological definition of Canada”. From the beginning, the media in Canada have been obliged to serve two different majority language populations. The Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act of 1932 created the national public broadcaster, the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission (CRBC), which would later evolve into the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC-Société Radio Canada). In the beginning, there were attempts to air both languages on the national CRBC radio service. The view was that there was only one radio audience in Canada made up of two different language groups, English speakers and French speakers (Raboy, 1991). According to Vipond (2008: 320), “the CRBC seemed to be claiming the authority to define Canada linguistically and culturally”. As a powerful national institution, the CRBC could be used to create an “imagined community” (Anderson, 1983) of a bilingual pan-Canadian nation (see Charland, 1986; Hayday, 2009; Raboy, 1991). In other words, the idea was that with a bilingual national broadcaster, individual listeners would come to appreciate the different language communities sharing the territory. However, the CRBC was unable to simply create national unity without resistance. Bilingual broadcasts were met with “absolute, militant” opposition from English Canada (Raboy, 1991). According to Vipond (2008: 332), English Canadians argued that CRBC bilingual programming was being “forced” and “foisted” upon them, “rammed down their throats” and “thrust into [their] homes”. In fact, when the CRBC included French content, it led many Canadian listeners to turn to American English-language stations (Vipond, 2008: 332). As a result of the public and political pressure, and to avoid American influence, the CRBC moved away from French and bilingual programming on the national networks (Vipond, 2008: 342). According to Raboy (1991), this was actually welcomed by French Canadians, who had feared marginalisation within a single service that was only nominally bilingual.

By the Second World War, the divide between English and French branches of the CRBC was complete. It became obvious, however, during the conscription crisis of

## Chapter One: Introduction

1942 when French Canadians resisted conscription to WWII, that media power still lay in the hands of the English-speaking majority. By order of the federal government, the CBC denied the Quebec-based *Ligue pour la défense du Canada*, who spearheaded the “No” campaign, access to its stations. As a result, despite the divide between the English and French branches of the radio, the national public broadcaster came to be seen as an “oppressive agent of centralised federalism”, controlled by English speakers (Raboy, 1991). It is clear, then, that the CBC as the federal, national broadcaster was designed to contribute to Canadian unity. Historically, this has meant working against the Quebec nationalist movement. Indeed, when it became apparent to the federal government in 1964 that the nationalist movement in Quebec was spreading and increasingly radical, one action taken in the House of Commons was the announcement of new policy measures in which the CBC played a central role. Secretary of State Maurice Lamontagne declared the CBC “one of Canada’s most vital and essential institutions” which was assigned the crucial task of “becom[ing] a living and daily testimony of Canadian identity, a faithful reflection of our two main cultures and a powerful element of understanding, moderation and unity in our country” (cited in Raboy, 1991). The national public broadcaster was therefore attributed considerable power by the federal government (Conlogue, 2002: 26; Fletcher, 1998; J. Smith, 1998). Today, unlike the CBC, most Canadian media are privately owned and need not support federal Canada, even if they are required to operate within it.

During the Quiet Revolution, French speakers gained control of their own media; since then, media services in Canada have become to some extent polarised as each official language community manages its own media. Because they work within and produce news products for their respective communities, the English and French Canadian media reflect different views and interests (see Conlogue, 2002: 7; de Mer, 2008: 33; Gagnon, 2006: 81; *la Presse Canadienne*, 2012). Since the English and French communities have different histories (see Section 1.2), this polarisation may mean that the English and French Canadian media represent languages and language issues differently according to community beliefs. J. Smith (1998: 22) makes the following observations about Canada’s dual broadcasting:

## Chapter One: Introduction

Operating separate English and French broadcasting systems potentially conflicts with creating unity. Not only can the systems be captured by groups that disagree on what the situation is and what information they should provide, but each language also organizes conception and perception in fundamentally different ways. These differences can cause and reinforce disagreements and impede consensus.

The private media, then, may contain language ideologies that are not evident in the Canadian public media outlet, the CBC-SRC. Thus, the English and French private media in Canada may diverge from one another in important ways because they work within and serve communities that are to some extent isolated from one another (Conlogue, 2002: 55).

Canadian media products are also designed to be appropriate for and acceptable to specific communities, or “media audiences”. According to Fletcher (1998), Canada contains two distinct media audiences, one French-speaking and one English-speaking. Since news is produced for specific communities, if communities are distinct from one another, it follows that the news may be different as well. This means not only that the media tend to avoid “regular in-depth coverage of the other linguistic community” (Pritchard and Sauvageau, 1999: 300; see also *la Presse Canadienne*, 2012; Saul, 1997: 163-4), but also that the media texts may contain ideologies specific to the home community. This is because journalists often tend to be members of their home communities and journalism influences community beliefs. This is particularly the case in Quebec, where French-speaking journalists are an integral part of the intelligentsia (Fletcher, 1998). It follows, then, that the news may be designed differently in English and French to suit the communities’ needs and value systems (de Mer, 2008: 16, 105-109; Pritchard and Sauvageau, 1999: 291).

Another important difference between the English and French Canadian media is that journalists work in largely separate professional worlds. English and French Canadian journalists tend to belong to different professional communities, which may influence, shape, and socialise individuals into a specific ideology (Cotter,

2010: 34-36; van Dijk, 2006: 122-3). There are two main journalist associations in Canada: the Canadian Association of Journalists (CAJ), and *La fédération professionnelle des journalistes du Québec* (FPJQ), both of which are monolingual. Fraser (2007) remarks that the CAJ and the FPJQ have run along “parallel tracks, with amicable but distant relations”, and more French-speaking Canadian journalists are members of the FPJQ than English-language journalists are members of the CAJ. Membership numbers are important because Pritchard *et al.* (2005: 302) have found that the FPJQ “actively socializes journalists to the profession and its ideology”, which may result in “greater solidarity among francophone journalists, perhaps leading to a greater constancy in their professional values”. Another example of working within different professional worlds arises from an extensive survey of journalists, which found that most journalists do not engage with the other language media: although 85% of francophone journalists claim to speak English, only 41% read English Canadian newspapers, whereas only 14% of anglophone journalists claim to speak French, and only 5% read francophone newspapers (Pritchard and Sauvageau, 1999: 292). Oakes and Warren (2007) cite the example of a 2002 “newspaper swap” undertaken by two Quebec journalists, one from Montreal’s anglophone daily *The Gazette* and the other from francophone daily *La Presse*. They remark that interest in such a media swap arises from the “polarised newspaper ecology” in Montreal (2007: 166). Indeed, the polarisation would seem to extend much wider than this single city: a large survey of Canadian journalists has suggested that French- and English-speaking journalists are uninterested in each other’s work, media, and even culture (Pritchard and Sauvageau, 1999).

Finally, English and French Canadian media texts may be affected by the major stakeholders in Canadian media outlets. Canada has one of the most consolidated media systems in the developed world, and “an unrivalled scale of cross-media ownership” wherein left-of-centre political orientations are remarkably few (Winseck, 2002: 799; see also Beaty and Sullivan, 2010: 16; Karim, 2008: 59; Soderlund and Hildebrandt, 2005c; Soderlund and Romanow, 2005: 11). Although there is no consensus as to whether ownership or concentration of ownership affects newspaper content (Pritchard *et al.*, 2005: 293), cases have been noted wherein media ownership has affected the employment of individuals with notable national views. Aldridge (2001: 615), for example, cites how an editor-in-chief at *The*

## Chapter One: Introduction

*Gazette* (Montreal) lost her job because of disagreements over Quebec sovereignty with the proprietor of the newspaper, Conrad Black. Although it is debatable how much power conglomerates exercise over news content and perspective, the fact that most English Canadian newspapers are owned by a small number of shareholders (namely, for the purposes of the 2009 data discussed here, CTVGlobemedia and CanWest), and the largest French Canadian newspapers are owned by a different shareholder (Power Corporation of Canada), means that the potential for polarisation is great (on media ownership, see Fletcher, 1998; Fraser, 2007; Pritchard and Sauvageau, 1999; Raboy, 1991; Soderlund and Hildebrandt, 2005a; Young, 2001: 650).

In sum, the French and English Canadian private media may contain different content because of community differences, professional worlds, and media ownership. Indeed, numerous studies have found important differences between the content of the French and English Canadian media (e.g. Elkin, 1975; Fletcher, 1998; Fraser, 2007; Halford *et al.*, 1983; Hayday, 2005: 60; Kariel and Rosenvall, 1983; Raboy, 1991; Robinson, 1998; Siegel, 1979; Taras, 1993). Many of these authors argue that the differences in media content may have implications for English and French speakers who read little and thus gain little understanding of the other linguistic community (e.g. Saul, 1997: 163-4). However, most of these previous studies have focused on specific electoral and national issues, glossing over the extent to which the Canadian media differ more regularly in subtle, inconspicuous ways. Also, most studies are rather dated, meaning that there is little recent research on the differences between English and French Canadian media (for some exceptions, see de Mer, 2008; Kuhn and Lick, 2009; Young and Dugas, 2011a, b). Finally, the little comparative French-English media research that does exist has predominantly used content analysis, which is quantitative (although sometimes supplemented by interview or survey data) and does not account for the more nuanced differences that are perhaps at the heart of the national, ideological, and linguistic divide (Richardson, 2007). As Fletcher (1998) notes:

Standard content analysis, focusing on manifest content, has its uses, but it cannot capture the cultural differences that reinforce identity and, perhaps, exacerbate conflict. Nor can it capture the

distressingly cynical interpretations of the motives of politicians or citizens from the other community that crop up from time to time in the French and English media. It seems clear that a new research agenda is needed.

There has been little discourse analysis of the Canadian media (for some exceptions, see Harding, 2006; Greenberg and Hier, 2001; Retzlff and Gänzle, 2008), and even less discourse analysis comparing English and French media data (some rare examples include Gagnon, 2003; Kuhn and Lick, 2009; see discussion in Roy, 2009: 261). The few examples of discourse analyses of Canadian media that do exist draw on relatively small data samples.<sup>2</sup> Finally, although languages serve important functions in Canada, little research has attempted to account for differences between beliefs about language (i.e., language ideologies) in French- and English-speaking Canada. Fundamental differences between the development and evolutions of the English and French Canadian media suggest that they may serve as a rich site for comparative analysis.

#### **1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

This thesis aims to address these gaps by comparing and contrasting language ideologies in a large data set of English and French Canadian newspaper articles. The methods that are used combine quantitative and qualitative tools in order to account for both large amounts of data and the subtleties within these data. The following research questions will be addressed:

- 1) How do the French and English Canadian media discursively represent (i.e. construct, construe, allude to) languages and language issues in the news?
- 2) How do these representations differ?
- 3) How do the different representations relate to understandings of national identity in Canada?

---

<sup>2</sup> One exception to this general trend is a large study on representations of climate change in English and French Canadian news media, which has used both quantitative and qualitative methods, including discourse analysis, on a large corpus of data (see DiFrancesco and Young, 2010; Young and Dugas, 2011, 2012).



The objective of such an investigation will be to determine if, as Fletcher (1998) predicted, the “Canadian media experience” has remained one consisting of “two solitudes”, or if representations of languages indicate greater cohesion and understanding between English and French speakers.

### **1.5 STRUCTURE OF THESIS**

The thesis is organised as follows. Chapter Two discusses the core theoretical concepts that will be applied throughout. These include the concepts of ideology, discourse, and nationalism. Chapter Three outlines the three specific versions of national identity and affiliated language ideologies that will be explored in the analysis chapters. Chapter Four presents the methodology and its component parts before outlining the procedure that is used for analysis. Chapter Five is the first of three analysis chapters, and explores language ideologies and national identity in Quebec. The next analysis chapter examines language ideologies and national identity in English Canada, and Chapter Seven focuses on language ideologies and national identity in federal bilingual Canada. The final chapter addresses the research questions according to the findings of the previous three chapters, and discusses avenues for future research.

## **2. THEORETICAL CONCEPTS**

### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

Before delving into the details and particulars of the Canadian situation, it is useful to outline the theoretical concepts that will be employed here. This chapter begins by outlining the concept of ideology and then, more specifically, the concept of language ideologies. The chapter then turns to the concept of discourse and how conceptualisations of national identity take shape within discourses. Finally, the chapter will outline the ways in which ideology and discourses are embedded in the media.

### **2.2 IDEOLOGY**

Ideology is invariably complex and researchers often disagree on its precise definition. The lack of consensus arises, perhaps, from the historical evolution of the concept: with origins in Destutt de Tracy's (1826-7) proposed discipline of a "science of ideas", the concept was redefined in the Marxist sense as expressions of class interest and outlook; from there, the concept fractured into different enterprises of philosophical design (Eagleton, 2007: 193; Williams, 1977: 108-9). Although there were notable historical developments of the concept (see e.g. Eagleton, 2007; Freeden, 2003; Gee, 2008; Hawkes, 2003; Silverstein, 1998; van Dijk, 1998a, 2006), for the present purpose, what is important is to clearly define what ideology is taken to mean within the context of this research. Here ideology will be defined as a historically-contingent system of beliefs specific to a social group that have become so ingrained in individuals' ways of life in that society that these beliefs are taken for granted to be common sense (Lakoff, 2001: 53-55; van Dijk, 1991: 36; 2006: 116; Williams, 1977: 109; Woolard, 1998: 6). Although beliefs often pertain to judgments and evaluations of a given topic, as a concept "ideology" is here not taken to mean positive or negative beliefs, true or false consciousness. Rather, the central tenet of this definition is the fact that beliefs tend to be implicit and embedded rather than explicit and overt.

### 2.2.1 Implicitness

In order for people to communicate effectively, some shared implicit understandings are necessary. Implicit meanings are often embedded in language in very specific ways. Let us consider Example 2.1.

#### Example 2.1

Must we from now on devote ourselves to a vaguely Canadian bilingualism?

*Faudrait-il désormais s'adonner à une sorte de bilinguisme vaguement canadien?*

(Beauchemin, 2009)

Here, there is a simple presupposition is that “we” have not, until the present time, devoted “ourselves” to Canadian bilingualism. The temporality of this presupposition is achieved by marking a change from the past with the phrase “from now on” (*désormais*). The implicit meaning, then, is an assumption of historical context. Implicit meanings can also be embedded in text such that readers achieve a certain understanding according to how an assertion is phrased. Let us consider Example 2.2.

#### Example 2.2

What can have caused this sudden chilling increase in resistance to the presence of the English language in Quebec? The “angryphone” movement is (fortunately) long gone.

(Anonymous, 2009d)

By asking a question and then answering the question with a seemingly unrelated statement, there is a connection that relies on implicit understandings. In this example, the first implicit meaning is conveyed through the amalgamation of the word “angry” with the word “anglophone” (meaning “English speaker”, commonly used in the bilingual city of Montreal) to achieve the playful and perhaps community-specific understanding of the neologism “angryphone”. The second implicit understanding is conveyed through the temporality of the two clauses. It could be interpreted as

something like: “The ‘angryphone’ movement could not have caused the increase in resistance because the ‘angryphone’ movement is over”. Eagleton (2007: 3) argues that preconceptions are necessary for understanding and identifying issues and situations, and thus “[t]here is no such thing as presuppositionless thought”. Although presuppositions and implicatures are strongly related and both involve implicit understandings, Fairclough (2003: 60) explains that they differ in that the former “takes as given what is assumed to be known” whereas the latter, more strategically, avoids explicitness.

Implicit meanings are also inherent in topoi (singular: topos). Topoi are ideological argumentation schemes that seem convincing because they rely on “common-sense reasoning” about specific issues (Blackledge, 2005: 18). These are routinised “conclusion rules” that allow arguments to negate further explanation because they connect an argument with its conclusion (Wodak *et al.*, 2009: 34; Baker *et al.*, 2008: 299). The idea is that an argument is reduced to such *de facto* ideological fundamentals that there is nothing left to say. Blackledge (2005: 18) gives the example of the “topos of threat”, which is the conclusion that “if there are specific dangers or threats, something should be done to prevent this”. This topos can be seen to underlie the argument made in Example 2.3.

### Example 2.3

As a small minority language in North America, French must be protected by positive discrimination policies, which is what Law 101 is meant to be. In the beginning, for example, Law 101 allowed signage in all languages except English because English is the language that constitutes a threat.

*Extrêmement minoritaire en Amérique du Nord, le français doit être protégé par une politique de discrimination positive, ce que voulait être la loi 101. À l'origine, par exemple, la loi 101 permettait l'affichage dans toutes les langues, sauf l'anglais parce que c'est cette langue qui constitue une menace.*

(Dubuc, 2009)

In this example, a newspaper contributor argues that it is reasonable for policies to discriminate against English, because English is a threat to French. Thus, the topos underlying this line of reasoning is that threats to the French language must be avoided. In Example 2.4, a contributor to an English newspaper article relies on the “topos of advantage or usefulness”, which, as Blackledge (2005: 18) explains, reasons that “if an action would be useful, then it should be done”.

**Example 2.4**

the foolish practice of designating so many Ottawa-based jobs as bilingual, when in practice *workers need only English*, has the unintended affect [sic] of keeping out immigrants.

(Anonymous, 2009a; emphasis added)

Example 2.5 could be interpreted as meaning that the French language is not as useful as English and therefore being bilingual in English and French is unnecessary. Since English is the only language that is useful, it is this language that should be promoted to immigrants to Canada.

Thus, implicit meanings, while perhaps quotidian and banal, are not without significance: they are to a certain extent ideological because, in order for communication to be achieved, implicit meanings must be understood within an appropriate social context with appropriate embedded interpretative assumptions. According to van Dijk (1991: 176), implicitness can be used as a “strategic means to conceal controversial claims” because it is more difficult to challenge implicitness than straightforward assertions. Since presuppositions, implicatures, and topoi convey information that is supposed to be known and shared by the writer and the reader (or the speaker and the hearer), this is information that need not be stated. In this way, statements may be made indirectly, discreetly invoking perspectives that are perhaps not even known by the reader at all, but which are simply suggested to be common knowledge (van Dijk, 1991: 183).

The idea here is that meaning-making relies not only on explicit formulations, but also on the inexplicit – for example, what is presupposed and implied (Fairclough, 2003:

11). The argument is, thus, anything that is not entirely explicit (i.e., requiring some inferential work) will require an individual to draw on his/her common sense (ideologies) in order to make sense of a situation. Understanding anything, in fact, involves judging it against a background of assumptions and expectations and considering its coherence within the community (Blackledge, 2005: 9). This is why many researchers in sociolinguistics and discourse analysis argue that it is impossible to avoid ideology and preferable to remain as self-reflective and transparent about one's assumptions as possible (see e.g. Baker, 2010: 143; Bucholtz, 2003: 404; Coupland 2003; Fairclough and Wodak, 1997; Gal and Irvine, 1995: 971; Heller, 2002; van Dijk, 1998b: 25). Being privy to implicit meaning indicates, to a certain extent, membership in a group, which may be as specific as the sociolinguistics research community or as large as a nation. Here, we return to the social aspect of ideology: beliefs are systematic – that is, interconnected and multiple rather than isolated and singular – and shared within a social group. Importantly, the social aspect of these beliefs, when linked to a social hierarchy, lends the concept of ideology a significant dimension of social power.

### **2.2.2 Ideologies and power**

Ideologies tend to include understandings of internal social hierarchy, the status quo, and expectations of social roles. Taking social power – both internal and external – for granted reinforces and reifies its “naturalness” (see e.g. Eagleton, 2007: 5, 70). While accepted hierarchies may be advantageous to the elites, they may be disadvantageous to others. If ideologies are entirely effective, then they are held across society by all members; in such a scenario, social hierarchies would remain unchangeable because change is undesirable when all members accept the status quo. Following Fairclough (1989: 32), then, ideological power is the ability to “project one's practices as universal and ‘common sense’”. Thus, an effective ideology means that things are accepted as “given” and the powerful remain powerful and the powerless remain powerless: this is a primary way in which ideology is linked to power (Eagleton, 2007: xxii, 12; Fairclough, 2003: 9; Ricento, 2006: 50). At the same time, however, ideologies can also contribute to changing social relations of power, domination and exploitation (Fairclough, 2003: 9). This is achieved when the dominant ideology in a society is resisted or challenged and perhaps supplanted with alternative or oppositional ideologies.

The Gramscian concept of “cultural hegemony” has been particularly influential to theorisations of ideology. Antonio Gramsci, a Marxist philosopher, posited that the ideologies of the ruling class become dominant across all social classes (see Gramsci, 1971). In other words, the claim is that the ideology of the ruling class, which is erroneously perceived to be universally beneficial, becomes “hegemonic” when it is accepted as the ideological norm of all social classes. Gramsci’s argument is developed and amended by literary and cultural theorist Raymond Williams. Williams, too, recognises that in any society, at any given period, there tends to be a “central system of practices, meanings and values, which we can properly call dominant and effective” (Williams, 1973: 7). This ideological system, he contends, is not abstract at the level of opinion or manipulation, but rather is “organised and lived” through practices, expectations, and understandings of human nature and the world (Williams, 1973: 7). Since most individuals rarely have the opportunity to alter their place in society, this ideological system appears to be “reciprocally confirming”, and as a result constitutes reality for the vast majority of society members who, through their work, themselves contribute to “the effective dominant culture” (Williams, 1973: 7, 11). In other words, no ideology is unreal, “right” or “wrong”, “true” or “false” – ideology simply refers to lived experience that, because it is lived, “become[s] coextensive with itself” (Eagleton, 2007: 58; see also Charland, 1987: 143; Eagleton, 2007: 13; Gal, 1998: 321; van Dijk, 1998b: 24-9, 2006: 117). However, Williams does not go so far as to call this dominant, effective ideological system “hegemonic”, since he argues that no system is singular or unchanging. All systems, he argues, are subject to highly complex internal structures that are perpetually renewed, recreated, and defended – and at the same time, challenged and modified (Williams, 1973: 6; see also Blommaert, 2005a: 166; Eagleton, 2007: 45-7; Gal, 1998: 320-1). While some alternative opinions, attitudes, and understandings of the world can be accommodated and tolerated within an effective and dominant culture, a functional model of ideology must allow for these kinds of variations, contradictions, and processes of change, rather than obfuscating the possibility of alternatives within, for example, the model of hegemony.

Challenges to a dominant, effective system are, in fact, inevitable, since in certain periods there will be aspects that the dominant culture is unable to accommodate or

account for (Williams, 1973: 10). It follows that ideologies are multiple, historically-specific, and changeable, and “no hegemony can thus ever be absolute” (Eagleton, 2007: 47). These challenges to hegemony arise according to “historical variation in real circumstances” (Williams, 1973: 8), and depend very much on the precise social and political forces present at that time. The possibility for change can occur in two main forms: the “alternative” and the “oppositional”. Although there is often only a very narrow line between the two, the principal difference is that one (the alternative) seeks to find a different path and be left alone with it, whereas the other (the oppositional) seeks to change the society through its enlightenment (Williams, 1973: 9). The different ways in which challenges to hegemony are sought can meet with different reactions from the dominant and effective system. Oppositional and alternative forces can take shape in both “residual” and “emergent” forms. By “residual”, Williams refers to the cultural and social vestiges of a previous social formation, whereas by “emergent”, he refers to the new meanings, values, practices, significances and experiences that are created. The effect is thus diachronic, with relations being considered both between residual culture and dominant culture, and dominant culture and emergent culture (Williams, 1973: 9). When change takes effect, the result is the formation and “coming to consciousness” of a new group, formed, as we can see, through a shared system of beliefs. Ideologies, then, are naturalised, socially-held and shared systems of belief that are historically contingent, naturalised, and subject to change. Furthermore, there may be in-group variation as individuals simultaneously draw on multiple ideologies. In effect, ideologies work in conjunction with the people and their lived experiences: just as dominant social groups inevitably fall from power, so too the ideologies that support their dominance are subject to a fall from grace in the public consciousness.

### **2.2.3 Ideological semiotic processes**

As a final note on ideology, it is useful to highlight five important semiotic processes that tend to underlie many ideological constructions. These processes enable ideologies to function as common sense, even if they are in fact highly contextually contingent and socially constructed. Each process uses semiotic means (i.e. meaningful symbols) to gloss over difference and “see” categories that are, without an ideological lens, merely arbitrary sets of features. The first is indexicalisation, which is the process by which social groups are delimited, or categorised, by specific defining features, often for the



## Chapter Two: Theoretical concepts

purpose of analysis (Gal and Irvine, 1995: 973). Blommaert (2007: 117) explains that indexicalisation produces social categories by “recogniz[ing] semiotic emblems for groups and individuals”. For example, a diverse group of people might be categorically viewed as “English speakers” or “asylum seekers” or “students” simply because the attributes “English-speaking”, “asylum-seeking”, or “studying” are useful for a given purpose. In these cases, the semiotic emblem (i.e. the sign that “points-to” a category) of the group is an “index” of that group.

The second process, iconicisation (or “iconicity”, Gal and Irvine, 1995: 973), is the process by which the index of a category is reinterpreted as its iconic feature. This is the way in which a historical, contingent, or conventional characteristic is seen as fixed, natural, unproblematic and emblematic of a group of people (Gal and Irvine, 1995: 973; Heller, 2007: 342; Jaffe, 2007b: 58). Through this process, those who are indexed are no longer viewed in relation to a temporary category, but as people who function as units of a group united by a specific feature. In this way, “asylum seekers”, for example, may be discussed in such a way that their individual needs for asylum are disregarded because their iconic attribute is that of seeking asylum away from their home country: the act of seeking asylum is seen as a display of the group’s inherent nature or essence.

The third process, recursion (or “recursiveness”, Gal and Irvine, 1995: 974), is the “projection of an opposition, salient at some level of relationship, onto some other level”. In other words, a partitioning process that may be functional and accurate at one level is seen as recurring on other levels, creating either subcategories or supercategories. For example, differences between the English and Spanish languages may result in purported differences between English speakers and Spanish speakers. The fourth process, erasure, is a way of simplifying or ignoring internal diversity so that there appears to be uniformity or homogeneity within pre-defined categories. As a result, “outliers”, or individuals, activities, or phenomena that are inconsistent with an ideological scheme, are rendered invisible (Gal and Irvine, 1995: 974). In this way, categories are seen as functional and adequate, since they take into account the representative items or individuals, while ignoring or erasing the unrepresentative.

The last process is essentialisation, which refers to how a group is defined and explained in reference to cultural and/or biological characteristics that are believed to be inherent to the group. In other words, practices and behaviours are seen as if deriving from the essence of a group rather than from historical accident (Gal and Irvine, 1995: 975). The process of essentialisation rests on two assumptions; first, that groups can be clearly delimited and second, that group members are more or less alike (Bucholtz, 2003: 400). The processes of indexicalisation, iconicisation, recursion, and erasure are all ideological in that they enable socially-constructed and contingent categories to be seen as natural and commonsense. Moreover, these processes all contribute to the overarching process of essentialisation, which at a broader level of abstraction includes all the other ideological semiotic processes. In other words, if a category is essentialised, it is because the processes of indexicalisation, iconicisation, recursion and erasure have contributed at some level, at some point, to the construction of the essentialised category. Essentialist group labels are valuable considerations in the study of ideology because they enable us to see how individuals are organised according to a particular function in society. Indeed, the process is cyclical: while individuals are categorised according to an identifiable characteristic, in turn, these essentialised categories serve to organise society and position individuals with respect to these categories. The impact is such that some of society's ideological boundary-making criteria are identifiable because of the ways in which specific characteristics are interpreted as valuable rallying points for social coherence.

### **2.2.4 Language ideologies**

We now turn to the concept of language ideologies (or “linguistic ideologies”, see Woolard, 1998), which builds on the broad concept of ideology as implicit, shared, systematic beliefs; in this case, however, these are beliefs concerning language specifically. Thus, language ideologies are beliefs about and understandings of language that are ingrained in a society and taken to be commonsense. Boudreau and Dubois (2007: 104) provide a useful definition of language ideologies:

[Language ideologies are] a set of beliefs on languages or a particular language shared by members of a community [...] These beliefs come to be so well established that their origin is often forgotten by

## Chapter Two: Theoretical concepts

speakers, and are therefore socially reproduced and end up being ‘naturalized’, or perceived as natural or as common sense, thereby masking the social construction processes at work.

Thus, language ideologies include understandings of the role language does or should play in society, or these may involve beliefs about the kind or variety of language that is or should be spoken in (certain sectors of) society. More specifically, language ideologies may concern linkages between such diverse categories as spelling, and grammar with other categories such as nation, gender, authenticity, knowledge, power and tradition. These linkages have real and important impacts on social life.

The linkage between language (or language features) and social categories are the result of what Silverstein (2003) calls the “orders of indexicality”. In the previous section, five processes were discussed that contribute to the naturalisation of ideologies in society. Silverstein’s orders of indexicality are related to the process of indexicalisation as previously discussed. Indexicality, to review, involves signs that either naturally or as a result of social construction point to some property common to a group (Squires, 2010: 459). However, the orders of indexicality, as used by Silverstein, focus specifically on linguistic features and how strata of social meanings come to be indexed by these linguistic features: “‘indexical order’ is the concept necessary to showing us how to relate the micro-social to the macro-social frames of analysis of any sociolinguistic phenomenon” (Silverstein, 2003: 193). For example, when a feature is noticed and correlated with a specific speech community, this is the first order index (what Silverstein calls the *n*th order). When this order becomes metapragmatically linked to an entire speech group, this is a second order index (what Silverstein calls the *n*th + 1 order). When these features are “objectified and metadiscursively linked to stereotypic personae”, a third order index (or *n*th + 1 + 1 order) is established (see discussion in Squires, 2010: 460). The idea is that meaning is transferred from one level onto another level where two things are clearly less connected (cf. recursion, above) (Silverstein, 2003: 194). As a result, since dialects, accents and lexicogrammar tend to be interpreted as indexical signals, readers and listeners infer meaning to these indexical signals through these socially-held orders of indexicality. The meaning attributed to indexical signals tends to be evaluative because communication is achieved because of – or fails

as the result of – standards, norms and expectations (Blommaert, 2005b: 393). Since meanings, and thus evaluations, of indexes are not precise or fixed, the field of potential meanings is what Eckert (2008: 454) calls an ‘indexical field’, which she defines as a “constellation of ideologically related meanings, any one of which can be activated in the situated use of the variable”.

As mentioned, ideological beliefs about language, and the transfer of these beliefs onto speakers and language communities, can have real and important impacts on social life. For example, language ideologies can contribute to the value attributed to a language, which can impact on its perceived worth (or “misrecognition” of worth, see Blackledge, 2005: 34; Bourdieu, 1977). Spitulnik (1998: 163) refers to this as the process of “language valuation” or “evaluation”, which functions to naturalise or neutralise perceived language value. Here, this will be referred to as the “commodification” of language; that is, the process of changing a language into a valuable commodity (Heller, 2003b). The belief that one language is more valuable than another, or that one language has any real marketable value at all, has a crucial effect on the function of a language in society (Bourdieu, 1977: 30). Some language varieties come to be valued more than others because of attributions of social, moral and political value to that language, and because of constructed links between language and categories of people (Blackledge, 2005: vii; Irvine, 1998: 61; Woolard, 1998: 19).

Throughout history, language has been associated with communities of speakers, their ethnicity, their culture, and their territory. Later, these associations often evolved into nation-states with distinctive and defended language varieties. Indeed, nation-internal coherence has often been fostered by asserting the distinctiveness of the “national language” in opposition with other nations’ (often closely related) languages. At the same time, “similar” language varieties have been used as the rationale for uniting speaker communities together as a single nation, wherein a single dialect is privileged over the others to encourage linguistic and social assimilation (see, e.g. Kasuya, 2001; Lo Bianco, 2005). Identities are not always best labelled according to language, however. It is unrealistic to equate one language with one culture in today’s globalised and multicultural context (see da Silva *et al.*, 2007; Gagnon, 2003: 111; Gal and Irvine, 1995; Young, 2001). The use of preformulated categories may lead to overlooking

## Chapter Two: Theoretical concepts

important differences within categories, and indeed, contribute to them by reifying them (Blackledge, 2005: 4). Pujolar (2007: 140) explains that individuals who use a language but are not historically related to the culture and society that a linguistic label indexes are forced to reside in “symbolic limbo”. The complex interplay of factors means that cumulative and widespread attributions of value can cause languages and linguistic identities to become “commodified” in local, national, and global markets (Heller, 2003b; Pacini-Ketchabaw and de Almeida, 2006: 312). The increasingly globalised economy has had profound effects on local communities, their culture(s), and the language(s) that they speak.

One central way that globalisation has impacted on local communities is through the increased prestige of English as the “international” language. In today’s world, English is the international language of the global market, and often it is argued to be free of ties to specific ethnic groups. For these and many other reasons, fluency in English is understood as an invaluable asset (or symbolic resource, see Bourdieu, 1977; see also Bolton and Kachru, 2006; Heller, 2003b; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 63; Ricento, 2005: 352-3). This commodification of English has tended to have rather profound effects on communities who speak other languages. In fact, the growth and expansion of English has sometimes been at the expense (i.e., diminishment, “death” or “genocide”, see Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006) of minority languages, minority language speakers, and their cultures (May, 2008). In reaction, there has been a growing movement to protect minority languages (see e.g. Duchêne and Heller, 2007). In addition to commodifying English, globalisation has also had the reverse effect of encouraging communities to rediscover their roots as “legitimate” sources of identity and culture, and to “act locally”, in part, by speaking and marketing their authentic, local language (Budach, Roy and Heller, 2003; Coupland, 2003; da Silva *et al*, 2007; Heller, 2003b; Jaffe, 2007a: 149; King and Wicks, 2009; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 5, 17).

Languages and language varieties are theorised as valuable in two distinct ways. In one way, language may be perceived as having “integrative” value if it is seen as a cultural asset in a particular social group; in another perspective, language may have an “instrumental” value that enables individuals to achieve specific goals (Ager, 2001: 2-10; Gardner and Lambert, 1959: 267; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 34; 91; cf. Kulyk, 2010:

84 on the “ideology of understanding”). According to Garvin’s (1993) conceptual framework of language standardisation, in locations where a language has predominantly instrumental value, individual fluency in a standard language is highly prized. In contrast, if a language tends to have predominantly integrative value, then expectations for individual fluency in a standard language may be lower. Garvin cites English-speaking countries as examples of places where the instrumental attachment to language dominates (Garvin, 1993: 51; Yavorska, 2010: 167). The evaluation of a language impacts on the role that language plays in society. In overt language planning situations, if a language has integrative value, a language policy may adopt a “language-as-right” approach (Ruiz, 1984). In other words, the language is seen as central to group identity and it is the group’s right to maintain and preserve its identity, in part through language. In contrast, if a language has primarily instrumental value, a language policy may employ a “language-as-resource” approach (Ruiz, 1984). In this case, the policy would serve to implement language as an instrument for participating in society. In another way, if language is not perceived as having any instrumental or integrative value in a society, it may not be included in any language policies whatsoever. Importantly, Ricento (2005) argues that viewing language in a utilitarian way, that is as something with instrumental value, can have negative impacts on both majority and minority language speakers. This is because languages are inevitably tied to communities, and the value attributed to a language becomes recursively attributed to the members of that community (Ricento, 2005: 355).

Indeed, an integrative attachment to a language may involve a particular variety of language loyalty and pride, according to Garvin’s (1993) conceptual framework of language standardisation. In some cases, the consideration of language as a national treasure correlates with the “separatist” function of a standard language, in which the independent identity of a language community is emphasised. In places like the United States, the English language tends to dominate because it has both integrative and instrumental value to the majority group. Ricento (2005: 364) argues that, in the context of the United States, viewing languages as instruments leads to the “unwitting dichotomising of English (national, civic, central) and other languages (local, ethnic, marginal) which has tended to undermine the efficacy and scope of the ‘language as resource’ metaphor”. In contexts like the United States, when language is tied to the

majority group, instituted in some state policy, and viewed as both integratively and instrumentally valuable, it becomes a dominant, effective language of that society. In this way, too, language becomes tied to state-driven agendas, which tend to work to maintain the status quo (Ricento, 2005: 362-4). The state plays an important role in the organisation of language ideologies and the commodification of language. First, it mediates between international/transnational models of language and national/local models. Second, it organises a space within which it can establish a regime of “national” language. Third, it has the capacity to provide infrastructure (e.g. media, education, culture) for the reproduction of a regime of language (Blommaert, 2005b: 396-7). In sum, although there are inherent problems in applying economic models to language, language ideologies continue to result in the commodification of language, with real and tangible effects on individuals in society (Ricento, 2005: 362).

Not all research that concerns beliefs about language in society has used the term “language ideology”. For example, research on language attitudes, motivation, folk linguistics, language planning, prestige, standards, aesthetics, and language awareness all deal to a certain extent with beliefs about language (see Ager, 2001; Coupland and Jaworski, 2004: 23; Preston, 2002; Ricento, 2005; Ruiz, 1984; Woolard, 1998: 4). Many of these disciplines could benefit from the explicitly social-theoretical framework of ideology analysis, which considers the values, practices, and beliefs in public and private contexts (Blackledge and Pavlenko, 2002: 123; Woolard, 1998: 4). Talk about language, or “metalinguage”, tends to express these beliefs, and studies of metalinguage are used in various disciplines for various purposes (Kelly-Holmes and Milani, 2011: 468). Jaworski, Coupland and Galasinski (2004a: 4) describe “metalinguage” in terms of what are often evaluative understandings and beliefs, referring to “[l]anguage in the context of linguistic representations and evaluations”. Metalinguage may involve expressions of how language works, what it is normally like, what various ways of speaking may imply or connote, and what language ought to be like (Jaworski *et al.*, 2004b: 3; Silverstein, 1998: 136; Spitulnik, 1998: 163). When metalinguage is used to make sense of the “reality of language”, metalinguistic interpretations tend to become ideological (Galasinski, 2004: 132; Jaworski *et al.* 2004b: 3; Preston, 2004: 87-9). Although metalinguage tends to be a subject discussed by linguists and philosophers of language, in reality it permeates society as a whole

(Cameron, 2004: 312; Coupland and Jaworski, 2004: 15-16; Gal, 1998: 317; van Leeuwen, 2004: 127). Notably, though, language ideologies are not always explicit, which means that they are not always expressed through language about language. In other words, although much metalanguage tends to be ideological, not all language ideologies are expressed through metalanguage.

This brief overview indicates that approaches to the study of “beliefs about language” vary widely. What distinguishes the study of “language ideologies” from the rest (including metalanguage) is the way in which the study of ideology in general presupposes a consideration of systematic beliefs in society. In other words, ideologies are invariably connected to society because they legitimise the status quo of that society. Language ideologies, then, are connected to specific language communities, and function to legitimise the role of language(s) in that society (and, by extension, sometimes to oppose the role of other languages). Since societies are different from one another, language ideologies differ according to their contexts and societies. Despite this variability, Blommaert (1999c: 432-3) argues that language ideologies tend to have some general traits (although rarely all of these traits at once): 1) concerns for structure and order (i.e., standardisation); 2) concerns for singularity and clarity of expression; 3) concerns over ownership and “correct” usage; and 4) the need for expert voices to legitimise and rationalise the beliefs.

To summarise, then, ideologies are naturalised, socially-shared systems of belief that have real, powerful consequences in society. With the concept of ideology disambiguated, we can now discuss how ideologies take material form in society. The next section will explore how ideologies are channelled through language in the form of discourse.

### **2.3 DISCOURSE**

The concept of discourse is relevant to this discussion because, while ideologies are systems of beliefs, they are abstract and systematic rather than real and material. However, ideologies underlie, and are expressed through, discourses: discourses, in this research, are thus taken to be ideological (Fairclough, 1989: 85, 2003: 9; Milani, 2007b: 171; van Dijk, 2006). As Eagleton (2007: 9) remarks, “ideology is a matter of



## Chapter Two: Theoretical concepts

‘discourse’ rather than ‘language’”. Here discourse will be defined as overarching, socially-indexing, ideological semiotic constructs and symbolic resources used for communication (Blommaert, 1999b: 7, 2005a: 3; Eagleton, 2007: 194; Fowler, 1991: 42; Foucault, 1981: 51; Gee, 2008: 161). This lengthy and complex definition will be examined and parsed in the subsequent sections.

In this particular study, discourse is examined in the language of newspapers. While discourses are often examined through language, they do not necessarily involve *only* language; they can also involve other semiotic meaning-making devices, such as gestures, signs, and ways of acting. However, discourses are not single communication events such as sentences or statements. Indeed, there is a clear difference between a discourse and a text. While a text is a semiotic construct used for communication, it is a singular example, even if it is reprinted, reissued and redistributed. When text is considered in context, then discourse is being considered: “context” includes, among other things, the sources and inspiration for a text, the impact a text has on other texts, the quotes and references included in the text, and other texts produced by the same or associated author(s) (Fairclough, 2003: 129; Foucault, 2006 [1972]: 54). In other words, a text may be a specific and unique example or “realisation” of a discourse; however a discourse refers to abstract “patterns and commonalities” that go above and beyond singular examples (Wodak, 2008: 6). Texts are examples of people “doing” (i.e., writing) what they think; however, pragmatic reasons prevent individuals from expressing all that they know and think. As a result, individuals’ expressions or productions of ideologies are normally partial (Boutet and Heller, 2007: 312; Fairclough, 1989: 23; Heller, 2002; van Dijk, 1998b: 24). Texts, then, only reflect the “tip of the [ideological] iceberg” (van Dijk, 1998b: 28). Texts are created from discourse; if texts draw on a common discourse, then they will inevitably be similar in their language patterns, logical assumptions, and underlying ideologies. Thus, while a discourse can take shape through any kind of semiotic meaning-making tied to a specific context, a text refers to a specific linguistic embodiment of a discourse. As a result, by examining numerous texts or other forms of semiosis, discourse analysts can identify, analyse and make transparent overarching ideological discourse. Returning to the definition provided above, then, discourses are overarching patterns across many examples of semiosis, such as those exemplified by texts.

Importantly, texts are produced and consumed within social contexts that may be, for example, institutional or national in character (Foucault, 1981: 52, 2006 [1972]: 56-7). We are referring, then, to social groups – however permeable the boundaries of these groups may be – and to the discourse(s) produced by these groups. These groups are often called “discourse communities” (Swales, 1990). Discourse communities may be heterogeneous on some levels, but they have some common systematic beliefs – that is, ideologies – that result in them having a shared representation system. In other words, discourse communities are composed of “individuals who share the same social practices” and thus who must, most of the time, “understand one another correctly” (Eagleton, 2007: 13). At the heart of the concept of the discourse community, then, is the social aspect of language use (Bourdieu, 1977: 648). Goodwin and Duranti (1992: 1) explain that, from the beginning of language use, children do not learn to speak simply through language acquisition, but through language socialisation, which is the process through which children learn how to “speak in a community” and become competent, socialised members of their society (see Brice Heath, 1993; Ochs, 1992). Milroy and Gordon (2003: 118) discuss a similar concept when they draw on Eckert’s (2000) notion of “community of practice” to illustrate how social meaning is indexed by language within a social network. This study focuses in part on national discourses, which suggests that “community” in the discourse sense need not be local or immediate: it can be as large as the nation. This is because what unites a group – heterogeneous as it may be on a superficial level – is an ideology woven of shared beliefs and understandings of the world (van Dijk, 2006: 120).

However, just as groups do not necessarily have clearly-defined boundaries, neither do discourses: they tend to be ambiguous, fluid, and evolve along with the social group. Similarly, just as most individuals belong to more than one social group, so too they are part of more than one discourse community and produce and consume more than one discourse (although sometimes a discourse is adopted in contrast to other alternative discourses; Foucault, 1981: 57, 2006 [1972]: 30; Gee, 2008: 161-2). By examining individual texts, then, we are looking at inventories of communication; by examining texts specific to social groups, we are starting to conceive of the group’s ideological discourse. In order to examine discourse, the social context must be made as explicit as

## Chapter Two: Theoretical concepts

possible, including “the production and reproduction of the producers and receivers and of their relationship” (Bourdieu, 1977: 651). To reiterate, discourses are produced in social contexts, and each context is crucially embedded in historical temporality, what Foucault (1981: 61) calls “in the true of its time” (see also Blommaert, 1999b: 5-6, 1999b: 426, 2005a: 126-137; Boutet and Heller, 2007: 312; Eagleton, 2007: 9; Foucault, 2006 [1972]: 57-61; Gee, 2008: 162). Discourse is thus an overarching, ideological, semiotic construct that indexes social groups.

Finally, discourses are symbolic resources because they indicate membership in specific discourse communities which inevitably have unequal access to power (Bourdieu, 1977: 657; Eagleton, 2007: xvii; Fairclough, 1989: 85). It is only once individuals are acculturated and accepted within a community, adept in the common language, and have absorbed the community’s discourse(s) that they can produce, reproduce, and even dismantle the discourses that comprise that community (Gee, 2008: 170; van Dijk, 2006; Wodak *et al.*, 1999). Individuals can achieve these kinds of changes through appropriate language use, which includes the appropriate genre, or the type and structure of language used for a particular purpose in a particular context (Blackledge, 2005: 8). Appropriate discourse use is evidence of valuable acculturation and acceptance in a specific community (cf. communicative competence, e.g. Hymes, 1997 [1972]). Also, since discourses are ideological, their imposition of commonsense understandings contributes to the reification of the status quo, including the (re)establishment of membership and non-membership, social class, and dominant or official language(s) (Bourdieu, 1977: 648). Because of its embedded ideology, discourse is interconnected with power dimensions in society (Foucault, 1981; Gee, 2008: 162). However, it is important not to overstate the “power” of discourse, and not to over-interpret discourse data (van Dijk, 2006: 129). Discourse has no agency of its own: “it gains power through the use that powerful individuals make of it” (Wodak, 2009: 312; see Bourdieu, 1991). Discourse also gains power through the ways in which it is renewed through serving new and diverse purposes that mirror ever-changing social power structures (Gee, 2008: 162). So in conclusion, discourses are overarching, socially-indexing, ideological semiotic constructs and a symbolic resource used for communication.

In order to study ideology, then, it is necessary to examine discourses. Discourses circulate and naturalise language ideologies, and allow individuals to share representations and understandings. Overt ideological metalanguage is evidence of what Blommaert (1999b) calls language ideological “debates”: textual manifestations of discourses concerning language issues. Blommaert argues that debates are precisely the focus of how language ideologies become manifested in society, since they are “points of entrance” for civil society into policy making and the locus of ideology (re)production (Blommaert, 1999b: 8-11; see also Watts, 1999: 68-9). Language ideological debates take place within a context of power relationships, discrimination, social engineering, and nation building (Blackledge and Pavlenko, 2002: 122; Blommaert, 1999b: 2). Individual language ideological debates can also increase in magnitude, evolving into what Blackledge (2005) calls “chains of discourse”. In this case, a debate originating at a local level may be shared throughout a discourse community, then “recontextualised and transformed in increasingly legitimate contexts, gaining authority”, perhaps eventually finding its way into the legitimacy of the state (Blackledge, 2005: 1). The concept of chains of discourse, Blackledge explains, indicates how ideologies at the institutional or political level are in fact fundamentally reinforced at the local level. However, chains of discourse are neither straightforward nor unidirectional; rather, they are likely to be “circular, reflexive, tangential, and fractured”, with states and institutions impacting on popular discourse as well (Blackledge, 2005: 13). As a result, language ideologies can be examined as they are manifested in their various stages of evolution and loci, whether at the local and individual level or embedded in the ideology of an institution, nation, or state.

### **2.3.1 National discourses and discourses of national identity**

Discourse communities can take many shapes, and national discourse communities are just one of many kinds of discourse communities. A national discourse is specific to a national group and emerges when people are “apprenticed as part of their socialization” within the national group (Gee, 2008: 168). National groups are fundamental to this discussion because the topic of this thesis is the expression and interrelatedness of language ideologies and discourses of national identity in Canadian newspapers.

## Chapter Two: Theoretical concepts

Here it is argued that “nationalism” is an ideology constructed largely unconsciously as a category for understanding the “nation”. In this approach, nations are not argued to be “real substantive entities,” but, rather, belief in the nation is “a form of ideological consciousness which filters reality, rather than reflects it” (Brown, 2000: 20; see also Anderson, 1983; Fox and Miller-Idriss, 2008; A. D. Smith, 2001: 9; Wodak *et al*, 2009). This way of conceiving nationalism (i.e., the “constructivist approach”; see Brown, 2000: 5) differs from other approaches (for an overview, see A. D. Smith, 2001: 43-61). Primordialism, for example, sees nationalism as an instinct of individuals born into specific linguistic, racial or homeland communities such that the bond between the individual and the community is seen as so innate and natural that it is primordial. In contrast, situationalism sees nationalism as a vested interest in common pursuits: when individuals recognise resources as valuable for their shared interest, nationalism suits the context or situation. While this thesis accepts that nationalism may involve beliefs in innate bonds between individuals and communities, and conscious or unconscious manipulations of social organisations for common goals, the central defining characteristic of nationalism is nevertheless considered a system of shared beliefs regarding the nation.

Nationalism may also involve the desire for the autonomy of the nation because not all nations are independent states. When nations are states, A. D. Smith (2001: 17) differentiates between “national states” and “state nations”. A national state is a state legitimated by the principles of nationalism; although the population is not culturally homogeneous, there is “a measure of national unity and integration”. In contrast, “state nations” derive from polyethnic states aspiring to nationhood by using processes of accommodation and integration to enhance national unity. Kymlicka (1995) makes a distinction between “multinational states” and “polyethnic states”. Whereas a multinational state contains more than one nation or national minority, a polyethnic state is one which contains numerous ethnic groups. National minorities are different from ethnic groups in that national minorities share a distinct language, culture, common history, and common homeland (i.e., a geographically and institutionally defined territory). Ethnic groups (or “immigrant groups”, see Kymlicka, 1998: 7), in contrast, are associations between immigrants who seek social and political integration

## Chapter Two: Theoretical concepts

(rather than differentiation) in a country, and hence whose distinctiveness – which may be linguistic, cultural, historical, or territorial – is manifested primarily in family lives and voluntary organisations.

As we have seen with “national states” and “state nations”, nations are not only minorities that exist within larger states. However, Kymlicka (1998: 165) notes that these are the groups that benefit most from nationalist rhetoric, which enables them to differentiate themselves from other groups (such as ethnic or immigrant groups), limit their vulnerability as a numerical minority, and legitimate their claims to rights and privileges. By using nationalism as a legitimising strategy for gaining control over language, education, government, employment and immigration, a minority can sustain its political culture. In contrast, because in a democracy the majority rules, there is little need for a majority to define itself as a nation. As a result, dominant forms of nationalism are often naturalised in the form of “patriotism”, a term that manages to avoid the connotations of nationalism, which are often negative (see e.g. Ignatieff, 1994: 11; 2000: 124; Winter, 2007: 483). Also, since nationalist rhetoric has become so closely linked with minorities (and similarly patriotic rhetoric with majorities), it has arguably lost some of its legitimising power.

Nations, here, are understood as real, meaningful categories of belonging for those who identify with them. Nonetheless, nations are not unproblematic, fixed, or natural entities and thus are difficult to study apart from the discursive constructions of them (see Wodak et al., 2009). Because a discourse involves naturalised understandings of the world, a national discourse, in the same way, involves naturalised understandings at the level of the nation. In other words, this is discourse taking place at the national level: individuals, groups, or institutions referring to issues that affect the nation. Building on the aforementioned definition of “discourse”, then, a national discourse is an overarching, socially-indexing, ideological semiotic construct and symbolic resource used for communication. What is unique to a national discourse is the fact that it indexes a *national* group rather than simply a social group. National discourse may take shape explicitly and actively or inexplicitly through more abstract means. For example, the production or transfer of signs may involve explicit and active performances, rituals, and mass ceremonies in which the nation is actively produced, reproduced or contested

in the public sphere (see e.g. Alexander, 2004; Collins, 2004; Uzelac, 2010). National holidays, for instance, involve mass ceremonies of nationalism being performed for the public, producing and reproducing national identity (Hayday, 2010; McCrone and McPherson, 2009). However, national discourse is also manifest through the production and exchange of even the most simple, everyday semiosis – which is why dominant nationalism (i.e. “patriotism”) is often taken for granted and naturalised (see Fox and Millier-Idriss, 2008; Wodak *et al.*, 2009). “Banal nationalism” (Billig, 1995) is achieved through simple routines and everyday actions that reify and reproduce the existence of the nation; this can include, for example, using the national language.

Finally, it is important to note how “national discourse” pertains to discourse at the national level but not necessarily discourse *about* the nation. National discourse about the nation has been examined under several different headings. For example, Bekerman (2002) and Eissenstat (2005) use the term “discourse of nation” to refer to discourses about the nation and national identity. This is similar to the concept of “nationalist discourse”, as defined by Baker and Ellece (2011: 75):

Nationalist discourse enables the construction of national identity. It is the discursive means whereby national identity is produced, reproduced, cemented and transformed. Nationalist discourse is therefore a means of representing shared experience through narratives, symbols and rituals which are regarded as the core of a national identity. Discourse analysts have examined how nationalist discourses can sometimes be based around stereotypes which distinguish between ‘us’ and ‘them’, and such discourses can be employed in order to justify discrimination or exclusion of out-groups.

This definition stresses the importance of discourse in the construction of national identity – notably similar to Wodak *et al.*’s (2009) concept of the “discursive construction of national identity”. Here, although this definition largely encapsulates the concept of “discourse about the nation” that is the focus of this thesis, due to the

negative connotations surrounding the term “nationalist” – especially within the Canadian context – the term “discourse of national identity” is preferred.

A. D. Smith (2001: 18) defines national identity as “the continuous reproduction and reinterpretation of the pattern of values, symbols, memories, myths and traditions that compose the distinctive heritage of nations, and the identifications of individuals with that pattern and heritage and with its cultural elements”. Smith’s definition entails a process of continuous change (see A. D. Smith, 2001: 20); national identity is thus not fixed or static, but rather as a subject in constant evolution. Furthermore, here, no single nation is the focus. Rather, this is an exploration of the different ways in which nations and national identities are discursively represented. These nations are not real, tangible entities, but abstract, imagined construals of identities within Canada; these often overlap with one another in the inclusion or exclusion of different social groups. For these reasons, Wodak *et al.*’s (2009) concept of the “discursive construction of national identity” is useful: like national identity, discourses are in constant evolution due to the underlying ideologies (see Section 2.2.2). In this study, then, the concept of “discourse of national identity” will be used to explore how national discourses represent different nations and national identities within Canada, and the roles played by languages within these discourses.

### **2.3.2 Language and nationalism**

One principal way in which the nation has been legitimised throughout history is by way of sharing a common language. In fact, sharing a common, national language is seen to be one of the hallmarks of a nation. Anderson (1983), for example, attributes the birth and tide of nationalism to the spread of literacy and language awareness. According to Anderson, nations exist only insofar as they are constructed or “imagined” by populations. Since individuals within a nation rarely meet one another, they only form a national bond through the way in which they imagine connections between themselves: this image is largely the result of language (Anderson, 1983). The printing press arguably played a major role in the dissemination of national ideologies: with the printing press and the rise of literacy, many groups of people found that they could understand and relate to each other despite geographic expanse and perhaps localised differences. In other words, since they could read and understand the same language and



material, they imagined themselves connected to one another through language. Still today, many populations are convinced they belong to a unique national community largely because they read, listen to, and watch the same material (in particular, material from the national news media; see Harris and Rampton, 2003: 3; Machin and van Leeuwen, 2007: 1-15, 44-45). Thus, a “nation” can be understood as a body of people sharing the same mental representation of the national language and believing themselves connected due to this shared language. Anderson’s concept of “imagined communities” highlights the importance of the print media in the emergence of national consciousness, connecting media institutions with the cultural constitution of nations, and the cultural experience of being part of a nation. The consequence of the connection between language and nation is that nations have tended to be conceptualised as monolingual and linguistically homogeneous. As Androutsopoulos (2007: 207-8) remarks, this was even intensified with the emergence of the mass media: “The mass media contributed to the constitution of national languages and gave rise to the linguistic ideal of public discourse in the monolingual nation-state: a language as homogeneous as the nation it represents.” As a result, the belief in a singular, homogeneous national language emerged as a supposed indicator of national legitimacy. In other words, the “one nation, one language” ideology (i.e., monolingual ideology) and the “standard language” ideology became among the first of many ideologies to be bound up in national discourses (see Horner, 2007: 133; Jaffe, 2007b: 57; Kulyk, 2010: 83-4). Indeed, debates about language become increasingly ideological when linked to the nation such that “language ideological debates” play a role in nation building (Blommaert, 1999b: 427; see also e.g., Blommaert and Vershueren, 1998; Delveroudi and Moschonas, 2003: 3; Gal, 1998: 323).

The monolingual ideology lingers, and is perhaps fostered by globalisation and the desire to create the aforementioned “authentic” linguistic and cultural communities amidst increasing diversification (Bourdieu, 1977: 650; Bucholtz 2003; Coupland 2003; da Silva *et al*, 2007; Heller, 2003b; Gal and Irvine, 1995: 972). According to Patrick (2007: 37), it is unsurprising that language is widely understood as the property of specific people when, in the midst of globalisation, “linguistic essentialism ties particular language varieties to ‘authentic’ cultural practices and sociocultural groups who inhabit particular places and localities”. As a result, we can see that it is now

widely accepted that language plays an important role in nations. Furthermore, there has been an emphasis on the role that the media plays in the dissemination of both national and linguistic ideologies (see Cotter, 2001: 430; 2010: 187-211; Pujolar, 2007: 129). In a country like Canada, where understandings about the nation are intertwined with language ideologies, the media is a site of particular interest.

### **2.3.3 Ideology and nationalism in media language**

Today, there exist numerous and diverse types, forms, and formats of media. Although much of what follows is generalisable to all areas of the media, this thesis deals specifically with the news media, that is, media that produce and disseminate the news. As a result, the terms “news” and “media” will henceforth be used interchangeably. The news media is well-known as a site of particular interest in the study of nationalism, ideology, and language for two main reasons.

First, the media is a powerful site of ideological discourse production. This is, in part, because the mass media are social institutions that impact on the communication flow in society (Leitner, 1997: 188). By impacting on communication exchange, media institutions have power over how individuals access information and how individuals communicate with each other. They also impact *which* information is disseminated to the public, how this information is presented, and at what point this information is released (Baker, 2010: 141; Jaffe, 2007a: 166-7). According to Cotter (2001: 423), journalists “manipulate” temporal elements, and as a result they are not “stenographers or transcribers; they are storytellers and interpreters”. However, since not all interpretations are explicit, they can involve hidden relations of power (Fairclough 1989: 49). The news media, as producers and distributors of the information, directly affect the discursive representation, construction, and reproduction of society, and indeed the nation (see Bell, 1998: 64-5; DiGiacomo, 1999: 105; Fowler, 1991: 4; Machin and van Leeuwen, 2007: 1-24). This is achieved, on the one hand, by manipulating the focus of the public eye on events that are deemed relevant, important, or “newsworthy”, and on the other hand, simply by being a highly visible information source that has the capacity to distribute and publicise information over a vast geography (Bednarek, 2006: 18; Conboy, 2007: 30; Cotter, 2010: 80; Fowler, 1991: 13; Spitulnik, 1998: 165). The capacity to distribute and publicise is particularly potent if a

news agency forms part of a chain or conglomerate. When individuals or corporations own a number of newspapers and/or other media establishments (e.g. TV, radio), then competition for alternate sources of information is reduced (Bell, 1991; Pritchard *et al.*, 2005: 293; Soderlund and Hildebrandt, 2005c: 33).

Furthermore, as previously discussed, texts tend to be ideological because most language use contains embedded assumptions about society. When information is conveyed in the media, the impact is significant because it is considered authoritative, reproduced *en masse*, and widely distributed. The ideological power of the news media is thus in part the result of its systematic tendencies and cumulative effect. As Fairclough (1989: 54) explains, “[a] single text on its own is quite insignificant: the effects of media power are cumulative, working through the repetition of particular ways of handling causality and agency, particular ways of positioning the reader, and so forth”. As a result, the language of the media is not necessarily more ideological than any other sample of language. All language is, to a certain extent, ideological, but the language of the media has a more important function than that of an individual speaker or text. As Fowler (1991: 124) explains, “[t]he articulation of ideology in the language of the news fulfils, cumulatively and through daily iteration, a background function of reproducing the beliefs and paradigms of the community generally”.

Nevertheless, it is important not to attribute undue causal power to the media as a distributor and disseminator of ideology (see e.g. Eagleton, 2007: 34). Some researchers argue that the study of ideology in the media may simply support a researcher’s own “ideological frame” or bias about what may be present in the text. Bell (1998: 65), for example, warns that over-eagerness to get to the “real meat” of ideological detective work can lead researchers to draw erroneous conclusions. Also, the search for ideology in the media often presumes clear, definable relations between linguistic choices and specific ideologies, attributing to individuals (i.e., reporters and editors) a far more deliberate ideological intervention than is likely (Cotter, 2001: 421; see also Bell, 1991: 214). Another criticism of the study of ideology in the news media is that most analysts do not contextualise media language as the “outcome of a discourse process” (Cotter, 2010: 4). The neglect of the “process” is problematic in various areas of linguistics research (see discussions in Bell, 1991; Boutet and Heller, 2007: 313; Duranti, 2009:

17; Fairclough, 1998: 143). In the media, for example, journalists report, write, edit, and produce text within the context of their discourse community (Catenaccio *et al.*, 2011; Cotter, 2001: 428; Sauvageau, 2001: 38). Through socialisation in the community, journalists learn the ideological values and norms that underlie the news discourse, which include categorisations concerning how the world works and the beliefs that structure it (Conboy, 2007: 30). Cotter (2010: 4) argues that a lack of understanding of the “normative routines of daily journalism” compromises linguistically-oriented research into media language and discourse, since she argues that “everyday practice [...] shapes the language of the news”. Thus, following Cotter, journalists are here understood as producing language within the context of membership in the journalistic discourse community. They are also not alone in the production of the news, since they work alongside editors, and within institutional contexts (Bell, 1991: 33-50).

Cotter (2010: 222) argues that reporters work to maintain a non-evaluative stance by “[not explicitly framing] stories in terms of judgements or moral lessons to be learned but in an apparently more neutral way that allows readers to make judgments for themselves”. However, because the journalistic discourse community intersects with other discourse communities, and because journalists function as part of institutions that observe, comment, critique, interpret, and regulate information, journalists continue to function as “ideological brokers” in public debates (Blommaert, 1999b, c). The question of ideology in reporting is thorny because it takes place not only through explicit evaluation and judgements, but also through more implicit means (van Dijk, 1998b: 29). Furthermore, ideology cannot be deduced from singular examples, nor examples that are speciously argued to be representative of the discourse as a whole. The fact is that bias, evaluation, judgements and assumptions must be shown to exist across numerous examples and in various forms in order to suggest the existence of an ideological discourse. Furthermore, media language, like nearly all samples of language, is socially constructed both as a social product and social practice (Fowler, 1991: 8). The result of being embedded in social practice means that all language tends to be ideological to a certain extent. The language of the news is simply argued to be a particularly important example of language because of its institutional and systematic functions. Following Fowler (1991: 8), it is not that the news is “biased” or “more ideological” than any other text. To the contrary:

what is being claimed about news can equally be claimed about *any* representational discourse [because] [a]nything that is said or written about the world is articulated from a particular ideological position (Fowler, 1991: 10).

As a result, it is not a coincidence that the media's words "intersect with our own" (Cotter, 2001: 430), since the media serves to reflect and reinforce social norms, impacting agendas and identities (Cotter, 2010: 2).

This brings us to the second reason why the news media are useful in the study of language, nationalism, and ideology: the media *reproduce* ideological discourse (see e.g. Catenaccio *et al.*, 2011: 1844). Some researchers believe that the media "reflect" reality, others that the media "co-orchestrate" reality, and still others that media "create" reality" (Leitner, 1997: 188). The lack of consensus perhaps reflects a lack of understanding of the way in which the media interact with the world. Media discourse is undoubtedly designed for mass audiences, with a target audience or readership in mind. In other words, the linguistic strategies in the news are oriented and motivated by opportunities of reception and the chance of profit (see Bell, 1991: 38; Bourdieu, 1977: 654). Journalists consider the audience or readership by reporting news that is relevant to the "community of coverage" (Cotter, 2010: 26). This includes not only people who are readers or listeners, but also those who live in the media outlet's geographical region, or those who have exposure to it. As mentioned above, the language of the news is the outcome of a process that takes place within the journalistic discourse community, which includes not only journalists, but also editors and news executives (Bell, 1991: 38). However, these individuals tend to live and work in their inhabitant or geographic community; the ties between the journalist community and the community of coverage can therefore be quite strong (Cotter, 2010: 34). As a result, in order to produce news that appeals to the community of coverage, a newspaper tends to carry specific stories that are presented in such a way so as to make the news relevant to and coherent with its community of coverage (Cotter, 2010: 46; Fletcher, 1998).

## Chapter Two: Theoretical concepts

Sometimes it is clear which stories and perspectives are relevant to a community; however, other times journalists must deduce or assume. At these times, journalists presuppose a “prototypical image” or an “ideal” recipient (Fairclough, 1989: 49; Leitner, 1997: 189), appealing to what Bakhtin (1981) called the “superaddressee”: an invisible but responsive and understanding third party existing above all individual participants in a dialogue. In other words:

with a greater or lesser degree of awareness, every utterance is also constituted by another kind of listener, a supreme one “whose absolutely just responsive understanding is presumed, either in some metaphysical distance or in distant historical time” [...] This superaddressee would actively and sympathetically respond to the utterance and understand it in “just the right way” (Morson and Emerson, 1990: 135).

The journalists, then, adopt norms in such a way as to appeal not only to immediate identifiable addressees, but also to an overarching, generalisable audience (see also Blommaert, 2005a: 73, 2007: 118). This generalisation of public opinion arguably leads journalists to adopt the “vox populi”, that is, the (presumed or assumed) voice and/or perspective of the community’s dominant group (Fairclough, 1989: 51; Karim, 1993; Leitner, 1997: 194). By adopting dominant norms, the media appeal to, produce, and reproduce the ideological discourse of the status quo wherein one social group dominates (Conboy, 2007: 24; Cotter, 2010: 187; Fowler, 1991: 23). The language of the news, then, although inherently intertextual (continuously drawing on the language of other people), continues to emphasise the language of the dominant group (Bakhtin, 1981; Catenaccio *et al.*, 2011: 1845). In this way, the news media is not solely responsible for the ideologies it may contain; rather, it can be taken as an example of ideological discourse that is already in circulation in society.

Thus it is through their membership in discourse communities that journalists reproduce (rather than produce in isolation) ideological language in the news. These discourse communities include both the journalistic community and the community of coverage. Aitchison (2007: 198) explains:

## Chapter Two: Theoretical concepts

No journalist, or even group of journalists, could ever cover everything that happens: they have to choose what to report. The selection has to tie in with what both editors and readers find important and interesting [...] But at a less superficial level, news is likely to be events which re-affirm accepted values in the society in which the readers live [...] This ‘solidarity model’ asserts common shared values, and provides a comfortable feeling that the world is behaving in an orderly fashion. Daily newspapers mostly work with this model, and many politicians try to promote it.

It begins to become apparent, then, that the language of the news tends to fit – or at least aims to fit – within society as it currently exists. Thus, although the news media are powerful, members of the journalistic discourse community are not authority figures in isolation from society; rather, they interact with the “community of coverage”, which includes participants active in the media process (Bell, 1991; Cotter, 2001: 422; Eagleton, 2007: 34; Gal, 1998: 321; Jaffe 2007a: 159; Robinson, 1998: 4). Furthermore, recipient uptake of the news is not prescribed or predictable, and thus the effects of media discourse can be equally uncertain. Leitner (1997: 189) explains that “[i]t is recipients that expose themselves to or withdraw from media output, they decode adequately or misconstrue content, they reinforce messages or alternatively nullify their effect”. Audiences have the possibility – and indeed the power – to resist media discourse. The meanings contained in the news, then, are “a product negotiation between readers and texts” (Garret and Bell, 1998: 2).

The process of recipient uptake also involves the choice of information source. Although newspaper readership, for instance, is often restricted by newspaper availability (e.g. Canada is dominated by “one-newspaper-towns”), when there is a choice between newspapers, readers are drawn to papers that report stories in a way that is designed to evoke a particular response. The newspaper’s “audience design” thus tends to accommodate addressees and their interests by reporting the “familiar and culturally similar” (Kariel and Rosenvall, 1983: 431; see also Gagnon, 2006: 80). Also, by including letters to the editor in the newspaper, the newspaper includes in a more visible way the discourse of its readers. Although many letters may be published in

online editions of newspapers, only a small number of letters can be published in print versions. As a result, the selection of which letters to publish can have ideological implications (Richardson, 2007: 151). The arguments being made here, then, are threefold. First, the media does not so much produce, but establish and reproduce ideas and values that are already present in society (Fowler, 1991; Leitner, 1997). Second, although the analysis of newspaper texts can be revealing, not all articles will necessarily have a direct – or indeed any – impact on readers (Cotter, 2010: 131; Johnson and Ensslin, 2007: 9). Third, despite the provisos, the language of the news can still be considered as ideological discourse, revealing underlying systematic beliefs and understandings concerning language and the nation (Delveroudi and Moschonas, 2003: 6; Horner, 2007: 144; Johnson and Ensslin, 2007: 13; Pujolar, 2007: 121; Spitulnik, 1998).

As discussed above, nations have historically been seen as legitimate, in part, because of a unique national language. The news media thus have an important function with respect to national ideologies: standard language ideologies, both manifest and implicit, tend to be intertwined with national projects when they exist in what Busch (2006: 206) calls the “monolingual habitus of the media”. This monolingual habitus appears to be linked to the ideal of a single national public sphere, with the aim of homogenising diverse populations (Busch, 2006: 219).

### **2.4 CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, the news media are an important site for the construction of collective, and importantly, national, consciousness (Brown, 2000: 8; Horner, 2007: 144; Johnson and Ensslin, 2007: 13; Pujolar, 2007: 121; Spitulnik, 1998). As previously discussed, the printing press played a major role in the dissemination of national ideologies. Still today, the mass media play a role in the perpetuation of national ideologies, since national populations are arguably persuaded that they belong to a unique national community in part because they read, listen to, and watch the same material in the same language. Media can be national in their scope, content and format; the media can also be national in terms of its consumption, engendering and reinforcing national boundaries (Anderson, 1983). In all of these ways, the media can contribute to the “activation and reinforcement of national sensitivities” (Fox and Miller-Idriss, 2008:



## Chapter Two: Theoretical concepts

551). The news media, then, are particularly important if they function to support – whether explicitly or implicitly – a national project. Thus, the media is a powerful site in the production and reproduction of ideological discourses on language and the nation. With these theoretical concepts established, language ideologies and discourses of national identity in the Canadian context can now be discussed in detail. This will begin, in the next chapter, with an outline of the various national discourses in Canada and the language ideologies that support these discourses.

# **3. CANADIAN DISCOURSES OF NATIONAL IDENTITY AND LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES**

## **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter focuses on three discourses of national identity in Canada. These are not argued to be the only national identity discourses; rather, these are the three most “effective” national identity discourses that exist in Canada because they have emerged from the largest and most powerful groups in the country. These discourses emerged at different times, for different reasons, and in different contexts, but they all emerged in real, lived circumstances for specific reasons. Viewing these discourses in their appropriate historical context, then, means seeing how some discourses are emergent, others are residual, some are alternative and others are oppositional (Williams, 1977: 8-10; see Section 2.2.2).

In Canada, discourses of national identity have emerged from different communities and serve to justify and legitimise access and rights to resources. Because there are diverse groups in Canada, it would be impossible to discuss all national identity discourses within the scope of a single thesis. Notably, the First Nations and aboriginal groups have not been included here; this is due to space restrictions, and also because they continue to be marginalised in the mainstream Canadian media (see Harding, 2006; Karim, 1993; Nesbitt-Larking, 2007: 252; Vipond, 2012: 120; cf. Voyageur, 2003). Although only three discourses of national identity are discussed here, even within these three there are important differences between how (often very similar) criteria are represented in the promotion of group interests. No discourse is more dominant than

any other except in terms of its relevance to and adoption by a specific community (i.e., one discourse of national identity may be more relevant than another in a specific community and hence may be dominant in that community). Since one of the most important criteria in symbolising difference and privilege in Canada is language, the three discourses of national identity discussed here entail specific language ideologies that are central to the legitimisation of rights and belonging in the different nations under discussion. The subsequent sections will discuss, in turn, the discourses of national identity in Quebec, English Canada, and federal Canada, and the various language ideologies that support these discourses. These language ideologies are based on previous literature and linguistic research in Canada, and will be used as a framework for analysis in later chapters (Chapters Five, Six, and Seven).

### **3.2 DISCOURSES OF NATIONAL IDENTITY IN QUEBEC**

Although some of the history of Quebec nationalism was presented in Section 1.2, it is useful to outline how this discourse of national identity compares to the English Canadian and pan-Canadian discourses. Quebec's discourse of national identity emerged as part of the nationalist movement of the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. It also emerged as an alternative to the discourse of French Canadian national identity, which had existed for several centuries. The history of Quebec nationalism is essentially a movement from an ethnic French Canadian nation to a civic, territorially-defined French-speaking nation (see Breton, 1988; McRoberts, 1997: 29; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 27). While French Canadian nationalism (the "residual" national ideology, in Williams' [1977] terms) was primarily based on *la foi, la race, la langue* (faith, race, and language) (Heller, 1999a: 148, 2011: 14), the Quebec nationalist movement (the "emergent" national ideology, in Williams' terms) is based on the territory of Quebec and is civic, with an inclusive notion of a shared French language.

Quebec's nationalist movement was spurred by the major changes taking place across Quebec in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries: urbanisation, industrialisation, the emergence of mass media, and the rise of new social classes. Through what has become known as the Quiet Revolution (*la Révolution tranquille*) (see Section 1.2), these new social classes drove the Quebec state to assume more active roles in society (McRoberts, 1997: 32). Indeed, the nationalist movement was spearheaded by the newly

elected Liberal Party, led by Jean Lesage, which had campaigned on a nationalist strategy. For example, the government won re-election in 1962 with the now-famous slogan *maîtres chez nous* (“masters of our own house”). This nationalist government contributed to Quebec’s move towards secularism; the principal reason for this departure from traditional Catholicism was that the clergy, who had helped to define French Canada, had also been complicit with English speakers in the repression of French Canadians (see e.g. C. Bouchard, 2002: 76; Conlogue, 2002: 62; Heller, 1999a: 148). Under Premier Jean Lesage, the Quebec government took control of the province’s educational and social welfare institutions that had previously been the domain of the Catholic Church (Weaver, 1992: 23). The government also systematically replaced the term *la province du Québec* (“the province of Quebec”) with *l’État du Québec* (“the Quebec State”) (McRoberts, 1997: 34), which contributed to a new discourse of Quebec national identity and moreover served to alter the conceptualisation of Quebec’s place within the Canadian federation. Béland and Lecours (2006: 85) note that Quebec has erected some social policies simply as a way to distinguish Quebec from the rest of English-speaking Canada. They highlight that Quebec often opted out of federal programmes and used the resulting financial compensation to set up social programmes similar to the previously federally-administered ones (Béland and Lecours, 2006: 81; cf. McRoberts, 1997: 41). This, they argue, was for the symbolic reason of realising autonomy and distinctiveness: Quebec identified itself over and against the English-dominant North American norm as something different and unique (see Taylor, 1993: 13). Thus, Quebec’s move away from religion enabled it to modernise in a way similar to the rest of the country; however, the government persevered in its mission to preserve the distinctiveness of Quebec faced with predominantly-English-speaking Canada and, more broadly, North America.

The new Quebec government also helped to reformulate established notions of membership in the nation. French Canadians had been isolated from other parts of Canada for many centuries and were a largely ethnically homogeneous society by the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century (C. Bouchard, 2002: 61). However, a steep decline in francophone birth rate meant that higher levels of immigration were required to bolster the Quebec demographic (Oakes and Warren, 2007: 126). To deal with the new influx of immigrants, a Ministry of Immigration was founded in 1968 (later renamed the Ministry

of Cultural Communities and Immigration/ *Ministère des Communautés culturelles et de l'Immigration*). Its task has been to integrate immigrants through Quebec's "interculturalism" policy (as opposed to Canada's "multiculturalism" policy) (Oakes and Warren, 2007: 28). Key to this interculturalism integration process was a common French language, which was to be shared by all members of the Quebec nation. However, the French-medium integration process has not been without difficulties, since immigrants have historically been attracted to the English language. Notably, it was not until 1977 that law decreed that all children, with the exception of anglophones with historical links to Quebec, would receive French-language education through to the end of secondary school (*Charter of the French language*, R.S.Q. c. C-11, s. 72; see Oakes and Warren, 2007: 87-88). Prior to this time, most immigrants had opted for their children to receive English-medium education. Although nowadays English-medium education is permitted for all children of Canadian citizens who received their primary schooling in English in Canada (see Oakes and Warren, 2007: 88), all other students must be educated in French. In other words, the *francisation* of immigrants and their children is seen as a crucial part of integration into the Quebec nation (Dufour, 2008: 117; Laurier, 2005: 575; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 92-7; Pagé, 2005: 215). In sum, Quebec nationalism involved a move away from the ethnic conceptualisation of "French Canadian" identity and towards a more inclusive form of Quebec national identity centred on a common French language.

In order to make French the common language of the Quebec nation, the Liberal government of the 1960s took notable initiatives. The principal driving force for these initiatives was the new French-speaking middle class, which had first propelled the Liberal government into power. Because their professional mobility had previously been blocked by the pre-eminence of English as a language of work, this new middle class had a particular interest in the quality of French and its status in Quebec (McRoberts, 1997: 99). Accordingly, one of the first acts of the Lesage government was the establishment of the *Office de la langue française* in 1961 (renamed in 2003 the *Office québécois de la langue française*) (Conrick and Regan, 2007: 31). The objective of this body was to establish French as the common language in "all sectors of human activity" (Oakes and Warren, 2007: 84). The Liberal government, later led by Robert Bourassa, also drafted Bill 22, which passed in 1974 and became the *Official Language*

*Act* (S.Q. 1974, c. 6); this made French the official language of Quebec (see Oakes and Warren, 2007: 85). The French language took a more defined, political shape in Quebec with the election of the Parti Québécois government in 1976 (Conrick and Regan, 2007: 30). Notably, this government's first bill in 1977, Bill 1, was the Charter of the French Language. In the Charter, French was declared "the official language of Quebec" and was made the "common public language" in numerous domains, including the legislature and courts of Quebec, public administration, the government and its ministries, the workplace, commerce and business, and education (see Oakes and Warren, 2007: 86-88).

It was the Parti Québécois, who passed the Charter of the French language, who spearheaded two referenda on Quebec sovereignty (1980 and 1995). Although Quebec separatism had been a relatively peripheral part of Quebec nationalism in the 1960s (McRoberts, 1997: 36), by 1995 it was a force to be reckoned with. The second referendum had been provoked by the constitutional crises of the 1980s and 1990s, when the federal government failed to accommodate Quebec's demands within the Constitution Act (1982) and the failed constitutional amendment packages (see McRoberts, 1997; Weaver, 1992: 25); it was defeated only by a very narrow margin (50.6% vs. 49.4%) (Conrick and Regan, 2007: 30-1). Although the question of sovereignty is closely linked to Quebec nationalism, the two are not necessarily synonymous (Taylor, 1993: 4; see also Béland and Lecours, 2006: 87; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 4, 34). Allegiance to the Quebec nation is not necessarily tied to separatism, nor is it incommensurable with Canadian federalism. Moreover, support for Quebec sovereignty has dwindled over the past decade: the separatist federal Bloc Québécois party lost its official party status during the 2011 general election by losing 44 of its 47 seats, including that of its then-leader, Gilles Duceppe. Also, a November 2012 poll by Angus Reid found that only a third of Quebecers would vote for sovereignty, despite the election of the (sovereigntist) Parti Québécois in September 2012. In sum, while sovereignty has played a part in Quebec nationalism, the central tenet of Quebec nationalism is not independence, but rather the preservation and promotion of the French-speaking nation.

Throughout the decades, Quebec has transformed its relations not only within its territorial boundaries, but also with Canada and internationally within, for example, the *Organisation internationale de la Francophonie* (OIF). The OIF is a supranational organisation, network, and discursive and social interactional arena for countries with French-speaking populations (Heller, 1999c: 340; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 84). Thus, while Quebec may not have a representative at the United Nations, it does have its own representative at the OIF, alongside representatives from the Canadian federal government and the province of New Brunswick (see Oakes and Warren, 2007: 76). As can be seen, Quebec's role in both domestic and international forums has changed from being a province of marginalised French speakers under English authority to an autonomous territory with a clearly defined national identity.

Notably, civic Quebec nationalism did not only emerge from ethnic French Canadian nationalism; it also emerged in "opposition" (in Williams' [1977] terms) to the English-speaking dominance that dated from the British conquest of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. As discussed in Section 1.2, the dominance of English speakers notably included a monopoly over the Canadian economy, including the economy of Quebec, where the majority of the population was French-speaking (C. Bouchard, 2002: 72-76). Oakes and Warren (2007: 9) note that, "in 1961, French Canadians were at the bottom of the salary scale of 14 ethnic groups, just above Italians and Aboriginal peoples". Quebec nationalism, then, was also an emancipation movement for French speakers to gain control over the territory in which they formed the majority. Quebec national identity was also constructed in opposition to French national identity, which had for so long figured as a historical point of reference for legitimacy and prestige (Paquot, 1997: 87). In other words, the history of Quebec, and in particular the history of French and British colonialism, had important effects on the Quebec nationalist movement (Bouthillier, 1997; Breton, 1988; Fraser, 2006: 15, 82). History remains an important component of Quebec identity, comprising part of its motto (*Je me souviens*/ "I remember"), and celebrated in the form of the historic French Canadian holiday, St-Jean Baptiste Day (June 24), which is now also Quebec's national holiday.

In sum, then, the Quebec discourse of national identity is part of a civic Quebec nationalist movement. The rejection of French Canadian national identity meant moving

away from religion and ethnicity and towards the French language as a defining national feature. Since the French language is a cornerstone of Quebec nationalism, in the following sections, ideologies about the French language will be explored. These ideologies do not reflect or explain the reality of French in Canada, but rather function to legitimise and naturalise the status and role of French with regard to Quebec national identity. Of course not every individual who identifies with Quebec national identity will rely on these ideologies, nor will all ideologies necessarily be present in any singular example of Quebec's discourse of national identity. Instead, these are some of the ideologies explored in previous research that play a role in supporting discourses of Quebec national identity.

### **3.2.1 Monolingual ideologies**

The French language plays a pivotal role in Quebec nationalism to the extent that French is the only official common public language of Quebec: this status underlies the ideology of monolingualism. In Quebec, the French language has a clear predominance in public life such that the *visage linguistique* ("linguistic face") of Quebec is French (see e.g. Behiels and Hayday, 2011: 7). This is argued (e.g. by Dufour, 2008: 35; Lisée, 2007: 12) to be the right of the Quebec majority – not to ban, block, or discriminate against other languages; but rather to assert French as the predominant language of public life.

Monolingual ideologies do not mean that French should be used or promoted at the expense of other languages, nor is it argued that all non-francophones should use French in their personal and private life (Lisée, 2007: 39-40). French predominance means that public spaces in Quebec should be as French-speaking as public spaces are English-speaking in, for example, New York City (Lisée, 2007: 49). Just as New York is home to numerous linguistic communities, so too is Quebec; however, in both cases a single language tends to predominate over all others. Oakes and Warren (2007: 88) note that Quebec's Charter of the French Language "is concerned with public communications only; at no time does it try to enforce the use of French in the private sphere". Still, the enforcement of French predominance has met with resistance and has often been argued to be discriminatory against non-francophones. In particular, English speakers have argued that their language is treated unjustly through Quebec's language policies, and



accordingly many left the province in the 1970s (see Bourhis *et al.*, 2007a: 197; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 167; Pettinicchio, 2012). However, the English language is in fact argued to be an important constitutive part of Quebec: it is not only a language that has been spoken in Quebec for centuries, it is also the predominant language of Canada and North America, and it is the language of globalisation (Dufour, 2008: 58; Lisée, 2007). In addition, and perhaps most crucially, due to the history of French Canada, the English language also arguably forms part of francophone identity (Dufour, 2008: 18; see also Lisée, 2007: 39). Nevertheless, in practice, the English language is still sometimes the subject of socially-accepted discrimination in Quebec (see Oakes and Warren, 2007: 160-1).<sup>3</sup> This is perhaps because the English language – due to its historical role both in Quebec and in Canada more broadly – continues to pose complex problems for the Quebec nation (see Section 3.2.4). Taylor (1993: 33) notes that a good part of the drive for monolingualism in Quebec is powered by the fear of assimilation into the English-speaking country. Accordingly, the French language will only acquire a truly predominant status in Quebec if monolingual French-speaking contexts evolve in which the English language – and other languages, too – are unnecessary.

Because of the misunderstandings about its language policies, it became necessary for Quebec officials to change the census metrics used to establish language vitality in the province. From the more traditional categories such as *langue maternelle* (mother tongue) and *langue d'usage* (the language spoken at home) emerged the new category of *langue d'usage public* (“common public usage”) (Oakes and Warren, 2007: 89). This new category is popular in official circles because it distances itself from assimilationist connotations and is therefore more aligned with Quebec’s civic nationalism approach (Oakes and Warren, 2007: 90). Indeed, some civic nationalists (e.g. Dufour, 2008: 51) argue that the previous *langue d'usage* metric had not even been a true measure of French spoken in Quebec: since the process of *francisation* tends to include a period during which immigrants continue to speak their mother tongue in the home context, the *langue d'usage* metric does not reflect the extent to which Quebec – and its people – are becoming increasingly French-speaking.

---

<sup>3</sup> Linguistic discrimination in Quebec is perhaps not dissimilar to linguistic discrimination elsewhere in Canada (see Bourhis *et al.*, 2007b).

However, others contend that language vitality depends on the intergenerational transmission of language in the family context, which is perhaps contingent on the language being spoken at home (see Castonguay, e.g. 1979, Landry, 2011: 56; see also discussions in Corbeil, 2011: 33-7; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 90). Anctil (2007: 201), for example, notes that according to the 2001 census, knowledge of French in immigrant communities in Quebec had increased significantly over the past four decades. He notes that whereas only 10% of allophone students in Montreal had attended French language schools in 1971-1972, by 2000-2001, that number had reached 78% of all allophone students. He also notes that between 1996 and 2001, the use of French at home fell from 83.1% to 82.8% across Quebec; however, the proportion of allophones using French at home rose from 16.1% to 20.1%. Thus, although the language spoken at home is no longer the metric used to establish language vitality in Quebec, it does have its uses for this very purpose.

Regardless of the metric used, the objective of establishing the status of the French language in Quebec is central to ensuring its place as the common public language of the nation. However, the civic design of this nation is also one reason why French is rarely referred to as the “national language”: referring to French as the *langue nationale* could be seen as tantamount to recognising that the language of the ethnic majority is favoured over languages of the ethnic minorities (Oakes and Warren, 2007: 103). In order to make French the predominant language for all ethnic groups, the challenge is to convince young Quebecers, who are increasingly bilingual if not trilingual, to adopt French as the predominant language in their linguistic repertoire (Oakes and Warren, 2007: 148).

The predominance of French in Quebec is crucially linked to the rejection of societal bilingualism. The rejection of bilingualism arguably emerged due to disingenuous role played by the leaders of French Canadian nationalism, who were largely bilingual and who straddled membership in both English and French Canada in order to function within the English-speaking regime (Heller, 1995: 378, 2003c: 24). It was through their bilingualism – speaking English with the English leaders and French with the community members – that French Canadian leaders were able to negotiate the terms through which they would continue to have power over the predominantly monolingual

French Canadians. In French Canadian nationalism, English was perceived to be a valuable language, and bilingualism too was valuable because it allowed French Canadians to function within the English-dominant environment. In the subsequent Quebec nationalist movement, French speakers were provided an alternative to English dominance, and part of this alternative was a territorially-defined context in which French was valued above other languages. By refusing to work within the system of English dominance, it was possible to create a monolingual French-speaking environment where English was unnecessary. Wiley (2000: 67) explains that a central tenet of monolingual ideologies is that languages are in competition and only one language can prosper. Such is the case in Quebec, where despite more recent positive evaluations of the English language (see above), the integrity of the French language is seen to be under threat due to the encroachments of English.

In sum, monolingual ideologies naturalise the status of French as the predominant language in Quebec. In turn, the singular nature of the French language in Quebec serves to legitimise the Quebec's status as a unique nation within Canada. Ideologies of French monolingualism thus enable Quebec to function as French-speaking nation in an inherently natural way (Heller, 2003c: 22).

### **3.2.2 Ideologies of French as a core value**

The French language also plays a central role in Quebec nationalism by serving as a core value of Quebec national identity. As Smolicz (1999: 105) explains:

Core values can be regarded as forming one of the most fundamental components of a group's culture. They generally represent the heartland of the ideological system and act as identifying values which are symbolic of the group and its membership. Rejection of core values carries with it the threat of exclusion from the group. Indeed, the deviant individual may himself feel unable to continue as a member. Core values are singled out for special attention because they provide the indispensable link between the group's cultural and social systems.

Quebec is not alone in adopting language as a defining identity feature or “core value”. Indeed, literature on this area (see e.g. Bucholtz and Hall, 2004; Edwards, 2009; Le Page and Tabouret-Keller, 1985) indicates that the concepts of “language” and “identity” are inextricable, and especially in nationalism contexts.

There is an important distinction to be made between the ideology of monolingualism and the ideology of language as a core value. In the ideology of monolingualism, language is considered in instrumental terms to be primarily a means of communication. In other words, the official status of the French language is asserted to create contexts in which no language but French is required, thus reinforcing the integrity of the language and maintaining the status quo of a majority group whose first language is French. In contrast, the ideology of language as a core value does not rely on understandings that only one language should be spoken for survival or state reasons, but rather for identity reasons. In other words, language is not considered only a means of communication, but also as a symbol of the nation with integrative value.

The French language has been a core value in French speakers’ identity since before Quebec was conceived as a nation. Indeed, Quebec nationalism arguably appropriated the French language, which had been a symbol of French Canadian nationalism, into the Quebec national movement. Since Quebec nationalism dropped other pillars of French Canadian nationalism such as religion and ethnicity (see Section 3.1), the French language became the most important, if not singular, defining feature of the nation (Boudreau and Dubois, 2007: 209). The leaders of the Quebec nationalist movement, Jean Lesage and René Lévesque, both contended that language was central to Quebec identity. During the height of the Quiet Revolution in 1968, René Lévesque declared: “Being ourselves is essentially maintaining and developing a personality that has existed for three and a half centuries. At the heart of this personality is the fact that we speak French. Everything else is linked to this essential element” (Lévesque, 1968 [1997]). Jean Lesage, too, declared: “Of all the languages currently spoken in the world [...] the French language is the one that fits us best because of our own characteristics and mentality” (cited in Stark, 1992: 133). Still today, Gérard Bouchard (1997: 120) argues that French is “vested with all the French Canadian cultural heritage”, and has become the benchmark of the status and vitality of French speakers in Canada

(Beauchemin, 2006; C. Bouchard, 2002: 8). French is therefore not only a symbol of the Quebec nation, but speaking French is a symbol of identification with that nation.

Part of the adoption of French as a core value of the Quebec nation involved the differentiation of the variety of French spoken in Quebec from the other language varieties that are spoken internationally. Because of the uniqueness of the Quebec variety of French, it was once considered a low form of the language and was pejoratively labelled “joyal” (a distortion of the word *cheval*, meaning “horse”). *Joyal*, in fact, refers to a register used only by the lower, urban classes, and not to the language variety spoken by the majority of Quebecers (Oakes and Warren, 2007: 111-2). Nevertheless, this confusion inspired artists and writers to reclaim the register by using it in their works during the Quiet Revolution. Often, *joyal* was used as a symbol of Quebec identity, and its distinctiveness served to distinguish Quebecers both from English speakers in Canada and from the French from France (C. Bouchard, 2002: 137-145). Simon (1992: 170) explains:

For the purists adopting Parisian written French as their model, *joyal* was an impure and degraded form of speech, its pronunciation vulgar, its grammar incorrect, its rampant anglicisms an affront. For those who were articulating a philosophy of cultural anticolonialism in Quebec, *joyal* was to become a kind of perverse badge of honour which was to flaunt Quebec’s alienation.

In other words, through the reappropriation and re-valuation of this once-stigmatised variety was the reappropriation and re-valuation of Quebec identity.

Although *joyal* played an important role in the reclaiming of Quebec identity during the Quiet Revolution, it is in reality not the variety of French spoken by most Quebecers, especially in present-day Quebec. Indeed, Oakes and Warren (2007: 122) explain that *joyal* is now an anachronistic concept, and contemporary linguists prefer the more neutral *français populaire* to refer to the informal register of French spoken in Quebec. Although the reclaiming of *joyal* was important for Quebec identity, it was in fact the reclaiming and re-evaluation of Quebec French that served to establish language as a

core value of the Quebec nation (see Section 3.2.3). Rather than *joual*, the language variety that has come to symbolise Quebec national identity is this standardised variety of Quebec French. This variety serves as a core value in Quebec national identity because it has been invested with the positive symbolism of the Quebec nation (C. Bouchard, 2012: 2; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 26-33). Thus, Quebec nationalism involved a move towards linguistic autonomy (or “decolonisation”, see Simon, 1992: 170) in which legitimacy was sought for the Canadian French variety through language standardisation (see C. Bouchard, 2002: 233; Lockerbie, 2005: 18-9; Meney, 2010: 474; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 117).

### **3.2.3 Ideologies of standardised French**

While French is a core value of the Quebec nation, its role as a core value relies on its legitimacy in society, which to a large degree depends on its standardisation. In other words, it is in part because Quebec French has been standardised, and thus legitimised, that it has been adopted as a core value of national identity. While the “ideology of the standard” posits that speakers must adhere to the standard language, the integrity of which must be maintained (Milroy, 2001: 530), ideologies of standardised French refer to metalinguistic comments about the quality or correctness of language use. In Quebec, a lengthy history of language debates has contributed to present day ideologies of standardised French.

The French language is one of the most standardised languages in the world, and French speakers internationally have developed strong representations of a singular, unified language (Eloy, 1998; Francard, 1998; Kasuya, 2001; Jaffe 1999; Lodge, 1993; Moïse, 2007; Pöll, 2005; Schieffelin and Doucet, 1998). These representations emerged because of the role the French language played in the unification of France in the aftermath of the French Revolution (see Lodge, 1993: 216; Weber, 1976: 67-94). From that time, the French language came to be seen as a central, unifying characteristic of the French nation, essentialising even today what it supposedly means to be “French” (see e.g. Oakes, 2001). An important myth associated with French is that there is a “centre”, that is, a standard or a norm, which derives from the territory of the French state. Around this centre circulate various regional and international French “peripheral” varieties (C. Bouchard, 2002: 137-145; 244-5; Lüdi, 1992; Eloy, 1998; Lodge, 1993;

Oakes and Warren, 2007: 112). Boudreau and Dubois (2007: 105) explain that numerous studies have shown that a French “standard” is not a reality; rather, it forms part of the linguistic imagination of francophones all over the world:

Because standard French is regarded as prestigious, those who speak vernacular varieties most often accept the symbolic dominance of ‘legitimate speakers’ since they too aspire to acquire ‘an imagined standard language’ in order to have access to the economic and social capital associated with standard languages and to a wider range of linguistic markets.

Because of beliefs about a singular, standard variety of French, Lodge (1993: 235-6) contends that many people are convinced that linguistic uniformity is the ideal whereas heterogeneity only impedes communication. Varieties of French and non-standard French, then, tend to be negatively evaluated, and the belief in the centrality of the French language legitimises the linguistic and cultural assimilation of regional and local languages and identities (Jaffe, 2007b: 58).

Beliefs about a standard language centred in France were transported to the “new world” throughout centuries of trade and immigration. There, they impacted on society to the extent that Canadian French speakers developed linguistic insecurities about their local language variety (for overviews, see Boudreau and Dubois, 2007: 105; C. Bouchard, 2002: 135; 2012). Nevertheless, associations such as the *Société du parler français du Canada*, founded in 1902, worked to raise the profile of Canadian French through the foundation of the first linguistic journal in French Canada (*Bulletin du parler français au Canada*, which later became *Le Canada français*), the organisation of two *Congrès de la langue française au Canada* (in 1912 and 1937), and the publication of a glossary of Canadian French (*Glossaire du parler français au Canada*) (see C. Bouchard, 2002: 115-150; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 110-111). Efforts such as these contributed to the redefinition of the Canadian variety of French.

A wealth of research entered into the standardisation debate, and two camps were formed with respect to the kind of French that should be promoted in Quebec. While one group (the “conservatives”) advocated the benchmark of quality French as that from

France, the other group (the “*aménagistes*”) argued that French in North America had distinctive features which should be given an important place within any definition of the linguistic norm (see Lockerbie, 2005: 16-7). A broad consensus was formed that ‘*le français standard d’ici*’ (“standard French from here”) was preferable to a standard of French from Europe (see C. Bouchard, 2002: 245; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 106-126). While in its written form, this standard approximates that of French from France, the standard oral model of Quebec French is widely seen as that of Radio-Canada, the French-language branch of the federal broadcaster (see Oakes and Warren, 2007: 119). The standard for written French is now embodied by a new Quebec French dictionary, *FRANQUS*. Although this dictionary has faced criticisms from purists who argue that the legitimisation of the Quebec variety of French will lead to “linguistic ghettoisation” (see discussion in Oakes and Warren, 2007: 124-5), Quebec’s Conseil de la langue française confirmed the need to describe the usages of Quebec French and its place within *la francophonie*. They also explain how such a dictionary will increase the linguistic security of Quebecers (see Section 3.2.2) and legitimise the language variety in the eyes of foreigners and immigrants, who are perhaps unfamiliar with the Quebec variety (cited in Oakes and Warren, 2007: 123). Armed with a standard language, then, it would seem that Quebec is better equipped to self-represent as a nation among other nations with singular, defined languages and corresponding national identities.

### **3.2.4 Ideologies of language endangerment**

The history of the French language in Quebec is thus interwoven with concerns over its status in comparison with both the so-called “international standard” in France and its international competitor – the English language. Because the French language has such an important role in Quebec national identity, concerns over its status are often rife. “Ideologies of endangerment” refers to the ways in which concerns over the future or status of a language are embedded in discussions of other (and perhaps unrelated) topics (Heller and Duchêne, 2007: 4). Ideologies of endangerment have an important function within discussions of Quebec national identity.

There are five main interrelated factors that have affected – and in some cases continue to affect – the status of French in Canada (see Boberg, 2010: 6; Bourhis *et al.* 2007a: 190). First, increased immigration across Canada in the 20<sup>th</sup> century has resulted in the



reduced proportion of francophones as part of the Canadian population; this continues to produce concerns regarding the demographic decline of French speakers and their numerical power. For example, Quebec's population of 7.9 million, while still a substantial proportion of the overall Canadian population of 33.5 million, is dwarfed by the population of Ontario (12.85 million) and population growth in Western Canada (see Statistics Canada, 2011). Second, the declining birth rate of francophones in Quebec has compounded demographic concerns (although the birth rate in Quebec appears to have stabilised in more recent years, see Statistics Canada, 2011). Third, immigrant families tended to send their children to English-medium schools until the Charter of the French Language restricted access to non-French education (Oakes and Warren, 2007: 87-92). However, there continue to be concerns over the extent to which immigrant families speak French at home (Anctil, 2007: 201; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 89-91; cf. Lisée, 2007: 39). Fourth, the dominant position of English causes concern over the role that French will be able to play in national and international contexts. Finally, Montreal, the largest city in Quebec, has an important symbolic role in maintaining the image of a French-speaking nation. With increasing numbers of francophones leaving the island of Montreal for the suburbs, the city is progressively multilingual rather than French-speaking, which is a constant source of insecurity for Quebec (see *inter alia* Corbeil, 2011: 43-7; Haque, 2012: 47; Jedwab, 2011; Levine, 1997; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 134-5; Séguin, 2012).

Although concerns over French language endangerment were well-founded in the mid-twentieth century when language attrition rates were alarmingly high (see e.g. Innis, 1973: 31), today, there is no consensus on the status of French in Quebec and no clear picture of its future (see, *inter alia*, Anctil, 2007; Bourhis *et al.*, 2007a: 192; Cardinal, 2004, 2005, 2008; Castonguay, 1999, 2002a, b; Oakes, 2005: 164; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 78). Thus, although it is unclear whether French is in fact endangered, it is clear that understandings of endangerment and the need to protect the French language underlie many discussions of Quebec national identity. Allusions to French language endangerment take shape through discussions of the role of the English language in Quebec, English-French bilingualism, and concerns over immigrant fluency in French.

Since English has for so long been the language of power and dominance, it has a particularly salient role in discussions of French language endangerment. English is argued to be the primary threat to the French language and it is sometimes evoked as a “sea” that threatens to overwhelm the French-speaking “island” of Quebec (for examples of this flood metaphor, see e.g. Jensen, 2000: 116; Létourneau, 2002: 85; Stark, 1992: 139). English is also seen by many as a symbol of oppression, since it is the language of the British under whom the original French inhabitants struggled for several centuries. For some, even anglicisms are considered a symbol of oppression and a symbol of how English continues to infiltrate even the micro levels of a French-speaking society (see discussions in Heller, 1999a: 160; Meney, 2010: 86; Paquot, 1997: 85). Chantal Bouchard (2002: 175) notes that particular vocabulary has been used to personify the French language in Quebec and contribute to understandings of its endangerment. Often, she notes, anglicisms are depicted as the “enemy” (*ennemi*) that “invades” (*envahit*) the French language, and French must be “fought for” (*lutter*) and “defended” (*organiser la défense*).

English continues to play a complex role in the lives of many French speakers in Quebec. While the French language has integrative value, the English language has instrumental value for many Quebecers, especially youths, who recognise the importance of language skills in the globalising economy (see e.g. Oakes, 2010). Although English is valued, few Quebecers would wish to abandon the French language. Thus, they are obliged to become bilingual, which yet another contentious issue. Many French speakers view bilingualism as a threat to the integrity of French because it is seen as social diglossia (Dufour, 2008: 16; Heller, 1999a: 160). While bilingualism refers to two languages functioning within a singular society, diglossia implies a hierarchisation of and value attribution to two coexisting languages – one is judged superior, the other inferior. English-French bilingualism is often seen as a precursor to English monolingualism, since English has more instrumental value (Fraser, 2006: 14, 67). Concerns about bilingualism are not unfounded, since bilingualism is historically linked to assimilation into the anglophone community (C. Bouchard, 2002: 237). There is also the issue of societal bilingualism, which has been rejected as part of Quebec’s move for the predominance of French across the nation (see

Section 3.2.1), but which nonetheless continues to pose a threat to the integrity of French predominance (see Dufour, 2008).

Bilingualism is also linked to the final issue of immigrant fluency. Historically, because of the instrumental value of English, immigrants tended to integrate into the English-speaking community in Quebec. Although the Charter of the French language has led most immigrants to use French as the common public language (Oakes and Warren, 2007: 87-8), and although Quebec has largely had jurisdiction over its own immigration since 1991 (McRoberts, 1997: 152-3; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 133-4), many minority groups in Quebec today are multilingual, using not only French, but also continuing to use their first language as well as the English language. Since immigration is supposed to buoy the proportion of French speakers in the face of other languages like English, the persistence of multilingualism is sometimes seen to be endangering the French language (e.g. Ghosh, 2004: 557-562; McAndrew, 2003, 2010: 46; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 140-8).

In conclusion, then, the ideology of language endangerment may support the Quebec discourse of national identity because it presumes the necessity of the French language within Quebec society. Concerns over English, bilingualism, and immigrant fluency in French are just some of the ways in which concerns over the status and future of the French language become manifest. Ultimately, ideologies of endangerment pertain to French speakers' concerns regarding the future of Quebec as a French-speaking nation.

### **3.2.5 Conclusion**

To conclude this section, four principal language ideologies that contribute to discourses of Quebec national identity have been overviewed. First, monolingual ideologies support Quebec nationalism in that they naturalise the role of French as the sole official language and the predominant language of Quebec society. Second, ideologies of French as a core value pertain to understandings of the integrative value of and symbolic role played by French in Quebec. Third, ideologies of standardised French support the legitimacy of Quebec's position as a unique nation with a unique and increasingly recognised language variety. Finally, ideologies of language endangerment naturalise the role of French in the nation by embedding it within larger discussions

concerning the future and status of the language within the context of English domination and the contingency of immigrant adoption of the language.

### **3.3 DISCOURSES OF NATIONAL IDENTITY IN ENGLISH CANADA**

The history of English Canadian nationalism is perhaps more difficult to study than that of Quebec nationalism because it is much less explicit. English Canadian nationalism began as a result of the British conquest of North America. According to Resnick (2005: 24-5), early British settlers of Canada identified with the “Greater British cause” – an imperial expansionist movement combined with a belief in “English” values and an element of racial superiority. This alignment with Britishness, Resnick argues, lingered into the 1960s. However, after World War II, a distinctly Canadian identity began to emerge (Igartua, 2006; Martel, 1998: 19; Resnick, 1994: 56; Weber, 1994). This was the result of the major role Canada played in the War, and the status it achieved independently of the United Kingdom. This status brought along with it self-consciousness. Vipond (2008: 332), for example, notes that fears over Canadian unity and stability emerged as early as the 1930s. Although Resnick (1977: 18) argues that the “new liberal internationalism” of the post-World War II period meant that there was little patience with issues of nationalism, the period of self-consciousness in the 1930s suggests a concern over a perceived Canadian identity, and perhaps the beginnings of English Canadian nationalism (Igartua, 2006: 4).

One reason why English Canadians became self-conscious about their identity was because of the rising status of the United States and Quebec; both have clearly defined national identities against which Canada is obligated to distinguish itself (Ignatieff, 1994: 115-117, 2009: 12; Resnick, 2005: 19; Saul, 1998: 129; Taylor, 1993: 23, 31; Webber, 1994: 210). Numerous scholars (e.g. Widdis, 1997: 57; Winter, 2007) have noted that being “non-French” and “non-American” have been the principal characteristics identifying English Canadians. Quebec’s national movement had rather direct effects on English Canada, with an exodus of English speakers following Quebec’s language policies resulting in the “increasing polarization of Canada’s official language communities in separate parts of the country” (Boberg, 2010: 11). It was perhaps only when faced with Quebec nationalism that English-speaking Canadians recognised some of the elements that united them as a national group in ways similar –

and dissimilar – to the Quebec nation. Igartua (2006), in fact, argues that English Canada underwent social, political and economic transformations similar to Quebec's Quiet Revolution, and with a similar magnitude of social change (see also Rea, 2006: 77). Similarly, Resnick (1994: 58) notes:

The 1960s [...] marked the birth of a peculiarly English-Canadian sensibility. A sensibility that was certainly not British, but no less decidedly not American; one that was perfectly at home with its language and its status as one of the English-speaking communities of the world; one that looked to its own history, geography, and development as a society for the hallmarks of its identity; one, finally, that much like Quebec nationalism, was dependent on a good deal of state support to help get it off the ground.

In both English Canada and Quebec, then, similar ideological arguments were being made to legitimise oppositional forms of nationalism.

As we can see, then, just as Quebec nationalism emerged from the vestiges of French Canadian nationalism, so too English Canadian nationalism emerged from the remnants of British nationalism via colonialism. However, Igartua (2006) and Hayday (2010) argue that English Canadians progressively turned away from their previous British-centric identity models and became increasingly united by common features: language, territory, regional diversity, a shared value system, and a shared self-image of Canada's place in the international community (Resnick, 1994: 25).

With regard to the first feature, it should be highlighted that, from the beginning, English Canadian nationalism was focused on the English language (i.e. the dominant language of the United Kingdom and the language of the British Empire) (Igartua, 2006: 4). Although English Canadian nationalism began as a largely ethnocentric project for Canadians of British heritage who spoke British English, the influx of non-English-speaking and non-white immigrants forced the British colonialists to adapt their discourse to (at least nominally) include all those who chose to align with Canada, regardless of their ethnicity and culture (Boberg, 2010: 41; Breton, 1988; Igartua, 2006:

1; Resnick, 1995: 84). Following Resnick's (1994: 73) use of the term "English Canadian", then, the label does not imply that the culture is solely English-derived or based or that ethnic communities are excluded; rather, it means:

immigrants and ethnic communities living in English Canada understand that their languages can never aspire to the status of an official language. And it further means that they accept to be part of an evolving society in which a culture based on English has been the prevailing one.

With regard to the second factor (territory), Resnick (1994: 27) explains that, in Canada, "geography [has] served as a substitute for history". Canada's vast territory is arguably fixed in the English Canadian imagination, instilled through images of the Arctic and other regions which most Canadians will never visit, since they live within a few hours' drive of the United States (see Igartua, 2006: 4). This discussion of territory in fact relates to the third factor, regional diversity.

Regional diversity is as much a divisive as a constitutive element of the English Canadian nation (Resnick, 1994: 28, 80; Widdis, 1997). Importantly, what has helped to unite the disparate regions of Canadian geography is the English language (Charland, 1986: 199). Indeed, although English Canadian nationalism is often inexplicit, Resnick (1995: 85) posits that English speakers tend to align with regional labels that index linguistic identities. In other words, because of the "coincidence" that has led to linguistic communities and regions aligning (see Webber, 1994: 210), rather than self-identifying as "English Canadian", individuals tend to refer to themselves as "Ontarian" or "British Columbian". Since all provinces except Quebec are English-dominant, it follows that most regional identity labels imply a dominant linguistic identity. Importantly, however, regionalism means that English Canadian nationalism is arguably more prominent in some areas than in others (see Resnick, 1977: 24). Nurse (2003), for example, notes that many Western Canadians think that Quebec separatism is a good idea, and Vipond (1996: 190) highlights that Western Canada historically opposed bilingualism policies in Canada. However, Resnick (1994: 80-3) notes that regional differences are not fixed, due to Canadians' mobility and a constant flow of

immigration within the country. According to Charland (1986), the obstacles inherent in Canadian regionalism were largely curtailed by the construction of the national railroad and the development of a national broadcaster. The railroad, Charland (1986: 201) argues, helped to bind the geographical space of Canada into a singular unit; the national broadcaster served to unite the collective Canadian imagination both culturally and ideologically. Still today, it is argued that the media continue to play a crucial role in the reproduction of the English Canadian nation (see e.g. Hayday, 2009; Igartua, 2006: 6; Raboy, 1991; Vipond, 2008).

Notably, there is no singular element that is uniquely English Canadian. Even Resnick (1977, 1994: 53) concedes that English Canadians do not share common origins, history or culture; the provinces and territories are heterogeneous in character; and national symbols tend to be pan-Canadian, which of course includes Quebec, which is not English-speaking (see also e.g. Fraser, 2006: 56). Accordingly, many commentators (e.g. Adams, 2008: 192; see discussion in Fraser, 2006: 56) have argued that the English Canadian nation does not exist, or that it is simply a political construction. Charland (1986: 198) in fact argues that English Canada is the “absent nation” because, apart from a shared language, little else holds it together. Indeed, English Canadians are reluctant to describe themselves as a nation (see Igartua, 2006: 1; Resnick, 1977: 15; 1995: 44, 81). Kymlicka (1998: 155) explains that English Canadians have “little or no sense of group identity” and the idea that English-speaking Canadians constitute a nation “has virtually no popular resonance”. One reason for this is perhaps that there is little need for English Canadians to distinguish between allegiance to their linguistic community and allegiance to the pan-Canadian community, which is predominantly English-speaking (Webber, 1994: 210-11). Indeed, McRoberts (1997: 38) notes that English Canadian nationalism has throughout history been a predominantly political nationalism focused on the Canadian state. It is thus unsurprising that Kymlicka (1998: 158) remarks that pan-Canadian nationalism has been “de facto a vehicle promoting the interests of English-speaking Canadians”. Thus, the unpopularity of the term “English Canadian” may be simply the result of “Canadian nationalism” having come to mean English Canadian nationalism (see Resnick, 1977, 1995: 82-5; Taylor, 1993: 55). The unpopularity may also be the result of connotations of inauthenticity. Since many minority groups “hyphenate” their identity labels (“French Canadian”, “Italian

Canadian”, and so on), many English Canadians see themselves as “authentic” Canadians (“authentic” Canada being English-speaking), and have no reason to further define themselves as “English-speaking” (cf. McRoberts, 1997: 267). Resnick (1995: 85) explains that “a majority of English Canadians think of themselves as Canadians – period”. Like labels for individual identity, the terms “English Canada” and “nation” are also contentious. Instead, English Canada is often referred to as the “rest of Canada”, “Canada outside Quebec”, and even simply “Canada” (Kymlicka, 1998: 10; Resnick, 1995: 85; Taylor, 1993: 102).

Although English Canadian nationalism is not as explicit, nor as clearly defined, as its Quebec counterpart, language ideologies function in ways similar to the language ideologies in support of Quebec nationalism. Heller (2003c: 24) notes that many Canadians see English monolingualism as the privileged path to national unity, wherein English is a neutral unifying language and an asset in the national and international globalising communities. Thus, the language ideologies that support English Canadian nationalism parallel to some extent the language ideologies that support Quebec nationalism. While Quebec nationalism is supported by explicit monolingual ideologies, English Canadian nationalism is supported by unmarked monolingual ideologies. While Quebec nationalism relies on ideologies of standardised French, so too English Canadian nationalism relies on ideologies of standardised Canadian English. Finally, while concerns over international English continue to impact on ideologies of French endangerment, ideologies of instrumental English – that is, English as an international commodity and asset – support English Canadian nationalism.

### **3.3.1 Unmarked monolingual ideologies**

Monolingual ideologies in English Canada are similar to those in Quebec, except that, for the most part, these ideologies tend to be consistently unmarked. These ideologies presuppose that the Canadian norm should be English monolingual contexts because English is understood to be the language of the Canadian state. Nevertheless, it is more difficult to pinpoint the presence of these ideologies; they are naturalised to the extent that they rarely surface in English-medium Canadian discourse (see Rea, 2006: 81-4). Indeed, Heller (2003a: 14) notes that the study of language and power in English Canada is more difficult than a study of French Canada, because “one of the hallmarks



of dominant discourses is their ability to erase salient features.” This follows research that has suggested that multilingual societies, especially those where English is spoken, have “monolingualising tendencies” (Heller, 1995: 374; see also Blackledge, 2002a: 69-71; Bucholtz, 2003: 405; Jaspers and Verschueren, 2011: 1157). In this case, English Canada has become monolingual to the extent that a large number of English Canadians are either oblivious to the fact that language plays any role in their national lives, or they are uninterested in their language altogether.

As far back as 1955, Matthew Henry Scargill, who pioneered research on Canadian English, noted English Canadians’ lack of interest in their own language:

Our French Canadian colleagues have a culture and a language of their own and study them. Our many Slavic communities are advanced in the study of their own language in Canada. It is the English-speaking Canadians who lag behind, who do not consider their language worthy of study, who do not seem to know or care if they have a culture and a language to give expression to it (cited in Rea, 2006: 83)

Ten years later, Walter S. Avis, who edited several dictionaries of Canadian English, noted the continuing trend: “[l]anguage in Canada [...] is taken for granted” (cited in Rea, 2006: 84). Although discussions of English in Canada are relatively uncommon, this does not detract from the place of the English language in English Canadian national identity. Rather, the unmarked status of the English language may suggest the extent to which the English language is embedded in this identity. Monolingual ideologies are arguably well-established if English is the only language to have an embedded role in the national identity. In such a case, unmarked monolingual ideologies would only become salient if it were necessary to discuss English in comparison with other languages.

One context in which unmarked language ideologies may become salient is in discussions of immigration. In such contexts, there are often implications or even explicit comments that newcomers should adopt the English language. Vipond (2008:

332) notes that even in the 1930s, English was perceived to be essential to assimilate immigrants. Today, the research of Pacini-Ketchabaw and de Almeida (2006: 317) suggests that Canadian immigration documents and settlement services present English monolingualism as the ideal norm to newcomers to Canada. They explain that English is made dominant in media and government discourses in both explicit and implicit ways, and since language is constructed as synonymous with culture, the importance of learning English is reinforced as crucial for integration into the community (Pacini-Ketchabaw and de Almeida, 2006: 326). Thus, English is constructed as the singular national language of Canada, and not one of two official languages (see Section 3.4).

Finally, although many English-speaking Canadians are largely indifferent about their language, there are (or have been) associations such as Alliance Quebec (1982-2005), Canadians for Language Fairness, Language Fairness for All and the Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada (later renamed Canadians Against Bilingualism Injustice, and later still Canadian Network for Language Awareness). While some of these associations, such as Alliance Quebec, have endeavoured to promote the rights of English speakers, others such as the Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada have led campaigns against bilingualism policies across Canada and campaigns against concessions to Quebec. Indeed, the subheading on the Language Fairness for All website is “English is the first language of Canada”, and the (now renamed) Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada aims to make Canada an exclusively English-speaking country (McRoberts, 1997: 204). In 2006, the group Canadians for Language Fairness sued the City of Ottawa over its bilingualism bylaw, which was argued to be a “form of social engineering” that unfairly favours French speakers (CBC, 2006). The lawsuit was dismissed on the grounds that it did not breach the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (*Canadians for Language Fairness v. Ottawa (City)*, 2006 CanLII 33668 (ON S.C.)). Although these associations are small in membership and low in terms of activism, they suggest the ways in which English language advocacy in Canada may take shape in the form of protest over bilingualism.

In sum, monolingual ideologies are central to English Canadian national identity because they are presupposed and embedded in understandings of the nation. The status

and role of the English language seem to have been consistent in Canada for many decades, and are presented in a naturalised way to newcomers.

### **3.3.2 Ideologies of standardised Canadian English**

Although ideologies of standardised Canadian English resemble ideologies of standardised French in Quebec, because of the different historical evolutions, English Canada has had little need to codify its particular linguistic variety. Nevertheless, the codification of Canadian English has helped to ensure Canada's legitimacy as a nation, especially faced with the United States.

English Canada has traditionally defined itself in contrast to the United States (Ignatieff, 1994: 115-117; Resnick, 2005: 19; Taylor, 1993: 23, 31; Webber, 1994: 210; Widdis, 1997: 57). However, the culture, language, and history of the United States are notably intertwined with that of Canada. The United States undertook most of the groundwork for the establishment of a standard of English distinct from that of the United Kingdom (see e.g. Rea, 2006: 74; Ricento, 2003, 2005). Because the Canadian and American varieties of English are so similar, Canada has suffered from little linguistic insecurity faced with any other variety of English (see e.g. Boberg, 2000, 2010; Owens and Baker, 1984). Historical accounts of Canadian English attribute many of its features to American Loyalists who fled to Canada during the American Revolution (see e.g. Boberg, 2010: 100-101; Orkin, 1971: 49-64). Notably, though, while English is seen as the "patriotic language of authentic Americans" (Ricento, 2005: 353) and "English is coterminous with the [American] nation" (Ricento, 2005: 356-7), there is little evidence to suggest that the same is the case for the English language in Canada. Indeed, while the Webster's dictionary of American English may be seen as the "linguistic counterpart of the Declaration of Independence of the United States" (Lockerbie, 2005: 46), Canadian English dictionaries have only emerged in the past half century. Efforts have taken place in more recent years to establish the standard of English that is unique to Canada, and Canadian English is seen as a means through which Canada can differentiate itself from the United States (Casselman, 2006: xxvi; Fee, 2007: xvi). One of the ways in which this takes shape is by emphasising the British (rather than American) origins of Canadian English (Boberg, 2000: 4). A "narcissism" of even very small differences is sometimes used to distinguish a unique English Canadian national

identity (on this subject, see Resnick, 1994: 53; Conlogue, 2002: 17; Ignatieff, 2009: 12; Saul, 1997: 102).

Boberg (2010: 26) defines Canadian English as “the variety of English spoken by people who acquired their knowledge of English as children exclusively or mostly in Canada”. The standard was only unified in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, and its legitimacy was supported not only by media dissemination, but also by the development of the *Gage Canadian English Dictionary* and the *Canadian Oxford Dictionary* (Boberg, 2010: 40-1, 168, 241; Fee, 2006; Rea, 2006: 24; Tagliamonte, 2006: 312). The compilation of dictionaries was a crucial step in English Canadian national identity because it provided a benchmark for a distinctive national linguistic norm. In the introduction to the 1983 edition, *the Gage Canadian Dictionary* claimed to be a “catalogue of the things relevant to the lives of Canadians”, which provide clues for “the true nature of our Canadian identity” (cited in Rea, 2006: 71). Practices such as standardised spelling and pronunciation, when done to a national standard, serve to exemplify national consciousness (Rea, 2006: 49). Even the leniency or flexibility of the standard can be attributed meaning. In the introduction to the *Oxford Guide to Canadian English Usage*, the editor Margery Fee attributes English Canadian distinctiveness to the “calm acceptance, even in the same sentence, of both American and British [spelling] forms” (cited in Rea, 2006: 51). Significance, then, can be read into the multifarious ways in which language is used, and this significance can be projected onto the nation.

Notably, there is no complete consensus that Canadian English is entirely unique (e.g. Casselman, 2006; Fee, 2007: x; Lilles, 2000; Rea, 2006: 23; Trudgill, 2006: 282). There are three central tenets to the arguments. First, Canadian English is not seen as necessarily unique because the differences between American and Canadian English grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation are “neither many nor large” (Boberg, 2000: 4, 166, 245-7). Second, Canadian English is not seen as unified because it displays variation that correlates with region, speech style and a broad range of social categories (Boberg, 2010: 25; Trudgill, 2006: 278). Finally, many aspects of Canadian English are not unique to Canada, and are in fact consistent with research on varieties of English elsewhere (Tagliamonte, 2006: 326; Trudgill, 2006: 278). Nevertheless, many researchers argue that there are characteristics that distinguish Canadian English from

other varieties (e.g. the mixing of British, American, and Canadian words, pronunciations, and grammatical forms), and moreover, that Canadian English is evolving in unique ways (Boberg, 2010: 250; Fee, 2007: xv). Thus, attributions of uniqueness to the Canadian English variety may be used to distinguish Canadian identity from the identities of other English-speaking countries.

In conclusion, then, ideologies of standardised Canadian English may help to distinguish English Canadian national identity from other national identities, and in particular, American national identity. The codification of Canadian English and its institutionalisation through dictionaries has helped to solidify the national language, and national spelling and pronunciation practices may contribute to the reification of English Canadian national identity.

### **3.3.3 Ideologies of instrumental English**

The last ideology for the present discussion is the ideology of instrumental English. This ideology incorporates understandings of the instrumental value of English as an international language and serves as a rationale for the continued use of English as the national language in Canada. In other words, the ideology frames the role of English in Canada to be not simply the result of British heritage, but also because of the utility of English within the international community.

If a language has “instrumental” value, then it is seen as a tool that enables individuals to achieve specific goals (Ager, 2001: 2-10; Gardner and Lambert, 1959: 267; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 34; 91; cf. Kulyk, 2010: 84 on the “ideology of understanding”). Garvin (1993: 51) cites English-speaking countries as examples of places where the instrumental attachment to language dominates (see also Yavorska, 2010: 167). Seeing languages as functional tools may reduce individuals’ capacity to comprehend other cultures’ integrative attachment to their language (see Ricento, 2005: 355). Thus, ideologies of instrumental English may become manifest through the representation of English in functional terms as a key to accessing resources, and they also become manifest in the derogation of other speakers’ integrative attachment to their language.

According to Taylor (1993: 56), English Canadians tend to share three fundamental “beliefs”: first, language is (only) a medium of communication; second, a medium of communication should be chosen for the greatest efficiency; and third, for these reasons, English should predominate. Thus, globalisation has impacted on language ideologies in English Canada in that English has become the undisputed medium of international communication. Indeed, what Phillipson (1992) calls “linguistic imperialism” has facilitated the lives of many monolingual English speakers in Canada. Linguistic imperialism, Phillipson (1997: 239) explains, is “shorthand for a multitude of activities, ideologies and structural relationships [...] where language interlocks with other dimensions, cultural (particularly in education, science and the media), economic and political”. The crucial aspect of linguistic imperialism is that it functions within asymmetrical and often consciously manipulated power relations. In this case, the English language enables English speakers to dominate; this is invariably to the advantage of English speakers in Canada and reinforces their understanding of the importance of their national language and resistance to other languages (see e.g. Vipond, 2008: 334-5).

Thus, ideologies of instrumental English show that there are limited and unreflective ways in which English Canadian society considers language. Furthermore, these ideologies enable English Canadians to take for granted the status and role of monolingualism in society. Because this national language is also the international language with significant instrumental value as a tool for accessing resources both nationally and internationally, it is primarily understood as an instrument and means for communication.

### **3.3.4 Conclusion**

To conclude this section, three language ideologies can be seen to support English Canadian national identity. Unmarked monolingual ideologies have become engrained in English Canada to the extent that only the English language has the status of being the common medium of communication and most English speakers are unaware of or uninterested in the language that they speak. Ideologies of standardised Canadian English have nonetheless emerged top-down from authorities and have served to distinguish a language that is unique to Canada. Finally, instrumental ideologies draw

on the understanding that languages are tools for communication, and help to justify the reasons why English should be (the only language) spoken in the nation. Each ideology emerged as a result of the history of English Canada. English Canadian national identity emerged from the colonial sentiment of British settlers, but it adapted throughout the centuries to include other diverse groups; it thus became primarily civic in character. In this national identity, the English language has played an important role as a tool enabling all members to communicate in a single common language. This ideological rendition of Canadian history excludes one important group – French speakers, who for many centuries did not coalesce with the diverse English-speaking majority. In the next section, the final discourse of national identity will be presented. In this discourse, both English speakers and French speakers are accounted for within pan-Canadian national identity.

### **3.4 PAN-CANADIAN DISCOURSES OF NATIONAL IDENTITY**

The discourse of bilingual federal Canadian nationalism emerged as recently as the 1980s as a result of former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau's efforts to unite the country both linguistically and culturally. Discourses of pan-Canadian national identity provide an alternative to Quebec national identity and English Canadian identity (McRoberts, 1997: 172). As discussed in Section 1.2, when Quebec nationalism began to spread and gain popularity in the mid-20th century, its effects were not limited to the Quebec territory: it sparked similar self-reflection in terms of English Canadian nationalism, changed the way of life for French speakers outside Quebec, and forced the federal government to re-establish its place in the country.

The central tenets of pan-Canadian nationalism are policies that are intended to facilitate all Canadians' identification with the country. Indeed, Charland (1986: 217) explains that because Canada is a country whose national experience follows its state experience, Canadian identity and culture are rooted in the state itself. Canada thus consists of what A. D. Smith (2001: 17) calls a "state-nation": a polyethnic state which has sought to create a sense of nationhood by using policies to enhance national unity (cf. "multinational federalism", Kymlicka, 1998). Central to the Canadian state-nation are bilingualism and multiculturalism policies (Official Languages Act, R.S.C., 1985, c. 31 (4<sup>th</sup> Supp.); Multiculturalism Act, R.S.C., 1985, c. 24 (4<sup>th</sup> Supp.)). With the

Multiculturalism Act, Canada's official culture became multiculturalism and the original European colonisers (French and English) were no longer given special status as the "two founding nations". The revocation of the "founding nation" status is one of many reasons why many French-speaking Quebecers reject Canada's multiculturalism policy (see McRoberts, 1997: 117). Instead of founding nations, minority groups were also recognised as playing important roles in the historic evolution of the country. Immigrants, too, were encouraged to continue contributing to the development of Canada by celebrating their diverse cultures within the Canadian "mosaic" – which exists in contradistinction to the assimilation inherent to the American "melting pot" (see Haque, 2012: 174-5; Palmer, 1987 [1976]). Although the French and English were not given precedence culturally, they were recognised through language policies that made English and French the official languages of the federal government. These policies enabled French and English speakers to access services from the elected federal government in the language of their choice; allowances were also made for provincial governments to provide minority language education for these groups where numbers warranted (Hayday, 2005).

Although both of these policies were fundamental to the redefinition of Canada, the Official Languages Act came into force in 1969, thus preceding the Multiculturalism Act by nearly twenty years.<sup>4</sup> The objective of this policy was above all to stem the tide of nationalism in Quebec by providing a national alternative. Since Quebec nationalism was premised on French speakers' rights, the federal government strove to show that language rights could be realised through the institutionalisation of French-English equality within the federal system. Within a bilingual Canada, Quebec would no longer have any need to seek its economic, social, and cultural goals within an independent state (Fraser, 2006: 93; Hayday, 2005: 5-6; Trudeau, 1968: 29). Indeed, the idea was to create a federal bilingual Canada – open, liberal, inclusive and progressive – that would be a *better* nation than a French Quebec, which was painted as ethnic, archaic and exclusive (see Cardinal, 2008: 67; Conlogue, 2002: 16; Heller, 1999a: 155; Ignatieff, 2000: 132; Kymlicka, 2004: 832; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 17; Seymour, 1999; Winter, 2007: 495). With the Canadian alternative, it was argued that Quebec would not need to

---

<sup>4</sup> Although Pierre Trudeau announced in 1971 that a multiculturalism policy would come into effect, the Act was not passed until 1988.



become independent in order for francophones to exercise their rights; thus, hostility expressed towards Quebec nationalism is characteristic of federal Canadian nationalism (Hayday, 2010: 300; Heller, 2003a: 16; McRoberts, 1997: 172). Within the model of “from sea to sea bilingualism”, it was posited that all francophones – not simply those in Quebec – would be able to identify with Canada (Vipond, 1996: 180).

Indeed, although the new Canadian model was designed to appeal to all Canadians, the primary beneficiaries of the model proved to be linguistic minorities, and in particular, minority French speakers outside Quebec (Kymlicka, 1995: 157; Webber, 1994: 209). Quebec’s territorial nationalism had excluded French speakers from outside the province; without Quebec, these minority communities were left with no real demographic power in the rest of Canada (Bernard, 1998: 166; Bouthillier, 1997: 117; Charland, 1987; Heller, 1999a: 153-157; Young, 2001: 653). The francophone minority had much to gain from the model of federal bilingual Canada (Trudeau, 1968: 34; Vipond, 2008: 336; Webber, 1994: 207). Notably, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (*Constitution Act, 1982*, s. 33) afforded official language minorities the right to education in their mother tongue. Section 23 of the Charter explains that citizens of Canada who were born and raised (or received their primarily education) in English or French, and their children, are entitled to receive primary and secondary school instruction in that language where the numbers of those entitled warrant. Although these education rights were both for francophones outside Quebec and anglophone minorities in Quebec, it was francophones who benefited the most from these rights. For over a century, French-speaking minorities had struggled to obtain (or in some cases retain) French-medium education, which was seen as fundamental to their cultural survival (see Hayday, 2005; Heller, 1995, 1999b, 2003c).

Indeed, it was French language minorities, in particular, who had much to gain from the federal model of bilingualism. This model had clear parallels with their own experience: although French is an emblem of minority French speakers’ identity (Bernard, 1998: 172; Remysen, 2004: 96), because they are required to live on the border of two cultures, the English language, too, serves an important role (Bernard, 1998: 154). Thus, bilingualism not only enables minority French speakers to function in the English-dominant provinces, it also serves as a hallmark of their identity (Heller, 2003c: 22;

Remysen, 2004: 107). Furthermore, many French speakers outside Quebec are descendants of the original French colonisers of North America and thus tend to subscribe to the belief in the “two founding nations” of Canada; this allows them to conceptualise themselves not as a minority, but on equal footing with English speakers (Martel, 1997: 71). Since the bilingualism policies are based on the recognition of Canada’s “founding peoples”, many minority French speakers naturally align with the pan-Canadian discourse of national identity (Martel, 1997: 33). The alignment with the discourse is particularly salient in Ontario, the hub of French Canada outside Quebec (Budach, Roy and Heller, 2003; Hayday, 2005: 51; Martel, 1997: 165).

While Ontario is one area of the country where the pan-Canadian discourse is particularly strong, the adoption of the discourse has not been uniform across the country. The patchy adoption of this discourse reflects the differences inherent to different parts of the country (Beaty and Sullivan, 2010: 22; Conrick and Regan, 2007: 37; Hillmer and Chapnick, 2007: 10; Nurse, 2003; Saul, 1997: 465; Taylor, 1993: 104). Although the policies of pan-Canadian national identity allow diverse cultures to share a common identity and two common languages (Beaty and Sullivan, 2010: 17; Kymlicka, 1998: 2, 2004: 835; Saul, 1997: 8; Taylor, 1993: 102), diversity itself is dissimilar from coast to coast. Immigration patterns have historically differed across Canada, and these cemented in regional East-West, North-South, and “centre-periphery” divisions (Innis, 1993). Immigration patterns continue to differ as the regular influx of immigrants settle in different parts of this very large country. Notably, French speakers have never comprised large proportions of the population in Western Canada, and the French language is not widely spoken there. Perhaps as a result, bilingualism is unpopular in English-dominant Western Canada, and Western Canadians have been more or less indifferent to Quebec separatism (Hayday, 2005: 52; Nurse, 2003; Vipond, 1996: 190; on resistance to language policies in English-dominant contexts, see Ricento, 2006: 50). In contrast, the anglophone minority of Quebec traditionally aligns and identifies with a federalist vision of Canada, but their alignment is at odds with the francophone concept of nation (Oakes and Warren, 2007: 151, 161). Thus, the discourse of pan-Canadian national identity does not exist in the same form across all regions of Canada, often for historical or cultural reasons (Hayday, 2010: 290; Mackey, 2001: 144-7).

Regionalism is not the only obstacle faced by pan-Canadian nationalism. Many critics (see e.g. Mackey, 1991; McRoberts, 1997; see also discussion in Fraser, 2006: 274-285) argue that Canada is not a nation and that Trudeau's policies have only served to mask the reality of a country that does not share a common history, grand narrative, language, culture – or identity. Adams (2008: 102) notes that if one assesses a nation by traditional markers of nationhood (shared ethnicity, religion, and heritage), then Canada is “all over the historical and socio-cultural map”. Others argue that the idea of Canada as a bilingual country does not take into account its multilingual reality, and neither bilingualism nor multiculturalism policies have been uniformly popular amongst the general population (Adams, 2008: 86; da Silva *et al.*, 2007: 188; Kymlicka, 2004: 835-6; Pacini-Ketchabaw and de Almeida, 2006). Indeed, French-English bilingualism hardly seems to capture the essence of Canada when 20% of Canadians have a non-official language as their mother tongue (Statistics Canada, 2011). Furthermore, official bilingualism reflects only two European languages, which arguably silences the voice of the indigenous people and “perpetuates the myth of Europeans as nation-builders” (da Silva *et al.*, 2007: 204; see also Haque, 2012). Finally, only 17% of Canadians are actually bilingual in English and French, and most of these bilinguals (57%, i.e. 3.3 million people) live in Quebec (Statistics Canada, 2011). By many accounts, then, Canada is “bilingual only in name and in federal officialdom” (Boberg, 2010: 19; see also Heller, 1995: 373).

Another problem with this discourse is the theoretical incommensurability of federalism and nationalism. Ignatieff (1994: 110) notes that federalism is the antithesis of nationalism, since it is a way of conceptualising a polity, not a nation:

Those who believe in federalism hold that different peoples do not need states of their own in order to enjoy self-determination. Peoples who share traditions, geography or common economic space may agree to share a single state, while retaining substantial degrees of self-government over matters essential to their identity as peoples. Federalism is a politics which seeks to reconcile two competing principles: the ethnic principle, according to which people wished to be ruled by their own; with the civic principle, according to which

strangers wish to come together to form a community of equals,  
based not on ethnicity but on citizenship.

Indeed, Pierre Trudeau himself, who implemented multiculturalism and bilingualism policies to unite the country within a renewed federalism, argued that nationalism “cannot provide the answer” since it only has a role to play in “backward societies where the *status quo* is upheld by irrational and brutal forces” (Trudeau, 1968: 202-3; see also McRoberts, 1997: 78-116). Despite the theoretical incommensurability, there is the reality that French and English speakers have shared a common territory and polity more or less peaceably for many centuries (Heller, 1999a: 143). There is also the reality that, as discussed above, many French and English speakers appear to identify with pan-Canadian national identity. National identities are not static or established categories, but discursive constructions produced by social actors (see Section 2.3.1). For our purposes, then, theoretical incommensurability is less meaningful than practical identification on the ground (see also discussion in Oakes and Warren, 2007: 37).

Pan-Canadian national identity has emerged only recently because it continues to be the “Trudeau generation” and its progeny that have adopted the discourse (Hayday, 2005: 7; see also Kymlicka, 2004: 844). The Trudeau generation refers to the generation that grew up with the understanding of Canada as bilingual and multicultural; this understanding was naturalised as part of their relationship with and sense of belonging in Canada. Hayday (2005: 181) argues that the generation of children having grown up with Trudeau’s language policies “are likely to be well-disposed to expanding and continuing a strong official-languages policy for Canada and to building bridges between the two official-languages groups.” The pan-Canadian national discourse was disseminated, to some extent, by the popularisation of Canada’s national holiday. In fact, Hayday (2010: 290) argues that Canada Day “provided the opportunity for the federal government to experiment with a wide variety of different approaches to commemoration, nation-building, and identity formation [and] came to occupy an important role in Ottawa’s symbolic construction of Canadian identity”. Although Canada Day marks the anniversary of the creation of the Dominion of Canada in 1867 and became the Canadian national holiday in 1879, it was not an annual celebration until well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Hayday (2010: 300-4) argues that one of the implicit

goals of celebrating Canada Day has been to combat Quebec separatism. Notably, federal Canada adopted national symbols that were significant to some French Canadians. For example, the Canadian national anthem, *O Canada*, was a French Canadian hymn that was sung at St-Jean Baptiste festivities long before it was unanimously accepted by the House of Commons as Canada's national anthem (Canadian Heritage, 2009; Meney, 2010: 156-7). With more than thirty years since the establishment of Canada's national holiday, national anthem, and official policies to unite the country, pan-Canadian nationalism has become an increasingly commonplace understanding of an unhyphenated "Canadian" identity.

To conclude, pan-Canadian nationalism carries with it specific understandings of the role languages play in the nation. Boudreau and Dubois (2007: 104) posit that bilingual ideologies (what they call the "ideology of bilingualism") rely on understandings of "the social, cultural and economic advantages of being bilingual as an individual and as a country". In this thesis, ideologies of bilingualism will be broken down into three different forms. These include ideologies of bilingualism, ideologies of language and national identity, and ideologies of languages as commodities. These will be discussed, in turn, in the sections below.

### **3.4.1 Bilingual ideologies**

Bilingual ideologies refer to the naturalised understanding that Canada is a nation home to two languages of equal status. Ideologies of bilingualism can be compared to the ideologies of monolingualism discussed Sections 3.2.1 and 3.3.1. In Quebec, in order to circumvent English language dominance, nationalists strove to create contexts in which only the French language would be necessary; monolingualism (in the form of "predominance") is thus entrenched in Quebec national identity. In English Canada, monolingualism is presumed to be the natural state of affairs, since English is the normal, everyday language of Canada outside of Quebec. In bilingual federal Canada, both English and French are naturalised as the official languages of the country and the coexistence of two language communities is seen as natural and unproblematic.

Bilingual ideologies emerged as a result of the past half-century of language history in Canada. Most notably, the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism

significantly altered the place of languages within the Canadian nation. As noted in Sections 3.2 and 3.3, the early 1960s were a time of particular social and political ferment in Canada. These events were among the causes that led Lester B. Pearson to establish the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (henceforth B&B Commission) in 1963 as one of his first acts as Prime Minister of Canada. The objective of this commission was to:

inquire into and report upon the existing state of bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada and to recommend what steps should be taken to develop the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races, taking into account the contribution made by other ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada and the measure that should be taken to safeguard that contribution. (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1967, Appendix 1, cited in Conrick and Regan, 2007: 37).

The Commission was designed primarily to accommodate Quebec within the Canadian federation. The emergence of Quebec nationalism was seen as a threat to the legitimacy of Canada as a state. Indeed, it was Quebec journalist André Laurendeau, who later became a Commission co-chair, who first sparked plans for a royal commission through his 1962 editorial in *Le Devoir* (Fraser, 2006: 36; Haque, 2012: 50). The plan for the Commission, then, was for Canada to adapt in order to accommodate French speakers within and outside of Quebec. The drive for the commission also emerged because of other great changes in the country. Haque (2012: 34-51) explains that the Canadian population had become increasingly diversified in the aftermath of World War II, and the B&B Commission was one of several efforts by the Canadian government to instil a new sense of belonging in the country. During this same period, the government also adopted a new Canadian flag (1965), coordinated centennial celebrations of the British North America Act (1967), and established a Royal Commission on the Status of Women (1968) (see Fraser, 2006: 43-87; McRoberts, 1997: 38-54; see also Sections 1.2 and 3.4).

The Commission served to legitimise Canadian bilingualism through its very formation. The rationale for the Commission was that Canada is composed of, and therefore must accommodate, its two founding peoples (or “races”, which was the original term). These two founding peoples notably consisted of English speakers and French speakers, not other immigrant groups such as the Ukrainians who had largely settled the West, nor, more significantly, the aboriginal people of Canada, who had in reality been the first inhabitants of the country. The Commission’s Preliminary Report, released in 1965, observed that “Canada, without being fully conscious of the fact, is passing through the greatest crisis in its history” (cited in Conrick and Regan, 2007: 38; see also Fraser, 2006: 5; Haque, 2012: 75-93). The founding of the Commission, then, and its very first report both served to impart the significance of a French-English discord in Canada. The final report of the Commission underscored this significance, as it contained a hundred recommendations to redress the current state of inequality between English speakers and French speakers – and to a much lesser extent, members of other ethnocultural groups (see Conrick and Regan, 2007: 38; for critique, see Haque, 2012). The most far-reaching of the Commission’s recommendations were those concerning a law on official languages and the extension of official bilingualism to the federal government.

Accordingly, in 1969, the new federal government of Pierre Trudeau introduced the first Official Languages Act, which made English and French the official languages of Canada and imposed obligations on federal institutions to provide services in both languages (see Conrick and Regan, 2007: 39). These changes had important effects on Canadian society that continue to alter the way Canadians perceive the country. Thus, the formation of the Commission, its reports, its recommendations, and the implementation of these recommendations into language policies, helped to institute and make commonplace the idea that Canada is a bilingual country. Today, bilingualism has become a largely naturalised fact in Canada. Even such famously banal domains as cereal boxes that display English on one side and French on the other have become icons of Canadian nationalism (see e.g. Anonymous, 2009f). Bilingual ideologies, then, refer to the naturalised status that these languages have acquired as a result of this history and these policies.

### **3.4.2 Ideologies of languages and national identity**

Ideologies of languages and national identity pertain to the naturalised assumption that bilingualism is a defining feature of Canadian identity. This means that English and French, together, have integrative value as symbols of the pan-Canadian nation. The ideologies of languages and national identity in federal bilingual Canada are similar to the ideologies of French as a core value in Quebec nationalism. In both cases, languages are seen to have a central place within the nation. However, the difference between the ideologies is that in the case of federal bilingual Canada, the two languages play a primarily symbolic role in that most Canadians do not in fact speak both languages.

Canada's acceptance of diversity through bilingualism is seen as part and parcel of its national image. Boudreau and Dubois (2007: 104) explain: "Canada has developed a positive image of itself as a bilingual, therefore tolerant and progressive country". The symbolic role of English and French is stated explicitly in the introduction to the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages' overview of the Official Languages Act: "Our two official languages, English and French, are a fundamental characteristic of Canadian identity" (Office of the Commissioner, 2010b: 2). Bilingualism is also one primary feature that distinguishes Canada from the United States (Adams, 2008; Bernard, 1998: 24). Boberg (2010: 2) notes that "many Canadians would point to official English-French bilingualism as one of the defining features of Canadian nationhood, differentiating Canada from its much more powerful and influential neighbor to the south". For Canadians who are fluent in English and French, languages serve both instrumental and integrative roles. In such cases, languages are seen as "a symbol of belonging to a linguistic community, as a mark of social cohesion and identity, and as a means of collective political mobilization" (Budach, Roy and Heller, 2003: 615). Notably, though, most Canadians are not fluent in English and French. Those Canadians who are French-English bilingual tend to have French as their first language. Therefore, it is generally French speakers who live the reality of a bilingual Canada, whereas bilingualism is predominantly symbolic for English speakers (see Boudreau, 2008: 70). This does not detract, however, from the role of bilingualism as an emblem of the nation (Heller, 1999a: 145).



Indeed, the French language is sometimes argued to be at the very heart of pan-Canadian national identity – and no less so for anglophones than francophones. The idea of Quebec separatism is seen by many English speakers as “a threat to death” to Canada’s very sense of self (Saul, 1997: 293). This perceived threat is the result of English Canadians’ belief that Frenchness is an integrative component of Canadian identity. Conlogue (1996: 9) explains:

English Canada’s particular tragedy has been to believe that it is partly French, even though the French themselves have not agreed to this and we ourselves [anglophones] have done little to give it substance. In order to sustain this invented identity, we forget our history and stifle our ears.

For some English speakers, though, the French language does not have symbolic integrative value so much as it has instrumental value. This is one reason why middle class English Canadian parents encourage their children to enrol in French immersion programmes in school: the French language is perceived to be a crucial tool to accessing social resources in the bilingual country (Stark, 1992: 133; see also McRoberts, 1997: 107). Thus, the French language may play either a primarily symbolic role or an important instrumental role for English speakers who align with the discourse of pan-Canadian national identity.

Some scholars, such as Taylor (1993: 28) and Ignatieff (1994: 122), contend that federal bilingualism was designed particularly to target English Canadians whose conceptualisations of Canada (i.e., through the “residual” form of English Canadian nationalism, in Williams’ [1977] terms) had been monolingual. The goal of transforming English Canada was part of the overall scheme to eliminate understandings of Canada as being *de facto* an English-speaking country (Webber, 1994: 211). Since the federal policies came into place, English Canadians have come to feel pride in Canada’s political culture, its government institutions, and its social programmes; these are features that are seen to unite the country and that make Canada distinct (Stark, 1992: 134). Thus, regardless of whether or not most Canadians are

bilingual, the two languages often serve as identity features of an idealised Canadian identity.

Finally, bilingualism also forms part of Canada's international image. Canada has marketed itself to the world, and bilingualism is a crucial symbol of it as a nation. Being bilingual, as a person and as a state, has been portrayed as a way of being progressive and tolerant of other people and cultures (see Kymlicka, 2004: 831-2). The Canadian model of federalism accommodating linguistic and cultural minorities has been "sold" to other countries such as Australia and New Zealand (see Kymlicka, 2004: 838). McRoberts (1997: 69) notes:

Trudeau's vision provided some content to this emerging sense of Canadian nationhood. He offered Canada a new, compelling purpose that had significance for the world as a whole. Canada would show how different groups could live peaceably in the same country. Moreover, Canadians would not simply share the country but they would come together to create a new society.

Thus, the image of a nation reunited by bilingualism allowed Canada to develop its reputation in the international community as an exemplary liberal democracy (Heller, 2003c: 24; Ignatieff, 2000: 10; McRoberts, 1997: 72). This, it would seem, was Trudeau's goal in Canadian language policy. He argued that if Quebec were a "shining example" of freedom and progress, and if its culture, universities, and administration of public affairs were renowned, then "the ability to speak French would become a status symbol, even an open sesame in business and public life. Even in Ottawa, superior competence on the part of our politicians and civil servants would bring spectacular changes" (Trudeau, 1968: 180). Trudeau's design, then, stressed the interplay of language and identity in Canada that could, together, become valuable assets. Accordingly, ideologies of languages and identity draw on the understanding that the two languages are a natural part of what it means to be Canadian.

### 3.4.3 Ideologies of languages as commodities

Finally, ideologies of languages as commodities also support the discourse of pan-Canadian national identity. The commodity value of language becomes salient in three respects. First, through language policies, the French and English languages have become commodities within the Canadian national context because language skills are now assets in such things as employment. Second, languages are commodities in international contexts because of the multilingualism required for international affairs and trade. Finally, languages are also commodities because they are symbols of Canadian identity, which has been positively evaluated in international contexts (see e.g. Heller, 1999a: 160).

The *Canadian Action Plan for Official Languages*, published by the federal government, describes linguistic duality as “an asset for our future” (Privy Council Office, 2003: 2). Indeed, official language policy has meant that English-French bilingualism has been commodified across the country. Because English and French are required by law in such domains as education, signage, advertising, and official documents, fluency in English and French is key to employment in diverse areas (Heller, 1995: 380; see also Budach, Roy and Heller, 2003). For example, bilingualism is a prerequisite for most federal government jobs, which are widely seen as prestigious and highly-paid (see Gentil, Bigras and O’Connor, 2009, 2011). Many anglophones have been attempting to increase their employability by learning French, and the popularity of French immersion programmes suggests the extent to which bilingualism and, more generally, an appreciation of the French language serve material purposes (see e.g. Budach, Roy and Heller, 2003: 606; Fraser, 2003: 126, 2006: 183-208). In a study of French-speaking areas of Ontario, Budach, Roy and Heller (2003: 612) found that fluency in any language is seen as potential for collective economic advancement (see also Remysen, 2004: 107). Within the Canadian context, then, languages are valuable commodities.

Bilingualism has also been commodified internationally as a result of the multilingual nature of globalised society. As da Silva *et al.* (2007: 194) explain:

Recent intensified global competition has sharpened awareness of bi- and multilingual language practices as valuable commodities and a source of ‘competitive advantage’ which, according to governments and industry leaders, needs to be ‘managed’ in order to be sustainable or profitable.

Awareness of the roles that English and French play in the international community is an incentive for many Canadians to become fluent in both official languages. By presenting itself as a bilingual country, Canada has economic advantages in the international community; these advantages are passed on, or are widely perceived as passed on, to bilingual individuals (da Silva *et al.*, 2007: 188; Heller, 1999c: 351-2). Ideologies of languages as commodities, then, draw on the naturalised understanding that languages have real, operable currency in Canada and abroad.

#### **3.4.4 Conclusion**

To conclude this section, pan-Canadian nationalism was developed by the Trudeau government in the 1960s in reaction to Quebec nationalism and as an alternative – or perhaps in opposition (see Section 2.2) – to English Canadian nationalism. Despite the theoretical incommensurability of “federalism” and “nationalism”, this discourse of national identity continues to grow as new generations of Canadians come to understand their country as being a multicultural country within a bilingual framework. Three language ideologies work to naturalise this national identity. Bilingual ideologies refer to the naturalised understanding that Canada is a nation home to two languages of equal status. Ideologies of languages and national identity refer to the symbolic role that English and French play in Canadian identity. Finally, ideologies of languages as commodities refer to the ways in which English and French are perceived as having instrumental value within national and international contexts.

#### **3.5 SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES: A SUMMARY**

To conclude this chapter, the strong relationship between nationalism and language in Canada is the result of a lengthy and complex history. Each discourse of national identity arose in reaction to another: Quebec nationalism arose largely as a reaction

against Anglo-dominance; this, in turn, led to English Canadian nationalism becoming more manifest. Quebec nationalism was widely seen as a threat not only to Canadian unity, but also to the minority French-speaking communities spread across the country. As a result, the federal government made extensive policy changes to accommodate both English and French-speaking communities – and later, communities of other backgrounds – into the Canadian federation. The result was a new discourse of national identity of pan-Canadian bilingual unity. Importantly, language has been intertwined during all points of this history. Linguistic resources in their various forms are involved at every level of the Canadian economy, “from tourism to communications and information technology to the marketing of goods and services” (da Silva *et al.*, 2007: 188). As Heller (2003c: 24) notes, language is taken up in debates on the nature of Canada’s future in a variety of ways. While some argue that national unity would be best achieved on the basis of bilingualism, others contend that English monolingualism is the privileged path to national unity, and still others, in Quebec, continue to strive for the independence of a French-speaking nation.

It is useful to highlight that using the English language does not necessarily mean that an underlying discourse (if any) will be one of English Canadian nationalism; in the same way, using the French language does not indicate alignment with the Quebec discourse of national identity. As Blommaert (2006: 173) notes, “[l]anguage, here, may just be a tiny ingredient of a wider complex”. While numerous voices may be organised within or according to a single language, there still tend to be divergent voices within that language. It is thus important to maintain that language is an index of nationalism in Canada, but that it cannot be recursively used to ascribe identity to a language user (see Section 2.2.3). While language is often a clear, unifying force, delimiting and indexing identity, it is “only one identity marker among others” (Blommaert and Vershueren, 1998: 192). Language should not be used as “a synecdoche for community [relying] unquestioningly on the supposedly natural correlation of one language with one culture” (Gal and Irvine, 1995: 968-9). Because the Canadian media tends to be monolingual – and monolingualising (Heller, 1995: 374; see also Blackledge, 2002a: 69-71) – it is easy to fall into the trap of equating one language with a monolingual discourse of national identity. This is a trap that should be avoided and one reason why the data in the present study will be analysed from multiple angles. Thus, one should not

assume that French and English Canadians should share identical discourses, since language has been a catalyst in the groups' divergent evolutions (Blommaert, 2006: 172). The idea is that language ideologies work within these various processes and serve as "gatekeeping practices" in the creation, maintenance and reinforcement of boundaries between people in various contexts, including community, nation, state and global levels (Blackledge, 2005: 35; Blackledge and Pavlenko, 2002: 131; Spitulnik, 1998: 164). In subsequent chapters, English and French Canadian newspaper articles from 2009 will be examined in order to determine the extent to which the aforementioned language ideologies, which have been identified in the literature, are evident in the data. If they are present in the data, it remains to be seen if they appear to support any version of nationalism that has been outlined here (see Table 3.1).

<p><b>Quebec national identity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-monolingual ideologies (marked)</li> <li>-ideologies of French as a core value</li> <li>-ideologies of standardised French</li> <li>-ideologies of language endangerment</li> </ul>	<p><b>English Canadian national identity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-monolingual ideologies (unmarked)</li> <li>-ideologies of standardised Canadian English</li> <li>-ideologies of instrumental English</li> </ul>	<p><b>Pan-Canadian national identity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-bilingual ideologies</li> <li>-ideologies of languages and national identity</li> <li>-ideologies of languages as commodities</li> </ul>
--	--	---

**Table 3.1: Schema of language ideologies and nationalism in Canada**

The objective, then, is to explore the language ideologies that exist in modern day Canada, how they differ, where they tend to be focused, and their implications for nationhood.

# **4. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE**

## **4.1 A METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE TO STUDY IDEOLOGY**

The methodology and procedure used in this analysis are designed specifically for the purpose of uncovering language ideologies and national discourses in Canadian newspapers. They are designed for three purposes: first, to take into account a large amount of data; second, to take into account the majority trends as well as the subtleties within that data; and third, to take into account similarities and differences across languages.

With regard to the first purpose, a large quantity of data is required because, as discussed in Chapters One and Three, Canada is a very large country with linguistic, historic, economic, geographic and legislative differences that tend to be specific to regions and provinces. Furthermore, it has been argued (e.g. Bell, 1998: 103; Fairclough, 1989: 54) that studies of the media should be based on comprehensive samples of data because media language tends to be repetitive, formulaic, and often ideological within and between media outlets (Conboy, 2007: 24; Fowler, 1991: 66; Thurlow, 2007: 217). Thus, the methodology must be able to draw on a data sample that is sufficiently large to account for both the diversity within Canada and language used within different media outlets.

With regard to the second purpose, ideologies are a tricky topic to broach because, as discussed in Chapter Two, they can be manifested in so many different ways. Language ideologies are constructed on both micro and macro levels of discourse, thus requiring dynamic and multifunctional modes of analysis (Blackledge and Pavlenko, 2002: 122; Eagleton, 2007: 50; Thompson and Hunston, 2000: 8). Language ideologies may be overtly present in such formats as “language ideological debates” (Blommaert, 1999a), or they may be

implicit and embedded in quotidian discourse. Thus, the methodology must be able to account for the various ways in which ideologies may be present in the data. Finally, with regard to the third purpose, because previous research has suggested that the French and English Canadian media differ in numerous ways, the methodology used must be able to account for these cross-linguistic differences.

In sum, research methods must be selected or designed “according to how the research object is constructed” (Fairclough, 2010: 225) because theory and methods are inextricable. Thus, the methods used here have been designed according to the theoretical concepts outlined in Chapter Two and the context outlined in Chapters One and Three. This methodology is called cross-linguistic corpus-assisted discourse studies and its theoretical foundations are outlined in the first section (Section 4.2) of this chapter. In the subsequent section (Section 4.3), the procedure for executing the methodology will be presented.

### **4.2 CROSS-LINGUISTIC CORPUS-ASSISTED DISCOURSE STUDIES**

“Cross-linguistic corpus-assisted discourse studies” is an amalgamation of several different approaches to linguistic analysis. Principally, the components of this methodology include corpus linguistics and discourse analysis, which have been found to be mutually complementary in an approach called corpus-assisted discourse studies (CADS) (Partington, 2004). To this combination, a cross-linguistic component has been added, drawing and building on research in contrastive analysis, translation, and language pedagogy. The amalgamated result is “cross-linguistic corpus-assisted discourse studies”, henceforth C-CADS.

Cross-linguistic corpus-assisted discourse studies is a useful method for a study of language ideologies and nationalism in Canadian newspapers because its various components allow for a large quantity of data to be viewed both as a whole and in fine detail. Corpus linguistics, for instance, can provide overviews of an entire corpus through quantitative procedures that reveal majority trends and patterns, suggesting dominant ways in which topics and issues are discussed within a discourse community. Discourse analysis can be used to analyse data



samples in great detail with text-internal and text-external contextual considerations. Discourse analytic methods are particularly apt at uncovering and analysing the ways in which ideology is hidden through embedding in text (Bell, 1998: 65; Blackledge and Pavlenko, 2002: 122; Ricento, 2006: 47). This combination of corpus linguistics and discourse analysis, then, enables researchers to account for both large amounts of data (i.e., using corpus linguistics) and the subtleties within that data (i.e., using discourse analysis). The cross-linguistic component fits into both the corpus linguistics component as well as the discourse analytic component of the analysis, since all findings must be compared and contrasted across languages in order to account for differences between English and French Canadian newspapers. In sum, each component of the C-CADS approach is equally important; however, because each tends to have slightly different designs according to research applications, it is useful to outline the specific methodological theory and tools that are being applied here. Thus, in the subsequent sections, the theory and tools of corpus linguistics (Section 4.2.1), discourse analysis (Section 4.2.2), and cross-linguistic studies (Section 4.2.3) will be presented before the overall advantages and challenges of C-CADS are assessed and the procedure for its application (Section 4.3) is presented.

### **4.2.1 Corpus linguistics**

Corpus linguistics is an empirical approach to language that involves the application of new technologies (Bauer and Aarts, 2000: 25; Hunston and Thompson, 2006: 8; Taylor, 2008: 191; Tognini-Bonelli, 2001: 1-2). More specifically, it is, first, a linguistic approach with theories that attempt to explain the function of language in society according to attested data and, second, a methodology with a set of ever-expanding tools for linguistic analysis that continually contribute to and enhance this theory.

#### **4.2.1.1 Corpus linguistics theory**

The foundation of corpus linguistics is the use of a principled collection of electronically stored and computer-readable texts known as a “corpus” or “corpora” (Baker *et al.*, 2008: 274; Teubert, 2007: 89). The compatibility of

corpora with computer programs, which are capable of handling and sorting through substantial quantities of data, means that larger and more comprehensive samples tend to be used for analysis. Corpus linguists also tend to study real, naturally occurring data rather than artificially constructed examples; corpus linguistics research is thus by and large a study of language in society and can be considered inherently sociolinguistic (Partington, 2009: 298; Stubbs, 1996: 23, 2001: 221; 2007b: 130).

Sociolinguistic data is language that is both routine and creative, and language that is the product of discourse communities (see Section 2.2). Shared understanding is created within discourse communities by common discourses; these discourses rely on common understandings of words and phrases, and not only those that are obviously ideologically loaded but also those that are frequent or used in frequent combinations with one another (Stubbs, 2003: 313). Many words are frequent in a community because they occur in frequent phrases, which are in turn frequent because they are conventional ways of expressing common meaning (Stubbs, 2007a: 100). Conventional ways of expressing common meaning are related to community-internal value systems, which determine and establish the extent to which meaning is implied or must be overtly stated. According to Stubbs (2001: 166), “[a] community’s value system is built up and maintained, at least partly, by the recurrent use of particular phrasings in texts”. Frequent phrases and patterns are vital to communities because they facilitate understandings of connected discourse and the attitudes, values, and even ideologies within this discourse (Stubbs, 1996: 153-158, 2003: 306). In other words, the consideration of the function of frequent and repeated words and phrases provides researchers insight into the discourse and culture of specific communities. This reasoning is in line with the social theories of Bourdieu (e.g. 1991) and Giddens (1984), among others, who contend that routine and often mundane processes serve to reproduce culture through tradition and conventions (see Stubbs, 2001: 241).

Corpus linguistics theory also builds on the work of John Sinclair (e.g. 1991, 1996), who theorised that meaning in language is not created by words used in isolation from one another, but rather from words used in combination. Meaning

is often distributed across units larger than individual words, and thus words must be viewed in context (or “co-text”) in order for meaning to be understood (Stubbs, 2001: 100). This theory of meaning can be tested as never before using corpus linguistics. Corpus researchers are able to study previously unobservable linguistic and discursive phenomena that are revealed through frequent and statistically significant patterns. Complementing these majority patterns are considerations of low frequency or absence from the data sample, which have important implications too (Baker, 2010: 125). The goal of corpus linguistics, then, is to develop a theory of meaning from corpus data; depending on the sample of data under investigation, the meaning may be general and widespread or specific to the community from which the data are drawn (Hunston, 2002: 22; Stubbs, 2001: 20). Thus, although corpus linguistics is often criticised for not having a unified social theory, or worse, for being “theory light” (see discussions in Hunston and Thompson, 2006: 1-3; Stubbs, 2006: 15, 2010: 21-22), it is argued here that corpus linguistics is in fact based on a considered rationale for authentic language use, understandings of frequency, and a recognition of meaning distributed across units of language. Together, these comprise the central theoretical underpinnings of corpus linguistics.

### **4.2.1.2 Corpus linguistics tools**

In order to determine what is meaningful within a corpus, there are a variety of computer programs that rely on fairly standardised procedures to establish salience. Although there is no single methodology for how to “do” corpus analysis (Hunston and Thompson, 2006: 3), there are some dominant tools. The most common procedures include the three principal functions contained within WordSmith Tools (version 5.0) (Mike Scott, 2008b), which is the corpus linguistics program used here for analysis. These principal functions include WordList (a frequency tool), Concord (a concordancer), and KeyWord (a statistical significance ranking function). These will be discussed, in turn, in the subsequent sections.

### 4.2.1.2.1 WordList

WordList is a tool that allows researchers to view the frequency of all words within a corpus according to either the rank of frequency (most to least frequent, or vice versa), or according to alphabetical order. As mentioned, frequency is of primary importance in corpus linguistics, and it becomes meaningful when it is interpreted as typicality of speakers' tacit knowledge of discourse norms (Stubbs, 2001: 61). Indeed, Gries (2008: 403) goes so far as to say that frequency data can reveal the "cognitive entrenchment" – that is, the extent to which a word is embedded in the minds of language users – of particular words within a community. It is argued that frequency indicates lexical choices that writers or speakers have made or avoided in their language use. Frequency is the most common statistic employed in corpus linguistics, and tends to be the first step of most corpus analyses (Archer, 2009: 2; Gries, 2008: 403). In studies of ideology, frequent words and phrases may indicate the prominence of certain topics and ways of discussing them.

However, it is clear that frequency can be misleading (Sinclair, 1996: 80). If researchers only examine the most frequent words in a corpus, they may overlook less frequent ones, which can be as significant to studies of ideology as more frequent words. This is because ideology is not only evident from words that are clearly ideologically-loaded or phrases that are plainly evaluative and repeated; ideology can also be present in assumptions in discourse, which may mean that words and phrases are elided and their frequency is thus affected. For instance, if a speaker assumes that language plays a central role in national identity, this may mean that the language is frequently under discussion, or it may mean that it is rarely discussed because it is presumed to be already within the minds of the interlocutors of that discourse community. The challenge of how to utilise frequency in corpus linguistics is not limited to studies of ideology; numerous researchers (e.g. Baker, 2009b, 2009c; Davies, 2009; Kirk, 2009; Mautner, 2009) have noted how, more generally, a single-minded focus on frequency may result in some findings being overlooked. For example, it may mean that frequent words are decontextualised (and thus misunderstood), or it may mean that analytical categories, based on what appear to be majority trends, are oversimplified and erroneously applied to the data (see Freake *et al.*, 2011:

40; Williams, 1977 as discussed in Phillips, 1998: 215). Also, a single-minded focus specifically on high-frequency items may mean that lower frequency items, or variation more generally, are overlooked (Mautner, 2009: 44; Stubbs, 2001: 29).

However, these potential problems with frequency can be avoided through good research practice. For instance, frequency can be derived from individual lines of words in context (i.e., concordance lines), rather than from frequency lists, in order to establish the relevance of examples (Baker, 2010: 42). This in-text contextualisation can also serve to establish the discourse function of specific words, and thus their significance with relation to research objectives (Baker, 2009b: 6). Low frequency items can also be considered through tests of statistically significant absence (“negative keywords”; see e.g. Baker, 2009c: 95), which can help to determine which words occur less often than predicted in comparison with other corpora. In fact, Stubbs (2001: 221) argues that unique or unusual occurrences, marked by low frequency, may only be described against the background of what is normal and expected according to higher frequency scores; thus, frequency proves to be useful to establish both what is typical and atypical. Also, researchers can use dispersion plots (i.e., charts that present the distribution of an item according to its locations in the data) in order to establish consistency and typicality of categories as well as variation and minority trends (Baker, 2010: 39; Gries, 2008: 404-5). If an item occurs frequently only within a small number of texts, then it is not representative of trends across the entire corpus. Thus, dispersion plots can also be used to contextualise high and low frequency items.

In sum, frequency is an important tool in the search for ideology, because it can be used to establish which trends are repeated and prominent (and thus of high frequency) or naturalised and embedded (and thus of low frequency).

### 4.2.1.2.2 Concord

Another important tool in WordSmith is Concord, a concordancer, which enables researchers to determine which words collocate with which other words, thus

revealing semantic or discursive relationships. The tool has several different functions that show terms in context. For example, concordance lines display and organise the data according to search terms within their original “co-text” (i.e., the lexical content, or words surrounding a search term to the left and the right). These lines can be experimentally manipulated so that words within the co-text of individual lines are aligned and arranged in similar fashions (e.g. according to alphabetical order), making patterns more easily observable (Stubbs, 2006: 18). Collocate lists also provide an option for viewing connections between search terms and other words. These lists show words that “collocate” with the search term, with what frequency, and in which positions with relation to the search term. In default settings, WordSmith considers items that occur within five words of a search term to be meaningful collocates, although this too can be manipulated by individual researchers. Indeed, some argue that the closer a word tends to be located to a search term, the stronger the relationship is between the words (e.g. Milizia and Spinzi, 2008: 335; Stubbs, 2001: 29). Another component of the Concord tool is the clusters function. This enables researchers to see which words tend to cluster together in fixed or semi-fixed patterns, revealing phraseology and multi-word phrases that function as single semantic units (Archer, 2009: 6; Greaves, 2009; Milizia and Spinzi, 2008: 323; Mike Scott, 2004-5: 79).

The relationship between words and the meanings that result from their combination is of central interest to corpus linguists. Numerous theories have emerged to account for the relationship between words that repeatedly recur with other words. Hoey (e.g. 2007: 7-9), for example, argues that the strength of a relationship between words (i.e., as determined by frequency of collocation) leads speakers and writers become “primed” to use words in specific combinations to convey meaning. In other words, the argument is that through repeated exposure to authentic language use, speakers and writers retain a cognitive record of the context and co-text of use so that, cumulatively, they come to presume what is normally lexically and semantically associated with a word (Hoey, 2011: 155; Morley and Partington, 2009: 148). More broadly, this gradual adoption of discourse norms is part of a process of acculturation into a discourse community through which language users learn to effectively convey

messages and understand their interlocutors (Morley and Partington, 2009: 139-140; Partington, 2004: 152; Stubbs, 1996: 158, 2001: 59, 2003: 306; see also discussion in Section 2.3).

The continued occurrence of a word with various other words results in “semantic preference” (see Baker *et al.*, 2008: 278; Kempainen, 2004: 92; cf. Hoey, 2007: 8). This means that a word tends to be repeatedly associated with a set of other related words because speakers replicate the contexts in which a word has been encountered (Hoey, 2006: 53, 2007a: 8). The result of these proposed usage patterns is that words have a “preference” for semantically associated words. Meaning is created when words are used and understood according to a community’s consensual expectations and assumptions that result from previous instances of co-selection (i.e., discourse norms) (Stubbs, 2001: 7). When semantic preference takes an evaluative turn – that is, when a word tends to repeatedly collocate with other words that have predominantly negative or positive meanings – then a word is said to acquire “semantic prosody” (Kempainen, 2004: 93; Partington, 2004: 151; cf. Baker *et al.*, 2008: 278).

Semantic prosody is ultimately a contentious theory of evaluative collocation and connotation within corpus linguistics with numerous divergent accounts of existence and salience (for overviews, see e.g. Hunston 2007; Stewart, 2010; Whitsitt, 2005; Zhang, 2009). Related and alternative concepts exist, such as “evaluative collocation” (Bednarek, 2008), “semantic association” (Hoey, e.g. 2011), and “discourse prosody” (Stubbs, e.g. 2001b; Tognini-Bonelli, 1996). Here, the term “discourse prosody” will be adopted in order to emphasise the function of evaluative collocation in the creation of coherence and understanding within discourse communities (Baker, 2006: 87, 2010: 133; Baker *et al.*, 2006: 58; Stubbs, 2001: 66; Tognini-Bonelli, 1996: 193, 209; see Section 2.3).

Discourse prosody is a useful corpus linguistic concept to apply to studies of ideology because ideologies are often evaluative (Thompson and Hunston, 2000: 8; Stubbs, 2001b: 215). While collocation and related concepts such as semantic preference show us how language users reproduce the phraseology of their community, discourse prosody goes a step further and suggests how language

users reproduce the discourse of their community (Morley and Partington, 2009: 140; Stubbs, 2001b: 215). By using language according a community's discursive norms, an acculturated speaker tends to reproduce the values and judgments of his or her community. Discursive norms include such things as linking words together (i.e., collocation) in ways that are accepted by and used throughout the community; this accepted collocation, when evaluative, gives individual words their community-specific "discourse prosody". Certainly, language users can choose to "switch off" or "override" discourse prosodies, but it is argued that when this is done, it is usually with the intention of being ironic or humorous (see e.g. Louw, 1993: 157; Morley and Partington, 2009: 146; Stewart, 2010: 3). The assumption that discourse prosody relies on discourse norms implies that discourse is ideological. If members of a discourse community are obliged to rely on common discursive norms in order to communicate effectively, since the discourse of that community is to some extent formulaic and value-laden (i.e., as a result of collocation trends that are at times evaluative), then most instances of language use will be unavoidably ideological (Manca, 2008: 372; Morley and Partington, 2009: 144-147; Stubbs, 1996: 235). This, in turn, implies that individuals' use of language is manufactured and to some extent pre-determined as an effect of their membership in a discourse community (Gramsci, 1971). However, the discourse norms of any community are subject to the alternative and oppositional effects of competing ideologies both from within and outside the community (see Section 2.2.2; Williams, 1973). This logic is coherent with the theoretical assumptions about ideological discourse outlined in Section 2.2, and in fact serves to highlight how ideologies, embedded in discourses and specific to discourse communities, may differ between groups. Furthermore, this theorisation of evaluative collocation functioning within discourse communities is one notable reason why the term "discourse prosody" is preferable to "semantic prosody".

Several corpus researchers have suggested that the discourse prosody of single words may differ between groups according to contexts of use (Hoey, 2007: 9; Hunston, 2007; Manca, 2008: 383; Morely and Partington, 2009: 155; Nelson, 2006; Partington, 2004: 154). If discourse prosodies vary across domains, then they may differ even more if translation equivalents are compared between



language varieties because these so-called equivalents are derived not only from potentially different domains, but also from different social groups that speak different languages (Baker, 2010: 128; Berber Sardinha, 2000; Dam-Jensen and Korning Zethsen, 2008; Hoey, 2011: 157; Kempannen, 2004; Korning Zethsen, 2004; Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, 1996; Milizia and Spinzi, 2008: 334; Morley and Partington, 2009: 140; Munday, 2011: 169; Partington, 1998: 48-64, 77; Tognini-Bonelli, 2001: 113-128; Xiao and McEnery, 2006; Zhang, 2009). This final point is particularly relevant to cross-linguistic studies of ideologies.

Above and beyond discourse prosody, collocation trends more generally indicate the kinds of choices that speakers make and the denotational, connotational and evaluative meanings that result from these choices (Cotterill, 2001: 293). It is the task of the corpus analyst to interpret and explain lexical choices and the lexicogrammatical frame (i.e. collocational context) in which they occur (Qian, 2010: 39). Importantly, even if linguistic choices and patterns are probabilistic, quantitative measures cannot provide explanations: choices and patterns must be explained by researchers (Biber *et al.*, 2002: 3-4; Mautner, 2009: 45). In sum, then, the Concord tool provides numerous functions that enable researchers to determine how words are being used, whether these uses are dominant or marginalised within the corpus, and whether words appear to be imbued with evaluative meaning by their repeated co-text (i.e., their discourse prosody according to repeated evaluative collocates). All of these collocational angles on the data could have potential implications for studies of ideology.

### 4.2.1.2.3 KeyWord

The final WordSmith tool that will be described here is KeyWord, a statistical significance ranking tool. In popular language, a “keyword” tends to mean a word that is important in some way (Bondi, 2010: 1; Stubbs, 2010: 21). The KeyWord tool is useful because it has defined specific criteria that determine which words are important and why. According to the KeyWord procedure, words are “key” when they are of statistically significant high frequency (“positive keywords”) or low frequency (“negative keywords”). With this tool, significance is established by comparing one corpus (a “primary” or

“specialised” corpus) with a “reference” or “comparator” corpus. Reference corpora tend to be very large, general, and compiled by research teams or institutions, whereas comparator corpora are designed and compiled according to the research purpose of individuals (Mike Scott, 2004-5: 96).

This KeyWord tool works by counting the words (“tokens”) in each corpus, measuring their proportion of the overall lexical content of the corpus, and then using log likelihood tests to determine whether the difference may have occurred by chance ( $p < 0.000001$ ). Each word is accorded a “keyness” score according to its probability, and the words are then ranked according to their scores (i.e., the higher the keyness score, the lower the p-value). Words that are typical to both the primary and the comparator corpora are eliminated by the KeyWord calculations due to their similar frequencies. As a result, the KeyWord list includes only those words whose frequency or scarcity is significant. The calculation of statistical significance enables researchers to determine which words may have a specific ideological function in the discourse community from which the data are drawn. Keywords are thus useful for uncovering “aboutness” (Mike Scott, 2009), or salient thematic content, of a corpus, and can thus be invaluable in studies of ideology (Kempainen, 2004: 91).

However, keywords must be analysed in conjunction with other tools because, like frequency, statistical significance used in isolation can be misleading (Archer, 2009: 4). Problems have also been noted in the KeyWord process in that comparator and reference corpora are used inconsistently (see e.g. Baker, 2009a, 2010: 14; Johnson and Ensslin, 2006: 10; Mike Scott, 2009; Taylor, 2008: 184). Also, some researchers (e.g. Gabrielatos and Marchi, 2011; Kilgarriff, 2009: 1) have taken issue with the subjectivity inherent in KeyWord. For example, the KeyWord tool produces far too many words for an individual, or even a team, to analyse in any kind of comprehensive way, and researchers are forced to subjectively decide which keywords to examine (Baker, 2004: 351-2, 2010: 26; Berber Sardinha, 1999: 4-6; Johnson and Ensslin, 2006: 9-11; Kilgarriff, 2009: 1-2; Rayson, 2008: 526; Mike Scott, 1997: 237). Also, the definitions of “keyness” and “keywords” are inconsistent and the statistics used to measure “significance” are based on erroneous assumptions about what can be achieved

(see e.g. Gabrielatos and Marchi, 2011; Kilgarriff, 2009). Here, although a carefully considered comparator corpus was compiled, keywords derived from the KeyWord process do not comprise the focal point of analysis. Keywords are used to illustrate arguments rather than to draw conclusions. Thus, keywords are not studied exhaustively, because they are considered only “the tips of icebergs: pointers to complex lexical objects which represent the shared beliefs and values of a culture” (Stubbs, 2010: 23). Once identified, keywords are then analysed in greater detail using concordance and discourse analysis (see Section 4.2.3). Thus, keywords are considered just one indicator within a much larger, contextualised study (Sinclair, 1996: 80).

In general terms, then, keywords are useful in the study of ideology because they indicate the topics that are possibly of significant (or even ideological) interest to members of a discourse community.

### **4.2.1.3 Corpus linguistics and ideology**

Despite their usefulness, the tools described above are unable by themselves to account for all aspects of ideology. As we have seen, with the exception of concordance lines, most corpus analytic procedures principally rely on quantitative measures, which overlook the more subtle ways in which ideology can function in discourse (Baker *et al.*, 2008: 274; Bell, 1998: 65; Blackledge and Pavlenko, 2002: 122; Ricento, 2006: 47). Even concordance lines, which show search terms in context, do not provide a theory or a method for determining how ideology may be functioning within the context of the sentence or even at the level of the discourse community. Returning to the definition of ideology provided in Section 2.1, if ideologies are belief systems specific to social groups that are therein naturalised as commonsense, then corpus linguistics tools are useful in pinpointing some but not all of these characteristics. For example, since ideologies are systematic and socially shared, then corpus tools can establish the systematicity and unanimity of items through contextualised frequency, dispersion plots, and statistical significance tests. However, for the task of establishing how ideologies function as commonsense

assumptions underlying discourse, corpus linguistics by itself is found to be lacking. It is here that discourse analysis plays an important part. Numerous researchers have demonstrated how predominantly quantitative corpus linguistics tools can benefit from a combination with discourse analysis (see e.g. Baker, 2006). The subsequent section (4.2.2) presents the discourse analytic approach that has been found to be useful in cross-linguistic studies of ideology.

#### **4.2.2 Critical discourse analysis**

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is unique among approaches to discourse in that it is intended to focus on studies of ideology and power (see e.g. Blommaert, 2005a: 25; Fairclough, 1989, 2003; van Dijk, 2006; Wodak, 2001b, 2007). In CDA, discourse analysis is not only seen as the analysis of text, even if the data are textual. Discourse (textual or otherwise) is understood as a sample of socially-structured language use that is produced and consumed within specific socioeconomic, geographic and institutional contexts; thus, the analysis of discourse is to some extent the analysis of the society from which it emerges. In other words, language use is not considered to be isolated from the contexts in which it is produced; rather, societal power hierarchies and value systems are considered to be manifested in language. Silverstein (1992: 315-316) (a linguistic anthropologist, not a critical discourse analyst) notes:

there is no possible *absolutely* pre-ideological, i.e. *zero-order*, social semiotic – neither a purely ‘sense’-driven denotational system for the referential-and-predicational expressions of any language, nor a totalizing system of purely ‘symbolic’ values for any culture.

If all language is to some extent ideological (see Section 2.3), then it is the task of the discourse analyst to determine the ways in which it is manifest or implicit in language. The objective of being “critical”, however, does not exclude analysts themselves from scrutiny. An important tenet of critical discourse analysis is the refusal to claim total objectivity (Fairclough, 1989: 5). Since all language use is argued to be ideological and all individuals are members of one

community or another, then analysts, themselves, must be as transparent as possible about their position with relation to the context and the data. This is similar to the principle of self-reflexivity in the field of linguistic anthropology and critical sociolinguistics (see e.g. Heller, 2002).

Context and power are important considerations in the study of ideological discourse (Blommaert, 2005a: 12; Wodak, 2001b: 1). There are numerous relevant levels of context in CDA, including “co-text” (the text surrounding a keyword; see Section 4.2.1.1), “intertextuality” (the connections between a given text and those which it precedes and follows), “interdiscursivity” (the connections between discourses in use and other discourses circulating in society), and broader socio-political and historical contexts (Blommaert, 2005a: 46; Wodak, 2008: 2). These levels of context, also used in other discourse analysis approaches, affect any discourse community and influence language users, who rely on assumptions about context in order to produce comprehensible discourse. For their language to be comprehensible, speakers and writers must, to a certain extent, draw on common understandings of language that include not only discourse norms, but also discourse community norms, which include decisions as to what subject matter is relevant and how this subject matter should be described in such a way that it is logical to interlocutors (see Section 4.2.1.1).

Part of critical discourse analysis is, then, determining why certain texts produced by certain individuals frame topics and individuals in specific ways, and whether these comprise part of a broader body of texts in which these topics and individuals are represented in similar ways. Contextual factors, such as intertextuality and interdiscursivity, are indicative of realms of power in society if these have an impact on the way individual speakers or writers use language. In other words, if in their own speech or writing individuals draw on the language of politicians, intellectuals, or the media, then this shows evidence of intertextuality or interdiscursivity and suggests the ways in which individuals are affected by power hierarchies in society (van Dijk, 2003: 352; Wodak, 2008: 3). In particular, the mass media is scrutinised since it is argued that the language of the media reflects the discourses of powerful members of society (Wodak *et al.*,

2009: 214). Indeed, CDA has been used by many researchers to examine ideology in the news media (e.g. Jaworski, Thurlow, Lawson and Ylanne-McEwen, 2003; Kuo and Nakamura, 2005), including language ideologies (Blackledge, 2002b; Milani, 2007a; Ricento, 2005).

Although there is a fairly unified theory of discourse in CDA, there are numerous approaches to analysis within three dominant schools of thought: the discourse-historical, the socio-cognitive, and the dialectical-relational (for an overview, see Wodak, 2009: 311). The discourse-historical approach, used by Ruth Wodak and the Vienna School, applies argumentative, rhetorical, and pragmatic tools to examine social change and identity politics in large corpora of multiple genres. The socio-cognitive approach of Teun van Dijk focuses on the impact of the media and the reproduction of racism through the study of context models that affect the pragmatics of discourse (Wodak and Meyer, 2009: 25-6). The dialectical-relational approach used by Norman Fairclough relies on systemic functional grammar to analyse aspects of neo-liberal ideologies in British political developments. The approach used here draws on all of these schools, including, from the discourse-historical school, the argumentative and rhetorical tools for the analysis of national discourses (e.g. Wodak *et al.*, 2009), the approaches to ideology and the media from the socio-cognitive school (e.g. van Dijk, 1991, 1998b, 2006), and the use of systemic functional grammar from the dialectical-relational school (e.g. Fairclough, 1989, 2003; for an overview, see Blommaert, 2005a: 22-3). All of these provide different means of accounting for language ideologies and nationalism in the Canadian media.

However, the discourse analytic tools used here are not limited to CDA. As Blommaert (2005a: 6) notes, “CDA is part of a wider landscape of critical approaches to language and society”, and thus by extension, “it would be a mistake to see CDA as the *only* possible critical perspective on language in society” (*ibid*: 21; emphasis in original). Thus, while largely subscribing to CDA, the approach to discourse analysis taken here also draws on other disciplinary methods that adopt a “critical” approach to the analysis of language (Blommaert, 2005a: 19; Fowler, 2003 [1996]; Heller, 2002), and also corpus linguistics and cross-linguistic studies. Part of the need for methodological fusion

arises from the fact that discourse analysis has traditionally focused primarily on “monolingual discourse” not bilingual discourses (Blommaert, 2007: 116), and this is particularly the case for studies of the media (Androutsopoulos, 2007: 208). For the present purposes, the eclectic discourse analytic tools used here are outlined in the subsequent sections according to their use at the “micro” level (i.e., analysing ideology at the local level of text) or at the “macro” level (i.e., analysing ideology at the text, genre, and discourse level).

### **4.2.2.1 Micro-level tools**

Micro-level tools are the tools allow for ideology to be analysed in the lexicogrammar or at the “clause” level. These provide insight into how different angles of subjective experience are conveyed through lexicogrammatical choices. The micro tools used here draw predominantly on the transitivity system.

Transitivity refers to the grammatical system that represents the “world of experience” through the categorisation of processes (i.e., verbs) and the ways in which they unfold – or are unfolded – through time and space (Conboy, 2007: 56; Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004: 170). This is a way of firmly rooting the grammar of a text into a theory of how language functions and which functions it serves in society (Fairclough, 2003: 5). By situating the micro aspects of language – such as lexicogrammar – in society, we can establish the ideological implications of how and why messages are communicated in some ways and not others.

The transitivity system works by organising processes (e.g. processes of happening, doing, sensing, saying, being or having) into “process types”, each of which has its own structure for construing a “figure”. According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 175), a figure consists of (1) a process unfolding through time, (2) the participants involved in the process, and (3) the circumstances associated with the process. For example, “material” processes construe the actions and events of the external world (with actors, recipients, clients, scope and attributes), whereas “mental” processes construe reflection, sensation, and

awareness of the internal self (with sensors and phenomena that are sensed). “Relational” processes, on the other hand, serve to identify, classify and characterise “carriers” and “tokens”. There are also “behavioural” processes that represent outer manifestations of inner workings (e.g. consciousness), “verbal” processes that represent the exchange of communication through language or signs, and “existential” processes that simply denote existence or a happening (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004: 171). The importance of these process types is that once we are aware of the function(s) they serve, we can better understand the ways in which they are being used in a particular text.

In most instances, similar meanings can be conveyed in numerous different ways. For example, the official status of English and French in Canada can be conveyed in different ways (see Example 4.1).

### **Example 4.1**

- a. Canada has two official languages
- b. English and French are Canada’s official languages
- c. French and English are spoken in Canada
- d. Canada is a bilingual country
- e. Canadians speak English and French

In each of these examples, the process type is different and with each different type the meaning is somewhat altered. In some cases (a, d) Canada is described in relation to languages; in other cases (b, c), the French and English languages are described in relation to Canada. In some cases (a) Canada is assigned possessions; in other cases (d) its possessions are merely attributes. In one case (d) “Canada” can be understood as a metonym for Canadians; in other cases (e), the linguistic abilities of some individuals are used to describe all citizens of the country. Thus, writers and speakers can convey different meanings within ostensibly synonymous expressions. The awareness that a writer or speaker has chosen to convey a message through one process type rather than another may be suggestive of underlying ideology.



Other micro tools for discourse analysis are those used to study evaluative language. “Evaluation” refers to the language that expresses opinion, attitudes, feelings, or stance, and the term “evaluation” is used here to encompass a variety of near-synonymous terms, including “affect”, “appraisal”, “stance”, “intensity”, “affect”, “evidentiality”, and “hedging” (Thompson and Hunston, 2000: 2; Conrad and Biber, 2000: 57). According to Thompson and Hunston (2000: 6), evaluation serves three principle functions. First, evaluative language expresses the speaker or writer’s opinion and, in so doing, reflects the value system of that person and sometimes their community. Second, evaluative language constructs and maintains relations between the speaker or writer and the hearer or reader. Finally, evaluative language can be used to organise discourse. Evaluation is important to studies of ideology because, as noted by Thompson and Hunston (2000: 8):

ideologies do not exist in silence, but neither are they usually expressed overtly. They are built up and transmitted through texts, and it is in texts that their nature is revealed [...] Because ideologies are essentially sets of values – what counts as good or bad, what should or should not happen, what counts as true or untrue – evaluation is a key linguistic concept in their study.

The tools for analysing evaluative language, then, must take into account the various places in which evaluation can be located. At the micro level, evaluation can be studied in lexis (e.g. use of adjectives and adverbs) and grammar (e.g. use of intensifiers, explicatives, etc.) (Thompson and Hunston, 2000: 14).

Evaluative lexis includes adjectives, adverbs, nouns and verbs that indicate positivity or negativity, possibility or impossibility, or veracity or falsehood of a statement. Although there is not always consensus as to whether a word is clearly evaluative, comparison with other examples can shed light on the evaluative nature of a word (Channell, 2000: 39). Evaluative grammar involves the use of intensifiers (such as quantifiers and repetition), comparators (such as negatives, futures, modals, questions, imperatives, or-clauses, superlatives, and comparatives), correlatives (such as progressives and attributives), and

explicatives (i.e., clauses introduced by subordinators such as *while*, *though*, *since* or *because*). Evaluation also exists in syntactic structures and throughout longer phrases, which produce evaluation at the macro (text) level (Channell, 2000; Thompson and Hunston, 2000; van Dijk, 1991: 46).

In sum, micro tools allow us to see the world of choices that is available to language users for providing a means of communication. Faced with these choices, speakers and writers make decisions – whether conscious or not – as to which process types suit the perspective being advanced in the message and which grammatical forms and lexicon will be used to talk about this subject. In some instances, speakers and writers simply choose the most common means of expressing a message, which is suggestive of the discourse norms of their community.

### **4.2.2.2 Macro tools**

Macro tools rely on basic, interconnected understandings about what can be unearthed from the study of language use in society (from Blommaert and Verschueren, 1998: 191). First, since no language user in any communicative context is able to fully express all that they wish to communicate in any entirely explicit way, all texts leave implicit assumptions that authors expect their readers to share with them. Thus, the careful analysis of these assumptions will reveal a common frame of reference or “ideology” in the discourse. There are two principle approaches to macro tools that will be outlined here: strategy analysis and genre analysis.

Strategies comprise a broad plane of analysis that Reisigl and Wodak (2009: 93-4) break down into five principle types: (1) referential or nominational; (2) predicative; (3) argumentative; (4) perspectival, and (5) intensifying/mitigating. The first category, referential or nominational strategies, refers to how people, things and processes are named and categorised, and how these names and categories construct and represent social actors, in-groups, and out-groups. Referential or nominational strategies use categorisation devices, such as

metaphors, metonymies, and synecdoches, to enable a part or a member to stand for (i.e., represent) the whole (Wodak, 2009: 319-320). Predicative strategies are those where characteristics are attributed to participants through implicit or explicit predicates that serve to positively or negatively evaluate individuals, groups, or group members. Argumentative strategies, involves attributions and claims and how these are justified. Often, justifications rely on culture-specific *topoi*, which are embedded assumptions that are used to conclude an argument (see Section 2.1.1). Perspectival strategies involve the expression of perspectives and positions, which rely to some extent on the use of intertextuality and interdiscursivity to allow writers or speakers to align with a certain perspective by using words, phrases, quotations, or even discourses that are central to that perspective (Wodak, 2009: 320). More specifically, intertextuality involves the way in which the author of a text may draw upon a related set of other texts (Fairclough, 1989: 152), and interdiscursivity refers to the way in which an author may draw upon other discourses for legitimisation, sustainment or support (Wodak, 2008: 3; Wodak, 2009: 319). At times an author will distance him or herself from a perspective through the use of “scare quotes”, which are used to redirect responsibility for a contentious issue or remark away from the author and towards another source (Simpson, 1993: 142). Finally, intensifying or mitigating strategies indicate the extent to which attributions and claims are given emphasis or modified, which may have ideological implications.

Genre analysis also has important implications for discourse analysis at the more macro level. Newspapers, for example, have specific genres that reflect the “information providing” function of newspapers in society. Newspapers exist to provide information to the public; however, subjective decisions affect what information is deemed to be “newsworthy” (Cotter, 2010: 106-7). To a certain extent, newsworthiness is determined by evaluating events in terms of their contrast with the “norm”. In other words, events are “newsworthy” if they are unexpected or unusual according to community values of “normality” (Cotter, 2010: 9; Bednarek, 2006: 191). Thus, the stories contained in a newspaper reflect ideological community values of what is normal and abnormal, what is important and unimportant, and sometimes, what is positive versus what is negative. These community-specific values also determine where information is located within

newspaper articles. For example, the structure of the “inverted pyramid” is the most common way of organising a news story (Aitchison, 2007: 106). The pyramid structure means that the essential details of a story occur at the beginning of the article (“top of the pyramid”), whereas the less important details occur at the end of the article (“bottom of the pyramid”). Headlines, which occur before an article in a prominent position, are used to present the overall meaning and main topic of an article, including what is deemed to be the most important information in the event (Bell, 1998: 83; van Dijk, 1991: 51). The functions of headlines at the beginning of articles and their use of direct language have important effects on readers’ interpretations of the body of the article (Brown and Yule, 1983: 133). Similarly, the “lead” (i.e., the first paragraph or beginning of a story) of a newspaper article also has an important function since it is used to attract the reader. Indeed, Cotter (2010: 151) explains that it is in the lead that the information that is deemed “most interesting, relevant or new” is highlighted or “fronted”. The decision of which information should be placed in the lead is subjective and based on news practice values as well as knowledge of the community for which the newspaper is designed: again, this decision indicates community-shared values and ideologies. Thus, when a newspaper in one community is compared with a newspaper in another, the differences between the two suggest “how newspapers with different audiences, identities, political commitments and hence editorial policies mediate the information they receive” (Richardson, 2007: 106-7).

In sum, macro tools in discourse analysis enable researchers to examine how assumptions are embedded or organised within arguments and statements; these are relevant for the analysis of language ideologies and nationalism in Canadian newspapers.

#### **4.2.2.4 Corpus-assisted discourse studies**

The combination of corpus linguistics and discourse analysis, in the form of corpus-assisted discourse studies (CADS), has been found to be useful by numerous researchers (see overview in Partington, 2008). One of the primary

advantages of the CADS approach is that it enables corpus linguists and discourse analysts to address criticisms that have plagued the component methods when used in isolation (see Baker *et al.*, 2008: 275; Blommaert, 2005a: 31, 53; Blommaert and Bulcaen, 2000: 447; Stubbs, 1997: 102). Corpus linguistics and discourse analysis have faced criticisms ranging from theoretical incompleteness to methodological circularity; however, when used together in the CADS framework, researchers are able to address some of the weaknesses and exploit the strengths of each component part (see discussion in Baker *et al.*, 2008: 284-5). Some advantages of the CADS approach include large amounts of contextualised data (Partington, 2008: 97), reasonably high levels of objectivity (Baker *et al.*, 2008: 277; Lee, 2008: 92-3), and computerised coding, retrieval and analysis that mean findings are replicable (Lee, 2008: 92-3). Another advantage of the CADS approach is that it is inherently flexible: researchers may adopt, adapt, and employ techniques and tools where and when they prefer (Baker *et al.*, 2008: 275; Mautner, 2009: 35; Morley, 2009: 9; Rayson, 2008: 520-1). The objective of CADS, Baker (2010: 123) notes, is not to replace but rather to enhance small-scale, qualitative analysis with corpus-based analysis of discourse. In sum, CADS not only enables researchers to combine qualitative and quantitative methods, but the combination in fact provides greater analytical capacity than either method on its own (Morley, 2009: 10).

Still, there remains a lingering concern with the CADS approach: despite the fact that CADS is, at its heart, comparative (Partington, 2008: 96, 2010: 90), nearly all comparisons have been between single language corpora (for some exceptions, see Al-Hejin, 2012; Freake *et al.*, 2011; McEnery and Salama, 2011; Qian, 2010). In the subsequent section, the potential for cross-linguistic applications of the CADS approach will be discussed.

### **4.2.3 Cross-linguistic studies**

Cross-linguistic studies are the final component of the C-CADS approach. However, cross-linguistic studies are not a defined area of study in the way that corpus linguistics and discourse analysis are. “Cross-linguistic studies” refers to how translation or contrastive studies, and other related areas, can help to

compare and contrast corpus and discourse (i.e., CADS) findings across languages.

The use of multilingual data adds important dimensions to CADS research, not least of which the capacity to compare discourses between groups that speak different languages. Translation research shows that more or less identical perspectives can be expressed in different languages; however, the very need for translation emerges as a result of texts, perspectives, and even discourses being expressed only in one language (Dam-Jensen and Korning Zethsen, 2008: 207). Lockerbie (2005: 39), explains:

Since every culture has its own traditions and habits of thought, it also generates its own patterns in language, and its own rhetorical strategies which in turn lead to characteristic associations of words. These range from set idioms and expressions, many of them vernacular [...], to looser collocations of words habitually grouped together either semantically or syntactically. Hence connotation and difference of meanings can occur in a grouping of words that in themselves are not distinctive.

Lockerbie's statement not only highlights the various ways in which patterns of language need to be explored in order for group differences to be fleshed out; it also highlights some of the challenges that arise in cross-linguistic analysis. Lockerbie's argument becomes further complicated in multilingual contexts, when cultural differences are indexed and separated by languages. In an age where multilingual situations are increasingly common, the need for cross-linguistic analysis is incontrovertible. Dynamic methods are required for such cross-linguistic, cross-cultural analysis. However, there is no specific methodological procedure in "cross-linguistic studies". Rather, what is important is to highlight how the literature in translation and contrastive studies can contribute to CADS research. There are five issues worth noting.

First, ostensibly synonymous words across languages can serve different functions in the clause; thus, frequency can be misleading. Even languages with

similar roots abound with “false friends” that can mislead researchers and translators alike (Korning Zethsen, 2004). Even when translation “equivalents” share similar meanings, they may serve different functions in the clause, and this may affect frequency (Freake *et al.*, 2011: 30). The second issue is that, since clause structures may differ between languages, discourse analytic techniques must be adapted (Johansson, 2007: 3). Third, a reliance on preformulated categories may be inappropriate in comparisons between languages and cultures. Preformulated categories may lead to overgeneralisations and the “erasure” of some data to fit into categories (see Section 2.2.3). Good research practice means allowing categories to emerge from the data rather than imposing them there.

The fourth issue involves the comparison of the discourse prosody of translation equivalents. As discussed above, the comparison of translation “equivalents” can be a thorny area; this is further complicated when evaluative notions enter into discussion. To verify whether similar meanings and, moreover, evaluations are being conveyed, in-depth collocational and concordance analysis is required. Direct one-to-one equivalence cannot be assumed, and this means that the assessment of meaning and the comparison of frequency and statistical significance must nearly always be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Cross-linguistic studies of discourse prosodies are an under-researched area, but the literature that does exist suggests subtle evaluative differences in the uses of so-called “translation equivalents” (see Dam-Jensen and Korning Zethsen, 2008; Korning Zethsen, 2004; Munday, 2011; Partington, 1998: 48-64; Stewart, 2010: 18-9; Xiao and McEnery, 2006; Zhang, 2009).

Finally, the cross-linguistic comparison of keywords is complicated because (1) there are few parallel reference corpora available in different languages, (2) corpora of different languages cannot be directly compared against one another, and (3) keyness scores derived from different comparator corpora cannot be compared. Nevertheless, these obstacles can be overcome in cross-linguistic studies through the principled selection and design of comparator corpora in each language, each controlled for similar features such as genre, scope, size and time period. With this approach, keywords can be produced that are reliable both in

terms of their statistical significance and their ranked significance in comparison with keywords in the other language.

In sum, cross-linguistic corpus-assisted discourse studies (C-CADS) is a complex approach. However, given that corpus linguistics, discourse analysis, and cross-linguistic studies tend to draw on similar theoretical foundations about, for example, the importance of empirical data and the function of language in society, the three component parts are complementary. Together, these form a useful approach that enhances the predominantly monolingual research that has been done in recent years (e.g. Blommaert, 2007; Johansson, 2007: 6), and they shed light on the numerous facets through which meaning is conveyed. Now, with each component of the C-CADS approach explicated, we can turn to the way in which the method can be applied to data.

### **4.3 CROSS-LINGUISTIC CORPUS-ASSISTED DISCOURSE STUDIES PROCEDURE**

This section presents the procedure that was used for the collection of data and the compilation of the corpora. In the subsequent sections, then, the corpora will be presented, the criteria for the selection and design of primary and reference corpora will be discussed, and the procedure for analysis will be outlined.

#### **4.3.1 Compilation of corpora**

In order to examine language ideologies and national discourses in French and English Canadian newspapers, it is necessary not only to design an appropriate methodology, but also to collect appropriate data. It was therefore necessary to determine (1) the time period during which the newspapers would be considered, (2) which newspapers would be selected as data, and (3) how these corpora would be organised for analysis.

Since language ideologies and nationalism in Canada are historically intertwined (see Section 1.2), data were selected around the holidays of the “two founding nations” of Canada. These national holidays include Canada Day – celebrating



the day when the British North America Act was enacted on 1 July 1867, uniting the colonies and province of the British Empire into a single country – and St. Jean Baptiste Day – French Canada and Quebec’s national holiday, the feast of Saint John the Baptist, June 24. Although Influence Communication’s (2009a) review of the news shows that the summer sees a decrease in news production (in 2009: from 30,000 items average daily to as low as 10,000 items daily in July and August), Canada Day was ranked eighth in terms of the news stories that received the most news coverage over a seven-day period (3.6% of news over seven days), and St. Jean Baptiste Day was one of the media, art and culture items that received the most coverage in Quebec (2.36% over a seven day period) (Influence Communication, 2009a: 19, 2009b: 53). Since the two national holidays are so close to one another, they allow for corpora to be compiled synchronically within a specific time period (15 June to 8 July 2009). This period encapsulates the build-up and summation of both of Canada’s most widely celebrated national holidays.

Another reason for selecting this time period was the dearth of “language ideological debates” between 15 June and 8 July 2009. Given Canada’s history and politics (see discussion in Chapter Three), there are often linguistic upheavals that make headlines for weeks on end across the country. However, from 15 June until 8 July 2009, there were no major crises that provoked national or linguistic debates. This relative “linguistic peace” allowed for a more balanced account of the ideologies that are embedded in quotidian Canadian discourse. These are ideologies that are often inflamed and exaggerated during times of national and linguistic crisis (Cardinal, 2008: 63; cf. Billig, 1995: 109). Without these more extreme viewpoints, the aim was to ascertain the kinds of ideologies that circulate in Canadian discourse on a more regular basis.

As discussed in Section 1.3, newspapers were selected as data because they are seen to represent (i.e., produce and reproduce) majority discourses in society. In order to account for the dominant groups in Canada, newspapers were selected with the highest circulation figures (cf. Blommaert and Verschueren, 1998: 190-1). The Canadian Newspaper Association considers newspapers in Canada according to five geographic areas: Atlantic Canada (the provinces of

## Chapter Four: Methodology and procedure

Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island), Ontario (the province of Ontario), the Prairies (the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta), British Columbia and the Yukon (the province of British Columbia and the Yukon Territory), and Quebec (the province of Quebec). The newspapers with the highest circulation figures from each of area of Canada can be seen in Tables 4.1 and 4.2, where an additional category of “national newspapers” has been added.

Area	Paper title	Origin	Issues sold weekly	Ave. Daily
Atlantic Canada	The Telegram	St. John’s, NL	181 646	25 949
	Moncton Times & Transcript	Moncton, NB	223 311	37 219
	Halifax Herald	Halifax, NS	752 397	107 485
Ontario	Hamilton Spectator	Hamilton, ON	573 663	95 611
	London Free Press	London , ON	455 939	65 134
	Ottawa Citizen	Ottawa, ON	900 197	128 600
	The Toronto Star	Toronto, ON	2 349 760	335 680
	The Toronto Sun	Toronto, ON	1 162 864	166 123
Prairies	Winnipeg Free Press	Winnipeg, MB	889 457	127 065
	Winnipeg Sun	Winnipeg, MB	226 829	32 404
	Saskatoon Star Phoenix	Saskatoon, SK	335 990	55 998
	Calgary Herald	Calgary, AB	852 599	121 800
	Edmonton Journal	Edmonton, AB	839 365	119 909
	The Edmonton Sun	Edmonton, AB	401 207	57 315
BC and Yukon	Vancouver Province	Vancouver, BC	995 027	165 838
	Vancouver Sun	Vancouver, BC	1 060 139	176 690
	Victoria Times-Colonist	Victoria, BC	488 988	69 855
	Whitehorse Star	Whitehorse, YK	11 335	2 267
Quebec	The Gazette	Montreal, QC	1 057 294	151 042
	The Record	Sherbrooke, QC	22 865	4 573
National papers	The Globe and Mail	Toronto, ON	1 996 582	332 764
	The National Post	Don Mills, ON	1 182 206	197 034

**Table 4.1: English Canadian daily newspapers with highest circulation**

Area	Paper title	Origin	Issues sold weekly	Ave. Daily
Quebec	La Presse	Montreal, QC	1 504 674	214 953
	Le Nouvelliste	Trois Rivières, QC	257 234	42 872
	Le Soleil	Québec, QC	610 173	87 168
	Le Devoir	Montreal, QC	175 308	29 218
	Le Journal de Montréal	Montreal, QC	1 577 987	225 427
	Le Journal de Québec	Quebec, QC	617 781	88 254
Atlantic Canada	L'Acadie Nouvelle	Caraquet, NB	120 912	
Ontario	Ottawa LeDroit	Ottawa, ON	215 579	35 930
Prairies	(no data)			
BC and Yukon	(no data)			

**Table 4.2: French Canadian daily newspapers with highest circulation**

As discussed in Chapters One and Three, Canada's history, culture and demographics vary from one area to another. Because of the regional variation, it is important to consider each area separately. Ontario, for example, tends to be considered as a unit unto itself in part because it is the most populous province in the country (12.85 million inhabitants; 38% of Canada's population; see Statistics Canada, 2011). In contrast, the four Atlantic provinces tend to be considered as in conjunction with one another at least in part because of their geographic proximity and their sparse population (2.3 million inhabitants across four provinces; Statistics Canada, 2011). These demographics have implications for newspaper circulations because while populous Ontario publishes 38 daily newspapers (including both national papers), sparsely populated Atlantic Canada publishes only thirteen (see Table 4.3).

Area	Circulation figures (average per day)	Circulation figures (total sold per week)	Number of English papers published	Number of French papers published
Atlantic Canada	316 901	2 032 159	12	1
Quebec	921 892	6 322 671	2	9
Ontario	1 857 474*	11 890 127*	37*	1
Prairies	703 950	4 479 186	17	0
BC and Yukon	495 020	3 036 963	17	0

\*including two national papers

**Table 4.3: Regions of Canada with circulation figures in English and French**

In order to better account for diversity, two newspapers were selected from each region, and within each region, newspapers were selected from different provinces where possible, or from different cities where a region consisted only

of a single province. In this way, even if in Ontario Toronto is home to the newspapers with the highest circulation figures, only one Toronto newspaper is selected for the corpus; a newspaper with the next highest circulation figures from another Ontarian city is selected as the second newspaper for the corpus. This is one way to mitigate circulation figures versus regional representation. As mentioned above, in addition to the five regions delineated by the Canadian Newspaper association, a category of “national newspapers” has been added. There are two English newspapers, both published in the greater Toronto area of Ontario, that are distributed nationally and have a national scope of coverage. Since these are unique among newspapers published in Canada, they are considered within the “national newspaper” category rather than as part of Ontario newspapers.

With widely different demographics and newspaper circulation figures in French, it is impossible to compile a French corpus that is entirely parallel on numerical grounds to the English corpus. However, the different circulation figures in French correlate with the unique demographics of French speakers across Canada. Only 21.2% of the Canadian population speaks French as a first language (7.1 million people), and 87% of this population lives in the province of Quebec. The remaining large populations of French mother tongue speakers live in New Brunswick and Ontario, hence the existence of French dailies in these areas. In other words, the French-speaking population of Canada is significantly smaller than the English-speaking population, and French speakers are predominantly concentrated in Quebec. As a result, the vast majority of the French Canadian newspapers are published in Quebec, thus skewing the data toward this geographic area, rather than across the entire country such as the case in the English corpus. These demographics are reflected in the circulation figures: although Quebec has the highest newspaper circulation figures in Canada after Ontario, two of the seven newspapers published are in English, thus changing the composition of the readership in comparison with all other areas of Canada. These circulation figures all indicate the widely different demographics of French and English speakers and the effects on circulation figures (see Table 4.4).

	<b>Total number of dailies published</b>	<b>Dailies published in English</b>	<b>Dailies published in French</b>	<b>Percentage of dailies published in English</b>	<b>Percentage of dailies published in French</b>
Atlantic Canada	13	12	1	92%	8%
Quebec	11	2	9	18%	82%
Ontario	38	37	1	97%	3%
Prairies	17	17	0	100%	0%
BC & Yukon	17	17	0	100%	0%

**Table 4.4: Regions of Canada with daily newspapers in English and French**

One final important point is that while there are two national English newspapers with high circulation figures, no pan-Canadian newspaper exists in French. However, within Quebec, *La Presse* and *Le Devoir* are sometimes considered to be the “national” newspapers in terms of their scope and alignment with Quebec nationalism or a pan-Canadian perspective (see e.g. Gagnon, 2003: 78; Ignatieff, 1994: 120-1; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 158; Soroka, 2002). Therefore, for the purposes of this study, these two French newspapers will be considered national newspapers comparable to the English national dailies *The Globe and Mail* and *The National Post*.

With this reasoning, the English corpus is composed of corpora from the regional newspapers with the highest circulation figures (see Table 4.5). The French corpus is composed of corpora of the same geographic areas, drawing on newspapers with the highest circulation figures from those areas where available (see Table 4.6).

<b>English corpus</b>	<b>Data source (newspapers)</b>	
Atlantic Canada	Moncton Times & Transcript	The Halifax Herald
Quebec	The Gazette	The Record
Ontario	The Toronto Star	The Ottawa Citizen
Prairies	Winnipeg Free Press	Calgary Herald
BC & Yukon	Vancouver Sun	Whitehorse Star
National newspapers	The Globe and Mail	The National Post

**Table 4.5: English corpus with data sources by region**

French corpus	Data source (newspapers)	
Atlantic Canada	L'Acadie Nouvelle	(no data)
Quebec	Le Soleil	(no data)
Ontario	Le Droit	(no data)
Prairies	(no data)	(no data)
BC & Yukon	(no data)	(no data)
National newspapers	La Presse	Le Devoir

**Table 4.6: French corpus with data sources by region**

As we can see, the French corpus draws on considerably fewer data sources than the English corpus. This is made more evident, perhaps, because there is only one newspaper considered as a Quebec provincial paper because data from *Le Journal de Montréal* was unavailable. It is unfortunate for the sake of literal comparison that the two corpora are not of the same size. Nevertheless, the English and French corpora are equally valid in terms of their representation of newspaper readership across the country according to the geographic coverage, and this means that it is reasonable to compare them even if they are of different sizes.

Notably, nearly all newspapers used for analysis here belong to sizeable news conglomerates and many are the only daily newspaper in the city in which they are produced. It is worth briefly discussing each newspaper in turn in order to contextualise the data; each newspaper is presented according to its status and ownership in 2009 when the data were collected. In Atlantic Canada, the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* and its Sunday edition the *Sunday Herald* are published by Halifax Herald Limited and owned by Graham William Dennis. Although not classified as “independent” by the Canadian Newspaper Association (2009), its website claims that it is a paper “free of chain ownership” (Chronicle Herald, 2010). The *Chronicle-Herald* has been the only daily newspaper published in Halifax, the capital and most populous city of Nova Scotia, since the *Daily News* closed in 2008. Similarly, the *Times & Transcript* is the only daily newspaper in Caraquet, New Brunswick. The *Times & Transcript* is owned by Brunswick News Incorporated, a company that owns all other New Brunswick English-language daily newspapers. *L'Acadie Nouvelle* is an independently-owned tabloid and the only French-language daily newspaper published in Atlantic Canada.

## Chapter Four: Methodology and procedure

In Quebec, the *Gazette* is Canada's oldest continuously-published newspaper (Canadian Newspaper Association, 2008) and the only English-language daily broadsheet published in the city of Montreal, the most populous city in Quebec. It is owned by CanWest Publishing, one of the largest media stakeholders in Canada, which is also said to support the Conservative Party (Beaty and Sullivan, 2010: 19). Notably, the *Gazette* has the largest English-speaking readership of Quebec dailies and it is argued to support Canadian (i.e., rather than Quebec) nationalism (Gagnon, 2003: 78). The Sherbrooke *Record* is a tabloid owned by Glacier Ventures International Corporation, and is the only English daily newspaper published in the city of Sherbrooke, Quebec. It is also the only other English-language daily published in the province. Quebec City's *Le Soleil* is a tabloid owned by Power Corporation and is one of two French-language tabloids published in the provincial capital, where no daily broadsheets are published.

In the province of Ontario, Canada's most populous province that also produces the most daily newspapers, the *Toronto Star*, owned by Torstar Corporation, is one of three daily broadsheets published in the provincial capital and Canada's largest city. The other two Toronto-based daily broadsheets will be discussed below, since they are considered national rather than provincial newspapers. In Ottawa, the national capital, the *Ottawa Citizen* is the only English-language daily broadsheet and is owned by CanWest Publishing. Ottawa's French-language tabloid *Le Droit* is owned by Gesca Incorporated and is the only French-language daily published in Ontario.

In the Prairies of Western Canada, the *Calgary Herald* is the only daily broadsheet published in Calgary, the most populous city in the province of Alberta; it is also owned by CanWest publishing. The *Winnipeg Free Press* is the only daily broadsheet published in Winnipeg, the capital and most populous city in Manitoba. It is owned by F. P. Canadian Newspapers Limited Partnership. No French-language dailies are published in the Canadian prairies. In Western Canada, the *Vancouver Sun* is the only daily broadsheet published in the most populous city of British Columbia and it is owned by CanWest Publishing. The *Whitehorse Star* is an independently-owned tabloid and the only daily newspaper

published in the Yukon Territory. No French-language dailies are published in British Columbia or the Yukon.

Apart from these provincial newspapers, there are four newspapers in Canada that are here considered “national” in the sense that they have a different scope and distribution from local papers (Cotter, 2010: 121). First, in English, the *Globe and Mail* is published in Toronto and owned by CTVglobemedia Incorporated. When it was first acquired by Thomson Newspapers in 1980, substantial changes were made, notably a drop in Toronto-related material in order to make the newspaper “Canada’s national newspaper” (Soderlund and Hildebrandt, 2005b: 39). It remains today Canada’s most widely read national newspaper and the Canadian newspaper with the highest circulation after the *Toronto Star*. The *Globe and Mail* is widely recognised as liberal and left-wing in its political orientation and a supporter of Canadian federal nationalism (Gagnon, 2003: 78; Pritchard *et al.*, 2005: 291; Retzlaff and Gänzle, 2008: 84). Competing with the *Globe and Mail* is the *National Post*, another national newspaper published in the Greater Toronto Area. The *National Post* is owned by CanWest Publishing and is the sixth most widely-read newspaper in Canada; it is widely-recognised as conservative in its ideology (Soderlund *et al.*, 2002: 81). Although the two French-language “national” newspapers tend to be distributed only in Quebec, they are broadsheets with nationalist perspectives that are widely-read in the province and beyond. The Montreal-based *Le Devoir* is labelled as “independent” by the Canadian Newspaper Association (2008), and targets a “small Francophone elite and promotes Quebec nationalism” (Gagnon, 2003: 78). Montreal’s *La Presse* is owned by Power Corporation and is the fourth most widely-read newspaper in Canada and the most widely-read broadsheet in Quebec. It is also said to support Canadian federal nationalism (Gagnon, 2003: 78; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 158; Soroka, 2002).

All articles, editorials, and columns published by these newspapers between June 15 and July 8, 2009 were collected using the news databases *Canadian Newsstand*, *Eureka.cc* and *Actualité Francophone Plus*. Photo captions, editorials, and community announcements were also considered news items, since they serve as part of the newspaper content to enhance, clarify and add to



the news story (Blommaert and Verschueren, 1998: 190-1; Cotter, 2010: 58; Kariel and Rosenvall, 1983: 432).

#### **4.3.2 Compilation of primary corpora**

In order to study language ideologies and nationalism, it was necessary to access corpora in which these topics were particularly salient. Thus, “primary” corpora were created in each language by selecting only those articles that potentially discussed language issues. Articles were deemed as “potentially discussing language issues” if they contained at least one reference to a query term. In other words, if an article contained at least one reference to “language”, it potentially discussed language issues and was thus included in the primary corpus. However, language issues are discussed using a variety of different terms, not just the word “language”. To ensure that all relevant articles were included in the primary corpora, it was necessary to determine which query terms could index language ideologies.

Since language ideologies may be explicit or implicit, discussions that include the word “language” may be ideological, but so too may discussions that do not include the word “language”. It was decided that a constellation of “core query terms” (Gabrielatos, 2007) was needed to ensure that the primary corpora were (1) as comprehensive as possible and (2) to some extent semantically related. The rationale for using multiple core query terms to create corpora is that even if an article reports on or discusses issues related directly or indirectly to a given topic, the topic may not necessarily be referred to explicitly. Ideally, by including several appropriately-selected core query terms to the design of a corpus, these terms will return articles that are either specifically related to the topic or related more indirectly to it (Gabrielatos, 2007: 8-9). It was thus necessary to determine which query terms were relevant and related before using these terms to select texts for a corpus. In this sense, the initial approach to the analysis relies on informed but inevitably subjective researcher decisions, meaning that the primary corpora are the result of a procedure that is more theory-driven than data-driven (Partington, 2009: 289; Taylor, 2009: 215; Tognini-Bonelli, 2001: 10-11). In other words, the data for the primary corpora were selected based on

## Chapter Four: Methodology and procedure

previous research and literature on language issues in Canada (see Chapters One and Three): any newspaper article containing even a single relevant query term was considered as relevant as one containing two or more (see Tables 4.7 and 4.8).

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>ANGLO, ANGLOS, ANGLICIZE, ANGLOPHONE, ANGLOPHONES</i></li><li>• <i>BILINGUAL, BILINGUALS, BILINGUALISM</i></li><li>• <i>ENGLISH</i></li><li>• <i>FRANCO, FRANCOPHONE, FRANCOPHONES, FRANCOPHONIE</i></li><li>• <i>FRENCH</i></li><li>• <i>LANGUAGE, LANGUAGES</i></li><li>• <i>LINGUISTIC, LINGUISTICS</i></li><li>• <i>MONOLINGUAL, MULTILINGUAL, UNILINGUAL</i></li></ul> |
|--|

**Table 4.7: English core query terms**

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>ANGLAIS, ANGLAISE, ANGLAISES, ANGLICISME, ANGLICISE</i></li><li>• <i>ANGLO, ANGLOS, ANGLOPHONE, ANGLOPHONES</i></li><li>• <i>BILINGUE, BILINGUES, BILINGUISME</i></li><li>• <i>FRANÇAIS, FRANÇAISE, FRANÇAISES</i></li><li>• <i>FRANCO, FRANÇOS, FRANCOPHONE, FRANCOPHONES, FRANCOPHONIE</i></li><li>• <i>LANGAGE, LANGAGES, LANGAGIER, LANGAGIÈRE, LANGAGIÈRES</i></li><li>• <i>LINGUISTIQUE, LINGUISTIQUES</i></li><li>• <i>LANGUE, LANGUES</i></li></ul> |
|--|

**Table 4.8: French core query terms**

To create primary corpora using these core query terms, WordSmith dispersion plots were used to determine in which texts references to language were located. These texts were then copied and transferred to new folders that would become the French and English primary corpora. The corpora that still contained all newspaper articles became the comparator corpora against which the primary corpora were compared in order to derive keywords.

At the end of this procedure, four corpora were created: two primary corpora (one English, one French) and two comparator corpora (one English, one French) (see Table 4.9).

Chapter Four: Methodology and procedure

Name of corpus	Content	Corpora	Data sources
English primary corpus	Articles containing <i>language(s)</i> , <i>linguistic(s)</i> , <i>anglophone(s)</i> , <i>francophone(s)</i> , <i>bilingual(s)</i> , <i>English</i> , <i>French</i> , June 15-July 8, 2009	Atlantic Canada Quebec Ontario Prairies  BC & Yukon National papers	Moncton Times & Transcript; Halifax Herald The Gazette; The Record The Toronto Star; The Ottawa Citizen The Winnipeg Free Press; Calgary Herald Vancouver Sun; Whitehorse Star The Globe and Mail; The National Post
French primary corpus	Articles containing <i>langue(s)</i> , <i>linguistique(s)</i> , <i>langage(s)</i> , <i>anglophone(s)</i> , <i>francophone(s)</i> , <i>bilingue(s)</i> , <i>anglais(e/s)</i> , <i>français(e/s)</i> , June 15-July 8, 2009	Atlantic Canada Quebec Ontario Prairies BC & Yukon National papers	L'Acadie Nouvelle  Le Soleil Le Droit (no data) (no data) La Presse
English comparator corpus	All English newspaper articles, June 15-July 8, 2009	Atlantic Canada Quebec Ontario Prairies  BC & Yukon National papers	Moncton Times & Transcript; Halifax Herald The Gazette; The Record The Toronto Star; The Ottawa Citizen The Winnipeg Free Press; Calgary Herald Vancouver Sun; Whitehorse Star The Globe and Mail; The National Post
French comparator corpus	All French newspaper articles, June 15-July 8, 2009	Atlantic Canada Quebec Ontario Prairies BC & Yukon National papers	L'Acadie Nouvelle  Le Soleil Le Droit (no data) (no data) La Presse

**Table 4.9: Primary and comparator corpus breakdowns**

The complete French comparator corpus consists of a total of 8759 articles and 3 589 786 words. The English comparator corpus is much larger, consisting of a total of 18 271 articles and 7 524 331 words (see Table 4.10).

Chapter Four: Methodology and procedure

Corpus		Total number of texts	Total tokens (running words)	Types (distinct words)	Type/token ratio	% of corpus
Atlantic Canada	L'Acadie Nouvelle	1 421	504 979	32 628	6.66	14.07
Quebec	Le Soleil	2 212	778 320	45 684	6.03	21.68
Ontario	Le Droit	1 567	600 311	33 842	5.78	16.72
Prairies		(no data)				
BC & Yukon		(no data)				
National newspapers	La Presse	2 310	1 067 634	55 470	5.33	29.74
	Le Devoir	1 249	638 542	45 196	7.22	17.79
<b>Total French comparator corpus</b>		<b>8 759</b>	<b>3 589 786</b>	<b>100 286</b>	<b>2.87</b>	<b>100%</b>
Atlantic Canada	Moncton Times & Transcript	2 095	956 575	34 704	3.77	12.73
	The Halifax Herald	2 453	1 048 651	40 265	4.05	13.96
Quebec	The Gazette	1 462	437 310	27 805	6.55	5.8
	The Record	188	64 853	9 176	14.48	0.86
Ontario	The Toronto Star	1 568	525 760	30 812	6.04	7.00
	The Ottawa Citizen	1 825	563 159	29 126	5.31	7.49
Prairies	Winnipeg Free Press	1 085	623 717	33 547	5.62	8.30
	Calgary Herald	1 476	371 847	24 450	6.76	4.95
BC & Yukon	Vancouver Sun	1 205	403 944	24 271	6.2	5.38
	Whitehorse Star	501	230 204	17 509	7.88	3.06
National newspapers	The Globe and Mail	3 004	1 731 889	56 018	3.23	23.05
	The National Post	1 409	493 496	28 061	5.82	6.57
<b>Total English comparator corpus</b>		<b>18 271</b>	<b>7 524 331</b>	<b>107 295</b>	<b>1.48</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 4.10: English and French comparator corpora, size**

The complete primary corpora are smaller, consisting of 1436 articles and 920 305 words in English and 1395 articles and 778 453 words in French (see Tables 4.11 and 4.12).

## Chapter Four: Methodology and procedure

<b>English corpus</b>	<b>Newspaper</b>	<b>Number of texts</b>	<b>Total number of words (tokens)</b>	<b>Corpus tokens</b>	<b>% of total words in corpus</b>
Atlantic Canada	Moncton Times & Transcript	182	144 288	237 900	25.85
	The Halifax Herald	140	93 612		
Quebec	The Gazette	158	68 059	79 479	8.64
	The Record	24	11 420		
Ontario	The Toronto Star	96	42 775	99 036	10.76
	The Ottawa Citizen	115	56 261		
Prairies	Winnipeg Free Press	84	68 586	89 932	9.77
	Calgary Herald	65	21 346		
BC & Yukon	Vancouver Sun	60	32 859	47 851	5.2
	Whitehorse Star	22	14 992		
National newspapers	The Globe and Mail	382	312 540	366 107	39.78
	The National Post	108	53 567		
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1436</b>	<b>920 305</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 4.11: English primary corpus content breakdown**

<b>French corpus</b>	<b>Newspaper</b>	<b>Number of texts</b>	<b>Total number of words (tokens)</b>	<b>Corpus tokens</b>	<b>% of total words in corpus</b>
Atlantic Canada	L'Acadie Nouvelle	218	114 643	114 643	14.72
Quebec	Le Soleil	270	129 373	129 373	16.61
Ontario	Le Droit	216	114 140	114 140	14.66
Prairies	(no data)	(no data)	(no data)	(no data)	(no data)
BC & Yukon	(no data)	(no data)	(no data)	(no data)	(no data)
National newspapers	La Presse	408	242 249	420 297	53.99
	Le Devoir	283	178 048		
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1395</b>	<b>778 453</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 4.12: French primary corpus content breakdown**

With this considered design and compilation of primary and comparator corpora, the analysis of frequencies, concordances, collocates, and clusters was relatively straightforward. Furthermore, it was possible to obtain keywords by comparing the primary corpora against the comparator corpora. These corpus findings could be compared and contrasted across languages because each corpus was compiled according to identical criteria in each language; in other words, the cross-linguistic comparison is possible because although the corpora are not parallel,

they are comparable (cf. Johansson, 2007: 1-9; Laviosa, 1997; McEnery and Xiao, 2007: 20). With the bulk of the data established, what remained was to determine how and on which samples of data cross-linguistic discourse analysis would be applied.

### **4.3.3 Downsampling for cross-linguistic discourse analysis**

Although concordance lines are a useful site for discourse analysis, whole newspaper articles, too, must be analysed. The final step of the procedure, then, consisted of determining which individual articles would be selected for discourse analysis. The motivation for this final step was objectivity: according to the tenets of CADS (see e.g. Baker *et al.*, 2008: 277, 284-5) and thus C-CADS, in order to avoid research bias, data should be selected according to specific criteria.

Here, whole newspaper articles were selected for discourse analysis according to their proportion of core query terms (CQTs) (see Section 4.3.2). On the one hand, articles with the highest proportion of CQTs were selected because they contained the highest concentration of the most overt and explicit discussions of language issues. On the other hand, articles with the lowest proportion of CQTs were selected because these were articles where language issues were mentioned only in passing. While it would have been useful to examine articles where language issues were entirely inexplicit (i.e., presupposed and/or naturalised), it is very difficult to objectively find inexplicit references. In other words, finding a newspaper article without references to language issues and then to assume that language issues should be present would mean imposing researcher bias on the data. Instead, by selecting articles that only mention language issues in passing, the role, function, or nature of language is implied by its marginal function in the report. In sum, the goal was to analyse (1) entire articles where language plays a dominant role, and (2) entire articles where language plays a marginal role.

In order to focus only on the language issues most relevant to Canada (i.e., English and French language issues), only the CQTs *LANGUAGE/LANGUE*, *ENGLISH/ANGLAIS/E* and *FRENCH/FRANÇAIS/E* were selected for this step

of the procedure. Using these CQTs in English and French, fifteen articles<sup>5</sup> were selected with the highest proportion of each CQT for a total of six groups of fifteen articles each (one list of fifteen articles with the highest proportion of references to LANGUAGE, one list of fifteen articles with the highest proportion of references to ENGLISH, and so on). Next, the lists were cross-referenced in order to determine which individual articles contained the most references to multiple CQTs. Five articles emerged from this process in French, and six articles emerged from the English corpus. These eleven articles were then quickly reviewed for length and relevance: length was an important consideration in order to avoid articles that would be either prohibitively long or uncharacteristically short<sup>6</sup> for analysis. Relevance was another important consideration since many references to FRANÇAIS, for example, refer to French nationality rather than language. From the eleven articles, then, eight (four in French and four in English) were selected for analysis (see Table 4.13) (see Appendices 1-8 for entire articles).

<p>Anonymous. (2009g). Vigilance essential for French. <i>Toronto Star</i>, 1 July 2009, p. A17.</p> <p>Bélair-Cirino, M. (2009). Le français à Montréal: 90% des francophones sont inquiets. <i>Le Devoir</i>, 22 June 2009, p. A1.</p> <p>Ferenczy, M. (2009). Broader opportunities. <i>Ottawa Citizen</i>, 3 July 2009, p. A9.</p> <p>Havrankova, J. (2009). Apprendre le français, un privilège. <i>Le Devoir</i>, 22 June 2009, p.A6.</p> <p>Howlett, K. (2009). French schools will be available to more students. <i>The Globe and Mail</i>, 17 June 2009, p. A12.</p> <p>Meurice, P. (2009). Pauvres touristes. <i>La Presse</i>, 7 July 2009, p. A13.</p> <p>Ravindran, M. (2009). How to speed immigrants' entry into the workforce. <i>Vancouver Sun</i>, 30 June 2009, p. A10.</p> <p>Rioux, C. (2009). Full bilingue. <i>Le Devoir</i>, 3 July 2009, p. A3.</p>
---

**Table 4.13: Downsampled articles with highest proportion of CQTs**

The procedure for selecting articles with the lowest proportion of CQTs was similar to the procedure for selecting the articles with the highest proportion of CQTs. First, 15 articles were selected from each corpus according to their low proportion of each CQT (i.e., the lowest number per 1000 words). This produced

<sup>5</sup> In the case of downsampled texts, “articles” is used to refer to both articles and letters to the editor, both of which are considered equally valid as examples from the corpora.

<sup>6</sup> Some opinion articles or letters to the editor tended to be very short, and hence the inclusion of even just one CQT could mean that its proportion of CQTs appeared to be very high.

six lists of fifteen articles each (i.e., one list of fifteen articles with the fewest references to LANGUE, one list with the fewest references to ANGLAIS, and so on). These lists were then cross-referenced to determine which articles had the lowest proportion of at least two different CQTs. From this list, all twelve relevant (i.e., language-related) examples were examined (see Table 4.14).

<p>Anonymous. (2009c). Divine liturgy to be held tomorrow. <i>Moncton Times &amp; Transcript</i>, July 4 2009, p. E6.</p> <p>Aubry, J. (2009). Le plus grand vin canadien? <i>Le Devoir</i>, 19 June 2009, p. B6.</p> <p>Blatchford, C. &amp; Leeder, J. (2009). “Did we push her too much?” <i>The Globe and Mail</i>, 20 June 2009, p. A1.</p> <p>Cornellier, L. (2009). Pierre Falardeau et son Elvis. <i>Le Devoir</i>, 27 June 2009, p. E5.</p> <p>Lawrence, G. (2009). De l'évanescence à l'efferevescence. <i>Le Devoir</i>, 20 June 2009, p.D1.</p> <p>Le Bouthillier, C. (2009). Le Grand Caraquet – suite. <i>L'Acadie Nouvelle</i>, 25 June 2009, p. 13.</p> <p>Lussier, M. A. (2009a). De père en flic. <i>La Presse</i>, 4 July 2009, p. Cinema 2.</p> <p>Mazerolle, B. (2009). The quintessential Canadian. <i>Moncton Times &amp; Transcript</i>, 25 June 2009, p. A1.</p> <p>Nolen, S. (2009). India's gay community fights for 'dignity'. <i>The Globe and Mail</i>, 19 June 2009, p. A16.</p> <p>Valpy, M. (2009). The emperor and the tennis pro. <i>The Globe and Mail</i>, 27 June 2009, p. A1.</p> <p>Vigor, J. C. (2009). Cet art qu'est la composition florale. <i>Le Devoir</i>, 20 June 2009, p. D6.</p> <p>York, G. (2009). Sterilized, stigmatized. <i>The Globe and Mail</i>, 15 July 2009, p. A7.</p>
---

**Table 4.14: Downsampled articles with lowest proportion of CQTs**

These downsampled articles were investigated using CDA with the aim of finding evidence of language ideologies in relation to national discourses.

#### **4.3.4 Procedure**

The procedure was not unidirectional but rather a continuum of related and increasingly precise steps of analysis. Although the initial approach to the data was quantitative, qualitative procedures followed and then these results were supplemented by further quantitative and qualitative findings. More specifically, the first steps of analysis involved corpus procedures to determine the most frequent words and phrases and the highest-ranked keywords; these were then



organised according to thematic categories. The collocates, clusters and concordance lines of relevant frequent and statistically significant words were then examined in order to flesh out the details of how these words were used in context. When frequent words or keywords were expanded into full concordance lines, these lines were analysed using micro discourse analytic tools as appropriate.

When a saturation point was reached with the findings from keywords and frequent words, downsampled articles were analysed. Each downsampled article with the high proportion of CQTs was analysed using micro and macro discourse analysis. These findings were compared and contrasted to the findings from the primary corpora. Downsampled articles with the lowest proportion of CQTs were analysed using predominantly micro discourse analytic tools; this is because only a small proportion of each article pertained to language issues. Only the section of the article that contained the CQTs was analysed using micro discourse tools; the remainder of the article was analysed using more macro tools in order to contextualise the CQT under investigation. The findings from these articles with low CQTs were also compared with the corpus findings.

This alternation between the examination of large-scale (i.e., entire corpora) and small-scale (i.e., downsampled) data sets was used to ensure the reliability of the findings (Baker, 2010: 139-141). In addition, the findings from the newspaper corpora were compared against findings from the International Corpus of English – Canada (ICE-CAN) (Newman and Columbus, 2010) and the findings from more recent newspaper articles in order to situate examples more broadly both diachronically (i.e., 2009 newspaper examples versus 2011 and 2012 newspaper examples) and generically (i.e., newspaper examples versus spoken and written data from other genres; see [ice-corpora.net/ice/design.htm](http://ice-corpora.net/ice/design.htm)). In sum, then, the analysis started with corpus linguistics procedures that were used to uncover and analyse frequency and statistical significance. The analysis proceeded with a combined corpus linguistics and micro discourse analysis approach to concordance lines, collocates and clusters. Next, micro and macro discourse analysis tools were used to study the downsampled articles, and then discourse analysis and corpus linguistics tools were combined to compare the

downsampled findings to the corpus findings as a whole. If and when needed, more corpus linguistics procedures were used and then followed by more discourse analytic procedures.

In general, the findings were considered in relation to the proposed schema of language ideologies and nationalism (see Table 3.1). In order to present the findings in a coherent fashion in relation to this framework, if they appeared to support a proposed language ideology or national discourse, these were presented within relevant chapters and subsections: Chapter Five presents findings on the Quebec discourses of national identity, Chapter Six presents English Canadian discourses of national identity, and Chapter Seven presents pan-Canadian discourses of national identity. However, if the findings do not appear to support a proposed language ideology or national discourse, or if no findings appear to support a proposed language ideology or national discourse, they are not overlooked. Rather, these findings (or lack thereof) are presented or noted either within the relevant chapter or in Chapter Eight, which summarises the findings and the proposed framework.

### **4.4 SUMMARY**

This chapter has presented the theoretical tenets and the practical applications of the C-CADS approach that was designed to study language ideologies and nationalism in Canadian newspapers. The rationales for the design and compilation of the corpora were also discussed. In the subsequent chapters, then, the findings that emerged from the application of this methodology will be presented according to the framework proposed in Chapter Three (Table 3.1). These findings highlight not only how language ideologies and nationalism are embedded in the Canadian news; they also indicate the extent to which cross-linguistic corpus-assisted discourse studies can be an invaluable approach to data.

# 5. DISCOURSES OF QUEBEC NATIONAL IDENTITY

## 5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter seeks to demonstrate how language ideologies and Quebec nationalism are embedded in Canadian newspapers. Before discussing the findings, it is useful to contextualise the data under examination. Perhaps unsurprisingly, most data concerning Quebec nationalism are drawn from newspapers in Quebec, namely, from the newspapers *La Presse*, *Le Devoir*, and *Le Soleil*. However, findings from other French Canadian newspapers (*Le Droit* from Ottawa and *L'Acadie Nouvelle* from Caraquet) are also used throughout this chapter for the sake of comparison, contrast, and comprehensive analysis. In addition, findings from the English primary corpus are often used for these same reasons. Nevertheless, newspaper articles from Quebec are the most central to this analysis since they comprise 70% of the 800 000-word French primary corpus. A brief overview of the French primary corpus can be achieved by surveying the keyword list, arranged according to keyness score, which was produced by comparing the primary corpus to the comparator corpus (see Table 5.1).

Positive key word	Frequency	% of words in corpus	Reference corpus frequency	% of words in reference corpus	Keyness score
FRANÇAIS	1149	0.147	1149	0.031	1243.38
FRANÇAISE	385	0.049	385	0.010	415.07
ANGLAIS	376	0.048	376	0.010	411.47
LANGUE	374	0.048	374	0.010	409.32
FRANCOPHONES	313	0.040	313		338.81
FRANCOPHONE	238	0.030	238		257.33
FRANCE	600	0.077	1266	0.035	224.33
ANGLOPHONES	189	0.024	189		204.76
FÊTE	439	0.056	896	0.024	176.08
SARKOZY	138	0.017	146		140.31
LANGUES	127	0.02	123		140.29
FRANCO	130	0.02	153		118.46
RADIO	353	0.05	782	0.02	118.25
CULTURE	302	0.04	624	0.02	118.06
MOLSON	243	0.03	469	0.01	108.89
QUÉBÉCOIS	692	0.09	2026	0.06	99.48
SPECTACLE	452	0.06	1183	0.03	96.52
PARIS	237	0.03	496	0.01	90.16
ANGLOPHONE	84	0.01	84		90.11
FRANCOPHONIE	83	0.01	83		89.04

**Table 5.1: Top twenty French keywords**

The top-ranked lexical keywords (such as *FRANÇAIS*, *FRANÇAISE*, *ANGLAIS*, *LANGUE*) are related to language issues and thus confirm the intended design of the corpus; that is, this is a corpus that is focused on language issues (see Section 4.3.2). Indeed, the presence of these keywords is unsurprising, since they were the query terms used to design the primary corpus (cf. Bayley and Bevitori, 2009: 83). Nonetheless, other top-ranked keywords (such as *FRANCE*, *FÊTE*, *QUÉBÉCOIS*, *SPECTACLE*) suggest the ways that languages or language issues may be discussed alongside other topics, such as nationalism. More details about these topics emerge from collocation analyses, which are included in the subsections of this chapter. For the moment, suffice it to say that an overview of keywords confirms that the data appear to be relevant to a study of language ideologies and nationalism in Canada.

In this chapter, findings are first presented on Quebec national identity (Section 5.2), then the four principal language ideologies. These language ideologies are argued to support the Quebec national discourse (see Section 3.1). The ideologies will be presented in terms of the four language ideologies identified in Chapter Three. Of course, not all findings corroborate evidence of the language ideologies, nor do all

findings indicate evidence of the Quebec national discourse. It is not suggested that the proposed language ideologies are ubiquitous in Quebec, nor that all newspapers necessarily contain evidence of the Quebec national discourse; these and other issues are discussed in Chapter Eight. Since the proposed language ideologies often overlap with one another in terms of the subject matter and topoi that are used in arguments, the sections used in this chapter should not indicate that each ideology is self-contained or unrelated to the other ideologies. Indeed, many examples provided for one type of language ideology may gainfully serve to demonstrate another, which is why, again, the findings should be considered cumulative. The objective of this chapter, then, is to determine the extent to which the language ideologies identified in Chapter Three exist in French-speaking Canada, how they differ, in which context(s) they tend to be focused, and their implications for nationhood.

## 5.2 QUEBEC NATIONALISM

Before delving into a discussion of language ideologies in support of Quebec nationalism, it is important to determine whether the Quebec national discourse appears to be salient in the French primary corpus, and if so, how the Quebec nation tends to be represented. The findings suggest that (1) Quebec is the nation most discussed in the newspapers, and (2) “national” statuses tend to be positively represented.

With regard to the first finding, the lemma *NATION* shows strong links to Quebec. The most frequent lexical collocate of *NATION* is *QUÉBÉCOISE* (13 occurrences), and references to *la nation québécoise* occur in all French Canadian newspapers. Many of these refer to the federal government’s (2006) recognition of “the Québécois nation” (Office of the Prime Minister, 2006a, b; see also Martin, 2007a, b). Also, the term *NATIONAL/E* also has strong strong links with Quebec and the French language rather than with Canada and the English language (see Table 5.2).

Collocater	Collocates with...	No. texts in which collocation occurs	Total collocations
FÊTE	nationale	69	206
QUÉBEC	nationale	20	26
QUÉBÉCOIS	nationale	12	15
QUÉBÉCOIS	national	13	14
CANADA	national	10	12
FRANÇAIS	nationale	10	11
FRANCE	nationale	10	10
LANGUE	nationale	6	9
QUÉBEC	national	6	8
CANADA	nationale	6	7
FRANÇAIS	national	6	6

**Table 5.2: Selected FPNC<sup>7</sup> collocates of NATIONAL/E**

The lemmas *NATIONAL* and *NATIONALE* collocate much more frequently with *QUÉBEC* (8 and 26 occurrences, respectively) and *QUÉBÉCOIS* (14 and 15 occurrences, respectively) than with *CANADA* (12 and 7 occurrences, respectively). In fact, *CANADIEN* and *CANADIENNE* do not collocate at all with *NATIONAL/E*, and *CANADA* collocates with *NATIONALE* just slightly more frequently than *FRANCE* (12 versus 10 occurrences). Also, *NATIONAL/E* collocates with *FRANÇAIS* (6 and 11 occurrences, respectively) but rarely with *ANGLAIS/E* (2 and 5 occurrences, respectively). The two collocations between *NATIONAL* and *ANGLAISE* refer to the British National Party, which is described as “the English version of the *Front National* that is more racist” (*la version anglaise du Front National en plus raciste*), and the five collocations between *NATIONALE* and *ANGLAIS* refer to a current debate over whether bands that sing in English should be allowed at Quebec’s French-language national holiday, known as the *Fête nationale*. The first of these collocations is irrelevant to discussions of language and nationalism in Quebec, and the second in fact discusses the place of English in the Quebec nation.

Collocation between *NATIONAL/E/S* and *CANADA* remains very low compared to collocation between *NATIONAL/E/S* and *QUÉBEC* (combined, 19 versus 40 occurrences). As a result, the numerous institutions associated with the nation in the French primary corpus (*ASSEMBLÉE/* Assembly, *LIGUE/* league, *COMITÉ/* committee, *SOCIÉTÉ/* society, *GOUVERNEMENT/* government, *COMMISSION,*

<sup>7</sup> “FPNC” refers to the “French Primary Newspaper Corpus” throughout.

*BANQUE*/ bank, *FÉDÉRATION*) would arguably refer to institutions of Quebec, thus endowing Quebec with the semantic preference for words connoting an independent nation-state (cf. Freake *et al.*, 2011: 32). Indeed, more *GOUVERNEMENT* collocates of *NATIONALE* refer to either the Quebec provincial government (3 occurrences), or to the government of France (2 occurrences) rather than to Canada (1 occurrence). In sum, *NATIONALE* collocates with *QUÉBEC* 26 times, *FRANCE* ten times, and *CANADA* only seven times. While there are numerous references to Canadian national institutions, such as the “National Hockey League”/ *la Ligue nationale de hockey* (16 occurrences), the “National Arts Centre”/ *Centre national des arts* (13 occurrences), and “National Defence”/ *la Défense nationale* (5 occurrences), there are few references to Canada as a nation apart from the names of these institutions. Thus, frequency and collocation trends suggest that discussions of the nation tend to be focused on Quebec and linked to the French language, even if peripheral mention is made of France and Canada.

With regard to the second finding, “national” statuses appear to be positively represented in the French primary corpus. Although this may not be immediately apparent from a collocate list of the lemma *NATION*, further in-depth qualitative analysis suggests that national status brings with it connotations of prestige and empowerment. The qualitative analysis in this case began with the exploration of the lexical collocate of *NATION*: *INNUE* (5 occurrences). The only lexical collocates of *NATION* are *QUÉBÉCOISE* (13 occurrences), *PETITE* (5 occurrences), *INNUE* (5 occurrences) and the English words *FAST* and *FOOD* (5 occurrences, each) (the latter referring to Schlosser’s (2002) book *Fast Food Nation*). In comparison with the other collocates, then, the word *INNUE* is unusual because it occurs so rarely in the French primary corpus – only 16 times (cf. the English term *FOOD*, which occurs 23 times in the French corpus).

The Innu are an aboriginal people of Labrador and northern Quebec. They became the subject of several news stories when their welfare was debated on both sides of the Atlantic in response to criticisms launched by a Nobel Prize-winning French author, Jean-Marie Gustave Le Clézio. In 2009, Le Clézio argued that the Innu “tribe” would be negatively affected by new energy projects planned by Hydro-

Québec. A Quebec government-owned utility and a national institution associated with the success, competence and dynamism of the Quebec nation, Hydro-Québec became an historic triumph in 1960s Quebec since it enabled Quebecers to achieve economic emancipation from anglophone dominance (Desbiens, 2004: 105; McRoberts, 1997: 33). Indeed, Ignatieff (1994: 113) argues that Quebec’s nationalisation of its hydroelectric resources in 1962 was “the first major economic step in its drive to become a state within a state in the Canadian confederation”. Today, Hydro-Québec continues to symbolise national self-sufficiency, international status, and is as a result “as important a constituent of Quebec’s national pride as the Aswan Dam was to Nasser’s Egypt” (Ignatieff, 1994: 113). The defence of Hydro-Québec is thus at least to some extent intertwined with Quebec’s national self-interest.

Le Clézio criticised Hydro-Québec for its expansions that would negatively affect the Innu “tribe”. Journalists explicitly deride the portrayal of the Innu as a dispossessed “tribe” suffering under the hands of a coloniser, and instead portray the Innu as a modern and empowered “nation” (see Table 5.3).

<p>omme vient de l’apprendre l’écrivain, <b>la nation innue</b> ayant décidé de se rallier  ssaie de dire que tous les membres de <b>la nation innue</b> se rallient au projet. “Ill  logique» qui privera d’un «seul coup» <b>la nation innue</b> «de son lieu de vie». L’ar  e écologique», mais qui privera aussi <b>la nation innue</b> de «son milieu de vie».J  el tirer.Faut-il d’abord signaler que <b>la nation</b> - et non la “tribu” - <b>innue</b> n’a</p>
---

**Table 5.3: FPNC concordance lines with NATION and INNUE**

The implication of this label is that the Innu are not in need of defence. In other words, by giving the Innu an empowering label like “nation”, the journalists eliminate the basis for their need of defence and thus defend the national interests (i.e., Hydro-Québec).

References to the Innu “tribe” only appear within inverted commas. This suggests that journalists use quotation strategies to distance themselves from Le Clézio’s comments – if not to highlight Le Clézio’s erroneous and anachronistic discursive idealisation of the First Nations as a “tribe” (see Examples 5.1 and 5.2).



**Example 5.1**

This 2008 Nobel Prize-winning author considers that Hydro-Québec, a “major capitalist multinational”, is prompting an “ecological disaster”. And this, after having swindled the “Innu tribe” who were apparently incapable of discerning its true interests, and who thus fell victim to “industrial civilization” and the “modern technocratic world”.

*Le Prix Nobel de littérature (2008) estime qu’Hydro-Québec, une “multinationale caractéristique du grand capitalisme”, déclenche un “désastre écologique”. Et ce, après avoir floué la “tribu innue” visiblement incapable de discerner son véritable intérêt, devenant ainsi victime de la “civilisation industrielle” et du “monde technocratique moderne”.*

(Roy, 2009)

**Example 5.2**

On Thursday, in an open letter published in the prestigious French daily, Mr. Le Clézio denounced the “monstrous project” of Hydro-Québec. The new dams will “annihilate the better part of the river” and will deprive the Innu “Indian tribe” of its home environment, he wrote.

*Dans une lettre ouverte publiée par le prestigieux quotidien français, jeudi, M. Le Clézio dénonce le “monstrueux projet” d’Hydro-Québec. Les barrages “anéantiront la plus grande partie de la rivière” et priveront de son milieu de vie la “tribu indienne” des Innus, écrit-il.*

(Croteau, 2009)

According to Cotter (2010: 148-9), newspaper quotes serve to summarise or illustrate points or to “bring other voices to the fore” and “add ‘color’”. Arguably, then, the journalists use quotes to highlight certain colourful components of Le Clézio’s argument. Since these highlighted components are largely inaccurate with regard to contemporary understandings of Aboriginal people in Canada, these can be considered “scare quotes” (see Section 4.2.2.2), used by journalists in order to

distance and dissociate themselves from the content of the quotes (Simpson, 1993: 142). In this case, the scare quotes seem to be used to illustrate Le Clézio's misconception of the Innu, thus serving to discredit his defence of Innu rights altogether.

Other journalists in *Le Devoir* use quotation strategies to illustrate precise parts of Le Clézio's argument – specifically, these tend to be parts of the argument that are debatable, if not demonstrably untrue. For example, *Le Devoir* journalist Michel Dolbec uses quotes to surmise and at the same time illustrate the extreme inaccuracies in Le Clézio's argument. Dolbec (2009) cites Le Clézio as saying that the “destruction of the La Romaine river” would “in one fell swoop” deprive the Innu nation of “its way of life” (*Pour Le Clézio, la “destruction de la rivière La Romaine” sera clairement une “catastrophe écologique” qui privera d’un “seul coup” la nation innue “de son lieu de vie”*). The implication in all these cases is that Le Clézio's criticism of Hydro-Québec is baseless because his conceptualisation of the Innu and their way of life is misinformed. Indeed, the Innu are no longer solely dependent on the river for their way of life; to assume otherwise, as journalist Mario Roy points out, is pure “rural folklore” and “condescending Rousseauism” (*comme une courtepointe de folklore rural, de banalité pseudo-rebelle et de rousseauisme condescendant tricotée tellement serré qu’on ne trouve plus le fil sur lequel tirer/* “like a counterpoint of rural folklore, of pseudo-rebellious banality, and of condescending Rousseauism knitted so tightly that one can no longer find the strand on which to pull”). Rather than being a “tribe” and rejecting modernity, Roy argues that this nation is “far from [...] powerless”, “works hard in negotiation processes and public relations” and, moreover, aboriginal nations in Quebec have already demonstrated their ability to “skilfully profit” from similar projects (see Example 5.3).

### Example 5.3

Is it necessary to first show that the true calling of the Innu nation – and not the Innu “tribe” – is not providing picturesqueness for the white man? (Ah, the “sacred river” and its “wildlife”, its “berry picking” and its “medicinal plants”...)? That this nation, far from

being powerless, works hard in negotiation processes and public relations, including those in the United States and in France? That it is not tucked into folklore and does not resolutely reject modernity? That in Quebec other aboriginal nations have, in the past, known how to skilfully profit from the outcome of projects similar to that of the Romaine?

*Faut-il d'abord signaler que la nation - et non la "tribu" - innue n'a pas pour vocation première de fournir à l'homme blanc du pittoresque (Ah! La "rivière sacrée" et son "gibier", ses "baies pour la collecte" et ses "plantes médicinales"...)? Que cette nation, loin d'être impuissante, se débrouille fort bien dans la négociation et la relation publique, y compris aux États-Unis et en France? Qu'elle n'est pas, elle, repliée sur le folklore et ne rejette pas en bloc la modernité? Qu'au Québec, d'autres nations autochtones ont, par le passé, su brillamment profiter des retombées de projets comparables à celui de la Romaine?*

(Roy, 2009)

This editorialist's argument is certainly problematic – for example, Roy equates one indigenous group with another and takes for granted that indigenous groups have real operable power in society; however, it is not the objective here to explore these issues. Rather, the goal here is to highlight how the articles come to the defence of a national institution that is of great importance to the Quebec economy as well as to Quebec identity. Indeed, part of editorialist Roy's argument is that Hydro-Québec is beyond criticism – it is not a “multinational capitalist corporation” but a “state-owned corporation” that is the “entirely the property of the Quebec population” (*Hydro-Québec n'est pas exactement une multinationale capitaliste, mais plutôt une société d'état, entière propriété de la population québécoise*). The implication in Roy's argument is that since the Innu form part of the Quebec population, Hydro-Québec belongs to the Innu nation, too.

Because the Innu are explicitly re-labelled a “nation” by journalists, it would seem that the term “nation” has positive connotations of empowerment. This re-labelling

strategy also serves to legitimise the current hydro project (which, since it is part of the successful nationalist institution, ultimately benefit Quebecers nationally both materially and symbolically), because it presumes that the Innu, as an empowered nation, are fully capable of managing their own affairs and agreements with Hydro-Québec. These examples have also suggested some tension between Quebec and France both in the form of Quebec's resistance to French criticism and through Quebec journalists' emphasis on the misinformation about aboriginal people that evidently circulates in France. Since Quebec's national identity is constructed in part through opposition to France (see Section 3.1), this further indicates alignment with the Quebec national discourse. Finally, although there is recognition of the Innu as a nation – which is notable due to the rarity of other “nations” being discussed in the French primary corpus – it appears that this may simply be collateral on the part of the Quebec national discourse. In other words, the Innu are discursively constructed as an empowered nation in the French primary corpus, which allows Quebec to legitimise the maintenance of one of its national corporations.

Thus, the newspaper articles that describe the Innu as a “nation” appear to support Quebec nationalism and the socioeconomic hegemony of the Quebecois by discrediting the pro-Innu position of Le Clézio. According to van Dijk (1991: 39), discrediting advocates of minority groups is a tactic used all too often in newspapers to maintain the status quo of the dominant ethnic group. In sum, the term “nation” serves as a “topos of name interpretation” to rebut Le Clézio's criticisms. This topos relies on the understanding that if something is named X, it carries (or should carry) the qualities, traits, or attributes contained in the (literal meaning) of X (Wodak, 2001a: 75). Thus, the positive connotations of the term “nation” enable journalists to (1) demonstrate and emphasise awareness of the modern-day status and needs of the Innu, (2) discredit others who erroneously label them as a “tribe”, which serves to (3) protect the national interests through the legitimisation of Hydro-Québec. As a result, while a “tribal” status is associated with disempowerment and vulnerability, a “national” status, such as that of Quebec, is a positive attribute and a symbol of empowerment.

This section has overviewed references to nations and nationalism in the French primary corpus and has found that Quebec is the nation most often discussed in the newspapers and “nations” tend to be positively represented. Since Quebec nationalism appears to be present in the data, we will now turn to the language ideologies that support this version of nationalism.

### 5.3 MONOLINGUAL IDEOLOGIES

In the Quebec national discourse, Quebec is constructed as a “predominantly French” society. One of the ways in which this is achieved is through actively associating Quebec with the French language. As clearly stated in the Charter of the French Language, French is the “normal and everyday” language of Quebec (*Charter of the French language*, R.S.Q. c. C-11 [hereinafter Charter], preamble). Indeed, one of the recurring trends in the Quebec national movement is the emphasis that is continually placed on the role of the French language in Quebec society (Oakes and Warren, 2007; Pagé and Georgeault, 2006). In the French newspapers, this emphasis can in fact be shown to be salient: over a three-week period, 15.9% of all newspaper articles contained references to language, compared to half that number (7.86%) in English. These numbers suggest that during that period language issues were given considerably more emphasis in French than they were in English. Indeed, when we look at the frequencies of specific words within the French primary corpus, we can see that French is clearly the language in question (*FRANÇAIS*, 1149 occurrences; *FRANÇAISE*, 385 occurrences); English – the only other language occurring in significant numbers in the French primary corpus – is mentioned only a fraction of the number of times (*ANGLAIS*, 376 occurrences) (see Table 5.4).

Word	Frequency	% of words in corpus	Occurrence in no. of texts in corpus	% of texts in corpus
FRANÇAIS	1149	0.147	661	47.3
FRANÇAISE	385	0.049	292	20.9
ANGLAIS	376	0.048	271	19.4
LANGUE	374	0.048	213	15.2

**Table 5.4: Language frequencies in the FPNC**

In the French primary corpus, references to *QUÉBEC* and *QUÉBÉCOIS* are more frequent than references to *CANADA* and *CANADIEN* (1621 and 692 occurrences versus 1025 and 471 occurrences, respectively). Notably, *QUÉBEC* frequently collocates with *FRANÇAIS/E* (43 occurrences) and concordance lines demonstrate that the link between these terms can take various forms (see Table 5.5).

<p>our préserver et promouvoir le caractère français du Québec, quand on sait que l'our préserver et promouvoir le caractère français du Québec quand on sait que leucidité. (La fatigue politique du Québec français) en proposant à son parti de acclamé, La Fatigue politique du Québec français (Boréal, 2008), lance, après a du groupe Lake of Stew, criant «Québec français», alors que d'autres o ier rang de la lutte pour un Québec plus français, mais les temps ont bien chang vancer que le Québec souverain sera plus français ne signifie aucunement que la bannissement."Au Québec, ça se passe en français", tel est le mot d'ordre des g on, de 12h à 20h30, Hommage au Québec en français sur des rythmes du monde entie dans la langue officielle du Québec: le français. Il faut donc profiter des 23 ur diriger la métropole du Québec, où le français a le statut de seule langue of 'est la fête nationale des Québécois. Au Québec, la langue française est LA lang à "promouvoir l'usage et la qualité du français au Québec dans le cadre de cer pour promouvoir l'usage et la qualité du français au Québec. Caractère francophon 2,5 millions de personnes qui parlent le français à l'extérieur du Québec. Sans ngton, croit que tout parallèle entre le français au Québec et l'espagnol aux à0 les idées, ou presque, pour renforcer le français au Québec (le français comme c pour l'avenir de la langue française au Québec - c'est aussi le cas en France - t une menace pour la langue française au Québec, pensent 57 % des francophones, ngue française, elle permet notamment au Québec de se faire entendre à l'échelle ngue française, elle permet notamment au Québec de se faire entendre à l'échelle épanouissement de la langue française au Québec, selon M. Gagnon, est semblable e la situation de la langue française au Québec, selon lui. Les anglophones se co pour l'avenir de la langue française au Québec, le Canada n'en est pas sa menac pour l'avenir de la langue française au Québec - on le fait en France -, le Can à cette réalité. La langue française au Québec et, plus généralement, la cultur plus que sur le Québec, pour défendre le français dans les forums internationaux lture unique... Le reste du Québec parle français, ne laissons pas une ville (Mo</p>
---

**Table 5.5: FPNC concordance lines with FRANÇAIS/E and QUÉBEC**

Some concordance lines attest to the French character of Quebec (*le caractère français du Québec*, 2 occurrences), or simply refer to “French Quebec” (*Québec français*, 3 occurrences). Other concordance lines (2 occurrences) highlight the goal of making Quebec more French. Still other concordance lines (6 occurrences) highlight activities taking place in French, the official status of the French language in Quebec, or use Quebec as a metonymy for the French-speaking people of Quebec (“The rest of Quebec speaks French”/ *Le reste du Québec parle français*). The dominant trend (14 occurrences), however, is simply to locate the French language and its use in geographic relation to Quebec (e.g. “the French language in Quebec”/ *la langue française au Québec*). These collocation trends may be evidence of Quebec monolingual language ideologies.

Quebec monolingual language ideologies may also be present in examples where there are collocations between *QUÉBEC/QUÉBÉCOIS* and *FÊTE NATIONALE* (national holiday) (23 and 21 occurrences, respectively) (see Table 5.6).

ent en anglais et aussi en <b>français</b> à <b>la Fête</b> nationale, ont confirmé ensemble p s qui chantent en <b>français</b> le jour de <b>la Fête</b> nationale". La participation des d s qui chantent en <b>français</b> le jour de <b>la Fête</b> nationale", a affirmé Mathieu Bout e passer en <b>français</b> , puisqu'elle est <b>la fête</b> des Québécois, dont la langue offi Fête nationale des Québécois.C'était <b>la fête</b> du fait <b>français</b> au Canada. On dis
<b>La Fête</b> nationale en <b>français</b> seulement?L'e <b>La Fête</b> nationale en <b>français</b> seulement?L'e
n'aurait osé prétendre le contraire. <b>La fête</b> se fêtait en <b>français</b> , point. Les r intolérants ceux qui souhaitent que <b>la fête</b> nationale se déroule en <b>français</b> .
Saint-Jean qui, historiquement, était <b>la fête des Canadiens français</b> et personne rançais, et qu'elle était à l'origine <b>la fête des Canadiens français</b> , ont plaidé décréter un congé férié pour célébrer <b>la fête des Canadiens français</b> ? Comme tous
'est la fête des "séparatisses".C'est <b>la fête des Canadiens français</b> , Fernand.Ce cois, et il a fait désigner le 24juin <b>la fête des Canadiens français</b> , et non des çais au Canada. On disait que c'était <b>la fête des Canadiens français</b> . Célébrer l
nalisme québécois. Autrefois, c'était <b>la fête des Canadiens français</b> , où qu'ils qui était normal en 1974, du temps de <b>la fête des Canadiens français</b> , est devenu
a alors vraiment dire qu'il s'agit de <b>la fête de tous les Canadiens français</b> . Ce e bon vieux temps où le 24 juin était <b>la fête de tous les Canadiens français</b> .Ne

**Table 5.6: FPNC concordance lines linking FÊTE with FRANÇAIS**

While the majority of these instances refer systematically to *la fête nationale du Québec* (“Quebec’s national holiday”, 20 occurrences) or to *la fête [nationale] [de tous les/des] Québécois* (“the [national] holiday of [all] Quebecers”, 16 occurrences), many concordance lines also frequently discuss the debate over whether the national festivities should take place in French – and only French. As argued by a contributor to the op-ed section of *La Presse* (June 19, 2009), “the national holiday celebrates the distinctive nature of Quebec in North America, that is, its French character” (*la Fête nationale voulait célébrer la marque distinctive du Québec en Amérique du Nord, c’est-à-dire son caractère français*). Indeed, French is argued to be a defining feature of the St. Jean Baptiste holiday. Some examples (3 occurrences) underscore the use of French on the national day (*en français [à/le jour de] la fête nationale/* “in French [on/the day of] the national holiday”), and others (4 occurrences) emphasise French as an attribute of the national holiday (*la fête [nationale] + [process] + en français/* “the [national] holiday + [process] + in French).

Another dominant trend (10 occurrences) is to refer to the holiday as one for all French Canadians – rather than one simply for Quebecers. This suggests the linguistic nature of the celebration, or perhaps the fact that in reality the celebration extends beyond Quebec (*la fête [de tous les/des] Canadiens français*). Indeed, some

would argue that St. Jean Baptiste is not really a Quebec holiday; rather, it is a holiday for French Canadians (see Example 5.4).

**Example 5.4**

June 24 was not, at its origins, the national holiday of the Québécois. It was the celebration of the French fact in Canada. It was the celebration of French Canadians. Celebrating the French language, its survival, and its struggles is the first reason for observing Saint-Jean Baptiste.

*Le 24 juin n'était pas, à l'origine, la Fête nationale des Québécois. C'était la fête du fait français au Canada. On disait que c'était la fête des Canadiens français. Célébrer la langue française, sa survivance, ses luttes est la première raison d'être de la Saint-Jean-Baptiste.*

(Lefebvre, 2009)

In sum, then, collocates and concordance lines suggest a representation of the French language that is so central to Quebec nationalism that Quebec is often presented as the epicentre of all things “French” in Canada. This is unsurprising given that, as Heller (2003c: 67) has argued, the power of Quebec is “predicated on its claim to being the only legitimate representative of francophone interests [in Canada]”.

Quebec’s role as the centre of French Canada is evident not only in the frequency of specific words and their collocations; its role can also be made evident through the discourse analysis of downsampled articles. One of the four articles downsampled from the French primary corpus provides a useful site for explicating monolingual language ideologies in greater detail (see Appendix 8 for entire article). “Full bilingue” (Rioux, 2009), an article downsampled using the procedures outlined in Section 4.3.3, discusses the Quebec Premier’s visit to Brussels for an international conference on the environment. While there, Jean Charest gave a speech half in French and half in English, which the journalist criticises throughout the article. Overall, the journalist’s position is that the Prime Minister of Quebec should speak French unless an audience’s lack of fluency in French makes it necessary for him to speak another language. The topoi underlying his argument are that, first, French is



the official language of Quebec, and second, Quebec must not only defend, but advocate and promote the use of French in international forums.

The first topos is supported by several references. Rioux refers to Law 101 (the Charter of the French Language), which begins with the declaration that French is the official language of Quebec (*Charter*, preamble) (see Section 3.2). Rioux also notes that Quebec has only one official language – French (*une province dont l'unique langue officielle est le français*/ “a province wherein the only official language is French”). Rioux clarifies that the Premier should not be reproached every time he speaks English when it is necessary; on the contrary, the Premier should speak English any time his audience does not understand French (*chaque fois que cela est nécessaire*/ “every time it is necessary”; *chaque fois que son auditoire ne comprend pas le français*/ “every time his audience does not understand French”). However, his position is that since, in this case, the Premier was in Brussels – a city with a higher percentage of francophones than Montreal – when he gave his bilingual speech, and because there was simultaneous translation available, Charest had no need to speak English. According to Rioux, the English and French languages should be kept separate and used separately rather than be interwoven with one another in speeches. This interweaving of languages Rioux labels “speaking bilingual” (*le bilingue*): an “exotic language that is spoken nowhere apart from in small corners of Ottawa” (*langue exotique qui n'est parlée que dans certains quartiers d'Ottawa: le bilingue*/ “exotic language that is only spoken in certain parts of Ottawa: bilingual). Furthermore, Rioux implies that if Charest is to speak English, let it be only English (*anglais, et anglais seulement*), rather than a mix with French. Since Rioux’s position seems to be that French should be pure and separate from English, these statements indicate the existence of “monolingualizing” (Heller, 1995: 374, 1999a: 160) standard language ideologies (or what Kulyk, [2010: 84] calls the “ideology of purity”), and moreover a rejection of societal bilingualism (see Section 3.2.1). Suffice it to say for the moment that the French language – and moreover a pure variety of French – should be promoted by the Premier of Quebec.

The second topos that underlies many of Rioux’s arguments is one of “defence”. In other words, Rioux’s argument relies on an understanding that because French is language of Quebec, it must be defended and promoted. Indeed, his thesis seems to

be that if Quebec doesn't defend the French language, then no one will (*Si le Québec ne présente pas un visage essentiellement français dans les organisations internationales chaque fois qu'il le peut, on se demande bien qui le fera à sa place/* "If Quebec does not show an essentially French face in international organisations every time it can, we should ask who will do it instead"). There are two explicit calls to the defence of French (*défendre la place du français parmi les grandes langues internationales/* "defend the place of French among the big international languages"; *défendre le français dans les forums internationaux/* "defend French in international forums"), and the article begins with a reference to Jacques Chirac, former French President, who walked out of a conference in the European Union in protest over the use of English. This defence of French could also be viewed in terms of its call for linguistic purity, since Rioux so adamantly condemns the use of "speaking bilingual" (*le bilingue*). Since bilingualism – both personal and societal – is a hallmark of pan-Canadian nationalism, and since inter-sentential French-English codeswitching is commonplace for federal politicians, Rioux's arguments serve to reject pan-Canadianism too.

Rioux uses rhetorical devices, such as questions, as contextualisation cues to position himself alongside the readership, to serve as persuasion tools, and to cast doubt on the actions of politicians and on the future of French (cf. Frank, 1990; Goffman, 1976: 286; Gumperz, e.g. 2001: 221). The article begins with a question: "Who remembers the wonderful gesture Jacques Chirac made a few years ago?" (*Qui se souvient du beau geste qu'avait fait le président Jacques Chirac il y a quelques années?*) With such a question, Rioux appeals to his readers; a similar tactic occurs mid-way through the article with the disclaimer "Don't get me wrong" (*Qu'on me comprenne bien*). In this colloquial way, Rioux is speaking both with the people (using colloquial forms to appeal to a shared understanding with the readership) and for the people (as a journalist with an important place in the intelligentsia, see Pritchard *et al.*, 2005). This is also achieved through Rioux's positioning as a journalist for a Quebec newspaper, and thus someone with Quebec-based interests including concerns over language endangerment (cf. Harré on positioning, e.g. 2001: 696-7). The other questions use similar positioning and rhetorical strategies and serve two functions: first, to question Jean Charest as an adequate leader for a

French-speaking people, and second, to question the current status of French (see Examples 5.5-5.8).

**Example 5.5**

But what reason did he have to do this [speak English] in a francophone city like Brussels, where his audience was largely francophone [...], simultaneous translation was available, and the majority of the participants spoke French?

*Mais quelle raison avait-il d'agir ainsi dans une ville francophone comme Bruxelles, alors que l'auditoire était largement francophone [...], que la traduction simultanée était disponible et que la plupart des conférenciers s'exprimaient en français?*

**Example 5.6**

Should we count on the Catalans more than Quebec from now on to defend French in international forums?

*Faudra-t-il dorénavant compter sur les Catalans, plus que sur le Québec, pour défendre le français dans les forums internationaux?*

**Example 5.7**

Why should *la Francophonie* [the international organization] continue to, for example, spend millions on training francophone civil servants in the European Union and at the United Nations?

*Pourquoi la Francophonie continuerait-elle, par exemple, à dépenser des millions pour former des fonctionnaires francophones dans l'Union européenne et à l'ONU?*

**Example 5.8**

Should we from now on count on Catalans... or on the Greeks?

*Faudra-t-il dorénavant compter sur les Catalans ... ou sur les Grecs?*

In sum, Rioux recognises the fact that English must often be spoken in international forums such as the one attended by Jean Charest. However, he also argues that French must be defended as one of the dominant international languages. In other words, his call is not to defend French against English in Quebec, but rather to defend French against English in international forums. Implicit in this message is the

desire to promote Quebec's interests (which include the integrity of the French language) in the international context (see also Section 5.5).

Examples from other articles focus more specifically on French as an attribute unique to Quebec within the Canadian context. One article (Polèse, 2009) argues that if Quebec were an independent state, it would no longer engage with the linguistic affairs of the rest of Canada, and hence linguistic minorities would suffer from the lack of support of Quebec (see Example 5.9).

### Example 5.9

Thirty years ago, it was thought that the Acadians would disappear no matter what, but they are still there. It is unlikely, in my opinion, that French would remain an official language in Canada without Quebec.

*Il y a 30 ans, on pouvait penser que les Acadiens allaient de toute manière disparaître; ils sont toujours là. Il est peu probable, selon moi, que le français restera comme langue officielle dans un Canada sans Québec.*

(Polèse, 2009)

This article casts doubt on the strength of minorities in Canada without Quebec. This is achieved using comparatives (negatives such as “can no longer”/ *ne pourront plus*), modal verbs and modality (such as “can”/ *pouvoir*; “it is unlikely”/ *il est peu probable*), futures (such as “will remain”/ *restera*), and more large-scale comparisons between Acadians/francophone minorities and Quebec. As a result, this article presents Quebec's role as central to how Canada defines itself: without Quebec, Canada would be a different country altogether, and without Quebec, Canada (implied: “English”) would not be able to sustain francophone linguistic minorities.

Indeed, Quebec is often presented as both a defining feature and the exception to the Canadian rule – the site of difference from the “rest of Canada”. The distinction between Quebec and the rest of Canada is predominantly made in terms of linguistic differentiation. The distinction can take place either explicitly and implicitly. In

explicit terms, *ANGLAIS* collocates more with *CANADA* (24 occurrences) than with *QUÉBEC* (12 occurrences) in the French primary corpus, with 20 references to *Canada anglais*. In the English primary corpus, too, *ENGLISH* collocates more with *CANADA*, *CANADIAN* and *CANADIANS* (18, 8, and 5 occurrences, respectively) than with *QUEBEC* and *QUEBECERS*, and *QUEBECER* is not a collocate at all (14, 3, and 0 occurrences, respectively). There are also three references to “English-speaking Canadians” and only one reference to “English-speaking Quebecers” in the English primary corpus (see Table 5.7).

's time to step it up.How many English-speaking <b>Canadians</b> sp sp. The primary legal ideal of English-speaking <b>Canadians</b> is niable: Right up to the 1960s, English-speaking <b>Canadians</b> al " Almost everybody agreed that English-speaking <b>Quebecers</b> we
--

**Table 5.7: EPNC<sup>8</sup> concordance lines with ENGLISH-SPEAKING and CANAD\***

These instances suggest that in both the English and French newspapers, the “Frenchness” of Quebec and Quebecers is sometimes explicitly contrasted with the “Englishness” of Canada and Canadians.

However, the linguistic distinction between Quebec and the Canada is often inexplicit. Kymlicka (1998: 10), for example, has noted that the phrase “the rest of Canada” is often implied to mean “English-speaking Canada”. In a similar way, Heller (1999b: 15) also notes that French Ontarians and Acadians tend to be referred to as francophones in “the rest of Canada”, or in short form the “ROC”, indicating again their isolated status in an implied English-speaking territory outside of Quebec. The French primary corpus shows clear evidence for these observations (see Tables 5.8 and 5.9). Items are often linguistically indexed through reference to their location “outside Quebec” (*hors Québec*) or in the “rest of Canada” (*le reste du Canada*). For example, there are numerous references to francophones “outside Quebec”: the term *HORS* (“outside”) has only *QUÉBEC*, *COMMUN*, and *FRANCOPHONES* as lexical collocates (17, 9, and 5 occurrences, respectively). Although not all differences between Quebec and Canada are implied to be linguistic, many concordance lines show that language or linguistic features are used to highlight distinctions.

<sup>8</sup> “EPNC” refers to the “English Primary Newspaper Corpus” throughout.

Sommes (en millions) Québec // 517 Canada (hors Québec) // 553 Etats-Unis // 487  
 ombre (en millions) Québec // 3425 Canada (hors Québec) // 1699 Etats-Unis // 1013  
 également que 36 % des **Canadiens anglais (hors Québec)** pensent que le Québec sera  
 également que 36 % des **Canadiens anglais hors Québec** croient que la province ser  
 explique sans doute que 62% des **Canadiens hors-Québec** affichent un unifolié sur l  
 erté est à son comble: 93% des **Canadiens hors-Québec** affirment que leur pays est  
 says; c'est le cas d'à peine un **Canadien hors-Québec** sur 10. Presque huit Québécois  
 nnes pour démontrer que les **francophones hors-Québec** pouvaient réussir à l'intér  
 ssés. Beaucoup plus que les **francophones hors Québec** et beaucoup plus que les an  
 ous étouffe, qui écrase les **francophones hors Québec** et qui néglige ses obligati  
 es Québécois, Acadiens, des **francophones hors Québec** et des Autochtones, est à

**Table 5.8: FPNC concordance lines with HORS QUÉBEC**

e d'avoir davantage de résonance dans **le reste du Canada** qu'au **Québec**. L'argumen  
 rvenir pour protéger le **français** dans **le reste du Canada**. Les **Acadiens** et les au  
 rvenir pour protéger le **français** dans **le reste du Canada**. Les **Acadiens** et autres  
 ns les autres provinces. Les PPP dans **le reste du Canada** se portent bien, et ce,  
 io (et dans toutes les grandes villes **du reste du Canada**) ainsi que dans la gran  
 rsque les tensions entre le **Québec** et **le reste du Canada** sont élevées. Là encore  
 les partisans dans tout le **Québec** et **le reste du Canada** était sacré. Ils vont e  
 ortie d'une offre de partenariat avec **le reste du Canada**, soit la question du ré  
 longtemps le gouvernement fédéral et **le reste du Canada** ont compris que les deu  
 alogue politique de longue durée avec **le reste du Canada** et au premier chef, ave  
 activité du **Québec** pour les étudiants du **reste du Canada**."La différence de rémun

**Table 5.9: FPNC concordance lines with RESTE DU CANADA**

In a similar fashion, Quebec's "Frenchness" is often juxtaposed with other areas where French monolingualism is not the norm – including multilingual Montreal. The latter's multilingualism is contrasted against the implied monolingual French nature of the "rest of Quebec", as can be seen in the following two examples that were drawn from expanded concordance lines (see Examples 5.10 and 5.11).

**Example 5.10**

The rest of Quebec speaks French, let's not let one city (Montreal) change what is a given in the rest of the province [...] One city doesn't make a province.

*Le reste du Québec parle français, ne laissons pas une ville (Montréal) changer la donne pour le reste de la province [...] Une ville ne fait pas la province.*

(Proulx, 2009)

**Example 5.11**

According to the Leger Marketing survey carried out by the Association of Canadian Studies, 87% of francophones find that 'the French language is threatened in Montreal'. More surprising, 43% believe that this is also the case in the rest of Quebec.

*Selon le sondage de Léger Marketing effectué à la demande de l'Association d'études canadiennes, 87 % des francophones estiment que "la langue française est menacée à Montréal". Plus étonnant, 43 % croient que c'est également le cas dans le reste du Québec.*

(David, 2009)

These examples show how Quebec is sometimes contrasted with the rest of Canada, even if the formulaic repetition of "the rest of Canada" reinforces that Quebec does indeed comprise part of Canada. This supports the argument that Quebec's identity is often defined in opposition to English-speaking Canada (see e.g. Conlogue, 2002: 56; Paquot, 1997: 87). More importantly, these explicit and implicit contrasts construe Quebec as a predominantly monolingual society.

To conclude this section on monolingual ideologies, the corpus shows three dominant trends: (1) a semantic preference for *QUÉBEC* lemmas (*QUÉBEC*, *QUÉBÉCOIS/E/S*) to collocate with "French" lemmas (*FRANÇAIS/E/S*), (2) an implication that Quebec is the epicentre of "Frenchness" in Canada, and (3) a reliance on implied linguistic profiles of Quebec and Canada (through references to "outside Quebec" and "the rest of Canada"). The existence of monolingual ideologies was also supported by findings from one of the downsampled articles (Rioux, 2009). Combined, these trends begin to suggest the ways in which Quebec has become naturalised as a monolingual, French-speaking nation.

#### **5.4 IDEOLOGIES OF LANGUAGE AS A CORE VALUE**

The previous section demonstrated how the French language is deeply entrenched in discussions of a monolingual Quebec. This section builds on these findings and argues that the French language also serves as a core value of the Quebec nation. In other words, the French language serves not only as the accepted and endorsed dominant language of communication in Quebec (i.e., monolingualism), it also serves as a fundamental component of Quebec's culture and value system. Although this role is not always expressly stated or acknowledged, it is suggested through frequency and collocation trends and through the topoi of a downsampled article. This section will present three dominant findings: first, dominant identity labels in

the French primary corpus; second, value-laden attributions and ownership; and third, topoi that presume the cultural value of the French language.

As discussed in Section 3.1, Quebec national identity emerged in the 1960s out of French Canadian identity. While French Canadian identity focused on the pillars of faith, race, and language (see Section 3.2), Quebec identity rejected race (ethnicity) and the Church, focusing primarily on the role of the French language as a unifying element of the nation – not simply a means of communication, but a symbol of identity and destiny (Beauchemin, 2006: 132). Heller and Labrie (2003) have argued that this “traditionalist” discourse of French Canadian identity is still in circulation in some parts of Canada. Indeed, collocation trends in the French primary corpus do show that *CANADA* and *CANADIEN/NE/S* often collocate with *FRANÇAIS/E* through references to the identity label *CANADIEN FRANÇAIS* (“French Canadian”) (see Table 5.10).

Collocate	Collocates with...	No. texts in which collocation occurs	Total collocations
FRANÇAIS	canadiens	27	37
FRANÇAIS	canadien	11	12
FRANÇAISE	canadienne	9	9

**Table 5.10: FPNC collocations between FRANÇAIS/E and CANADIEN/NE/S**

Still, references to “French Canadian” are less frequent than other identity labels, such as the geolinguistic identity labels *QUÉBÉCOIS* (692 occurrences) and *ACADIEN* (86 occurrences), and only slightly more frequent than *FRANCO-ONTARIEN* (29 occurrences) (see Table 5.11). The term *Québécois* is a label which is multifaceted and even ambiguous in its blending of connotations of geography (Quebec), national identity (Quebec), ethnicity (French Canadian), and language (French). This label occurs more frequently than any other (*QUÉBÉCOIS*, 692 occurrences; *QUÉBÉCOISE*, 204 occurrences; *QUÉBÉCOISES*, 62 occurrences). Another identity label that has emerged relatively recently is *francophone*. Although this term tends to be used to refer to linguistic populations, it still evokes certain ethnic connotations. For example, Oakes (2005: 172) notes that since “francophone” tends not to refer to immigrants from France (who are usually referred to as *français/e/s*), it usually involves connotations of French Canadian ethnicity. The



term *FRANCOPHONES* is also frequent in the corpus (313 occurrences), and notably more frequent than the label *CANADIEN FRANÇAIS*. In sum, then, the labels *QUÉBÉCOIS* and *FRANCOPHONES* are the most frequent identity labels, which may suggest evidence of a Quebec national discourse in which the French language is a core value (see Table 5.11).

<b>Word</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
QUÉBÉCOIS	692
CANADIEN	471
FRANCOPHONES	313
CANADIENNE	225
CANADIENS	216
QUÉBÉCOISE	204
FRANCO	130
ACADIENNE	97
ACADIEN	86
CANADIENNES	78
ACADIENS	64
QUÉBÉCOISES	62
ONTARIEN	49
ONTARIENNE	39
CANADIENS FRANÇAIS	37
FRANCO-ONTARIEN	29
FRANCO-ONTARIENNE	14
CANADIEN FRANÇAIS	12
QUÉBÉCOIS FRANCOPHONE	11
CANADIENNE FRANÇAISE	9
FRANCO-ONTARIENS	8

**Table 5.11: FPNC frequency of linguistic labels**

Another way that language is marked as a core value of the Quebec nation is through references to “our” (*notre*) and “their” (*leur*) language (see Table 5.12).

<p>une Acadienne prônant la beauté de                  chef de notre gouvernement ravale                  ur rapport à l'anglais. Où s'en va                  nous devons nous battre et protéger                  vernement que nous désirons garder                  chef de notre gouvernement ravale                  es réflexions sur notre culture et                  ne, de notre patrimoine et même de                  de contribuer à la protection de                  reconnaît comme peuple avec                  fort soutenu pour améliorer                  s nous exprimons par</p>	<p><b>notre langue</b> et de notre culture. Je suis con  <b>notre langue</b> nationale au rang de langue régi  <b>notre langue</b>, où s'en va notre culture... Des  <b>notre langue</b> et notre culture... Le gouvernem  <b>notre langue</b> et notre culture. ASSEZ, C'EST A  <b>notre langue</b> nationale au rang de langue régi  <b>notre langue</b>, ces derniers mois ont été parti  <b>notre langue</b>. Une telle mission ne se calcule  <b>notre langue</b>; un récent sondage a pourtant mo  <b>notre propre langue</b>, notre propre culture, notre ide  <b>notre propre langue</b>, tant parlée qu'écrite? Aux jeun  <b>notre culture et la langue française</b>, sans exclure l'anglai</p>
--	---

**Table 5.12: FPNC concordance lines with NOTRE and LANGUE**

Expanded concordance lines show that *NOTRE LANGUE* refers exclusively to the French language (12 occurrences), whereas *LEUR LANGUE* can refer to French, English or other languages (20 occurrences). Moreover, *NOTRE LANGUE* is strongly linked with culture (58% of occurrences, 7 occurrences) and heritage and nationalism (16% of occurrences, 2 occurrences). Unlike *NOTRE LANGUE*, discussions of *LEUR LANGUE* tend to refer to anglophones (17 occurrences), or individuals' specific language choice or particularities (3 occurrences). For example, an article in *L'Acadie nouvelle* from June 2009 quotes a health official as saying "we offer patients in all our establishments equivalent services and excellence in the language of their choice" (*nous offrons aux patients de tous nos établissements des services égaux et de qualité dans la langue de leur choix*). While discussions of *LEUR LANGUE* sometimes refer to French and French speakers, these tend to refer to Ontarians (1 occurrence), Acadians (1 occurrence), and generic francophones (7 occurrences), rather than to French speakers in Quebec. In summary, then, collocation and concordance findings suggest that the French language may serve as a core value in the French primary corpus.

Further evidence emerges from a letter to the editor, which was among the five items downsampled for qualitative analysis (Havrankova, 2009; see Appendix 5 for entire text). This letter argues that immigrants to Quebec should feel privileged to learn French, which has both instrumental and integrative value. While other languages, such as Swedish and Dutch, are geographically limited, Havrankova argues that "knowledge of French opens the door not only to Quebec culture – already rich – but also to the immense culture of international Francophonie" (*la connaissance du français ouvre la porte non seulement sur la culture québécoise, déjà riche, mais aussi sur l'immense culture francophone mondiale*). French is also described as a

“beautiful” (*belle*) language that inspires pride and joy. Havrankova evokes the prestige of French by referring to it as “the language of Anne Hébert” (*la langue d’Anne Hébert*), which parallels the expression “the language of Molière”, a common substitution for reference to “the French language”. Since Molière is a French cultural icon, Anne Hébert, a French-language Quebec author and poet, is attributed equivalent iconic status, and by association Quebec French acquires prestige. Since French has both integrative and instrumental value, there is little reason for immigrants not to learn and use it. Indeed, the topoi underlying Havrankova’s argument are (1) that immigrants should learn French, because (2) the French language has a central role in life in Quebec.

Another downsampled article (Cornellier, 2009) indicates that the French language is central to Quebec national culture. In an interview, militant Quebec nationalist Pierre Falardeau lambasts Quebec filmmakers who make English films because he implies that they are foreign and disloyal to the nation (see Example 5.12).

#### **Example 5. 12**

According to Falardeau, culture must incarnate a preconception, a loyalty to oneself, giving meaning to life. It’s for this reason that the pamphleteer rages once again against entertainment culture – “Pierre Lapointe, it’s in French, but it’s like nothing” – or worse still, against defection. “It’s as though we create our own American culture for local consumption”, he hurls out on the subject of Pascale Picard and Quebec filmmakers who shoot in English.

*La culture, selon Falardeau, doit incarner un parti pris, une fidélité à soi-même, donner du sens à la vie. C’est la raison pour laquelle le pamphlétaire rage encore une fois contre la culture de divertissement - «Pierre Lapointe, c’est en français, mais c’est comme rien» - ou, pire encore, de la défection. «C’est comme si on se fabriquait notre propre culture américaine, pour consommation locale», lance-t-il au sujet de Pascale Picard et des cinéastes québécois qui tournent en anglais.*

In a similar way, the downsampled article that was discussed in Section 5.3 (Rioux, 2009) also alluded to the pivotal role of the French language in Quebec society, which is partly why it was argued that it should be promoted by Quebec's representatives in international forums.

To conclude this section, three findings suggest evidence of ideologies of language as a core value. First, identity labels such as *québécois* and *francophone* indicate a move away from French Canadian nationalism toward a version of nationalism specific to Quebec. Second, collocations between “our” and “their” language suggest that the French language is strongly linked to the people of Quebec. Third, topoi from the downsampled article (Havrankova, 2009) suggest that French is an icon of a positively-evaluated Quebec identity. Although none of these findings dominate or stand out in the French primary corpus, since evocations of language as a core value can be ambiguous and figurative, they are difficult to tease out of a corpus. As a result, the downsampled articles are the most rewarding for the study of this ideology, since the two that have been explored thus far have assumed that French has a fundamental role in Quebec identity.

## **5.5 IDEOLOGIES OF STANDARDISED FRENCH**

Issues of nationalism in Quebec are also tied up with ideologies of standardised French. As outlined in Section 3.2.3, there has been considerable debate about what kind of French is to be used in the province: a local variety, an international “standard”, or perhaps a Quebec standard. However, little evidence in the French primary corpus suggests evidence of ideologies of standardised language. This section will overview the infrequent and peripheral indications of these ideologies through dialectal labelling.

In the French primary corpus, there are no references to some of the most commonly used labels that refer to standard or non-standard varieties of French in Canada, including *français standard*, *français international*, *français d'ici*, *bon usage*, and *canadianisme* (see e.g. C. Bouchard, 2002: 245; see Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3). However, some labels do occur in the corpus, albeit infrequently; these include three references to *joual* and one reference to *patois*. Still, these terms are not uniformly

used within discussions about or comparisons with a standard language. For example, the reference to *patois* occurs in a discussion of a mother's desire to send her child to Saturday schools in the same way that ethnic minority children in Quebec are sometimes sent to Saturday schools to learn and practise their heritage culture. As can be seen in Example 5.13, her concern is that in multicultural Montreal, children may lose sight of their "patois" alongside the rest of their culture and heritage.

**Example 5.13**

Considered: signing my B up for Saturday school. All joking aside, maybe it would be best to get to it and give "Quebecois" classes, their patois, their culture, their ancestors, their food, their religion, their flora and their fauna. Sometimes it can be lost in the street.

*Songé: à inscrire mon B à l'école du samedi. Sans blague, faudrait peut-être s'y mettre et leur donner des cours de «québécois», leur patois, leur culture, leurs ancêtres, leur cuisine, leur religion, leur faune et leur flore. Des fois qu'ils l'oublieraient en chemin.*

(Blanchette, 2009)

In this case, then, patois is not derided or contrasted with a standard language; rather, it is part of heritage and has the privileged status of being first among the list of assets that Blanchette considers attributes of Quebec identity. One of the three references to *joual* conveys a similar appreciation for the vernacular French spoken in Quebec. The word is used in an interview with singer songwriter David Jalbert, who discusses his desire to make "Quebecois" music by writing in *joual* (see Example 5.14).

**Example 5.14**

"...I wanted to create something Quebecois, something festive. Write good songs in *joual* for around the fire. Something in the same style as *Okumé* or *les Colocs* [Quebec bands]," emphasised the musician, who grew up listening to, among other groups, *Beau Dommage*.

*« ...Je voulais faire du Québécois, quelque chose de festif. Ecrire en joul de bonnes chansons pour le bord du feu. Faire quelque chose dans la même lignée qu'Okoumé ou les Colocs », souligne celui qui agrandit en écoutant, entre autres, Beau Dommage.*

(Turcot, 2009)

In this example, as in Example 5.13, the vernacular is represented as a celebrated feature of Quebec culture. There is no mention of “standard” language nor any indication that *joul* is being compared against another language variety. In fact, these examples support the proposed ideologies of language as a core value more than ideologies of standardised French.

However, the other two references to *joul* are slightly more negative. The first (Vigneault, 2009) discusses a “controversy” that arose just prior to St-Jean Baptiste Day in 2001: a primary school teacher deemed that a school-distributed text written in “a language close to *joul*” was a poor example for children (see Example 5.15).

#### **Example 5.15**

There is rarely a year when controversy, big or small, does not explode just prior to the National holiday. In 2001, it was Daniel Boucher’s song *Chez nous* that caused a flurry of panic. A primary school teacher found that a text written in a language close to *joul* and distributed in schools constituted a poor example for children.

*Il se passe rarement une année sans qu'une controverse, petite ou grande, éclate à la veille de la Fête nationale. En 2001, c'est la chanson Chez nous de Daniel Boucher qui a soulevé un petit vent de panique. Une enseignante du primaire trouvait que ce texte écrit dans une langue proche du joul et distribué dans les écoles constituait un mauvais exemple pour la jeunesse.*

(Vigneault, 2009)

A teacher’s criticism – notably “controversial” according to the journalist – is that non-standard language is not a good example for children. Although standard

language is not referenced here, the distributed text that was found to be inappropriate was in fact not in *joual* but in a language “close to *joual*”; in other words, even though the text was not written in an entirely different language variety, ultimately it was non-standard and thus unacceptable. This suggests evidence of a standard language ideology perhaps not on the part of the journalist (who notes the controversy surrounding the case), but rather on the part of the teacher who is referenced in the article. Still, it is worth highlighting that this case took place in 2001 not in 2009 when the article was published, which suggests that ideologies of standardised French may be a dated issue.

The other example of *joual* occurs in an article (Dubuc, 2009) that overtly rejects the possibility that English is a significant feature of Quebec identity. Although the author concurs that English can be a language of communication for Quebecers, it is not a language with which Quebecers identify. Rather, Dubuc implies that because the English language has had such an impact on the French spoken by Quebecers, “the only contribution that English has made to French is *joual*”. In other words, Dubuc implies that due to incursions of the English language, the vernacular spoken in Quebec has become stigmatised (see Example 5.16).

#### Example 5.16

It is undeniable that English culture, like all American culture, has marked our culture. No one denies that English can be a language of communication. But making English a “language of identification”, proclaiming that it is a “significant feature of our identity”, this must be condemned from the rooftops. On this subject, the only contribution that English has made to French is *joual*!

*Que la culture anglaise, tout comme la culture américaine, ait marqué notre propre culture, cela est indéniable. Que l'anglais puisse être une langue de communication, personne n'en disconvient. Mais faire de l'anglais une «langue d'identification», proclamer qu'elle est une «composante majeure de notre identité», cela doit être dénoncé sur tous les toits. À ce chapitre, la seule contribution de l'anglais au français, c'est le joual!*

(Dubuc, 2009)

Again in this case, although there is no specific reference to a standard language, the fact that the English language is implied to have impacted on the French language in such a way that it is no longer French (i.e., it is *joual*) implies that there is a standard against which the vernacular will (negatively) be compared. Moreover, the rejection of English as a “language of identification” harks back to the rejection of societal bilingualism inherent to monolingual ideologies (see Sections 3.2.1 and 5.3). Thus, although two of these four examples provide some indication that standard languages may affect representations of languages, they are irrefutably few and far between.

Another way of approaching this subject is by examining the “standard” against which Quebec or Canadian French is compared (see Section 3.2.3). In many cases, the standard that is used is the variety of French that is used in France, commonly known as *français de France*. In the French primary corpus, there are only three references to *français de France*, all of which are compared with the variety of French spoken in Quebec. One of the three instances to *français de France* occurs in the headline, which highlights a Quebec television show that has met with success in France. The headline (*‘Minuit, le soir’ en français de France*) refers to the programme (*Minuit, le soir*) being aired in France, but notably in the variety of French spoken in France (*en français de France*). The content of the article notes that when aired in France, the “original Quebecois version” of the programme was supplemented by French subtitles (see Example 5.17).

#### **Example 5.17**

After having won 17 Gémeaux Awards [prizes in French Canadian achievements in Canadian television] in Quebec and four other awards internationally, the original Quebecois version, with French subtitles, had been broadcast on Cinécinéma Culte, in France, in autumn 2007, with glowing approval from the critics.

*Après avoir remporté 17 prix Gémeaux au Québec et quatre autres à l'étranger, la version originale québécoise, sous-titrée en français,*



*avait été présentée sur les ondes de Cinécinéma Culte, en France, à l'automne 2007, recevant des critiques élogieuses.*

(Cloutier, 2009)

Example 5.17 shows that despite the acclaim for the programme, its language variety is still compared against a standard defined in France. The fact that the journalist highlights that subtitling was used for the screenings in France could indicate standard language ideologies in the sense that Quebec French is still compared against the “international” variety (cf. Boudreau and Dubois, 2007 on “international French”). Nevertheless, because it was met with “glowing approval from the critics”, it would seem that no language or varietal barrier is sufficient reason to overlook its quality.

With regard to the second reference to *français de France*, this occurs in the context of an article (Sarfati, 2009) that discusses new Canadian additions to *Le Petit Larousse* (2010 edition), published in France. These include references to Quebec author and playwright Marie Laberge, the Canadian filmmaker David Cronenberg, the French branch of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation Radio-Canada, and some *québécoïsmes*. The latter refers to vernacular features of Quebec French, in this case, singular words that are unique to Quebec. Notably, there are only two references to *québécoïsmes* in the entire French primary corpus, and both occur in the context of this article. The *québécoïsmes* referred to by this journalist include words such as *motton*, *gomme*, *saucette* and *comptoir*, all of which have been included in the new French dictionary (see Example 5.18).

### Example 5.18

As for *québécoïsmes*, the *Le Petit Larousse* writes that in La Belle Province a *comptoir* is “a flat surface, on a closed unit, often with an in-built sink”. A *motton* is a “small mass of compact and hardened material” but in the expression *avoir le motton* it means “to have a closed throat” and in *faire le motton*, “to have or win lots of money”. A *hameçonnage* is a “tactic for fraud by email” and a *saucette* is a “little swim” or a “short trip somewhere”. Finally, the dictionary

writes that in Quebec the word *gomme* is used for what the French [i.e., *en français de France*] call... *chewing-gum*.

*Pour ce qui est des québécoismes, on écrit que dans la Belle Province, un comptoir est une “surface plate, sur un meuble fermé, dans laquelle un évier, un lavabo est souvent encastré”; un motton, une “petite masse de matière compacte et durcie” mais que, dans l’expression “avoir le motton”, il signifie “avoir la gorge serrée” ou, comme dans “faire le motton”, “posséder, gagner beaucoup d’argent”; un hameçonnage, une “technique de fraude par courriel” et une saucette, une “petite baignade” ou un “court séjour quelque part”. Et puis, on indique qu’au Québec, le mot “gomme” est utilisé pour nommer ce qu’en “français de France” on appelle... chewing-gum.*

(Sarfati, 2009)

Example 5.18 contains a number of interesting nominational strategies (see van Leeuwen, 2003 [1996]: 66) to refer to local and foreign terms. In the original French text, all *québécoismes* (*motton*, *gomme*, *saucette* and *comptoir*) are given in regular font. They easily might have been highlighted as technical terms or as items of interest by the use of italics or inverted commas; however, these terms are not marked in any way in the text. As previously discussed, journalists tend to use quotation strategies to highlight specific passages or words of interest and to dissociate themselves from the content of quotes (Cotter, 2010: 148-9; Simpson, 1993: 142; see Section 5.2). Since in this case the journalist opted not to highlight the terminology under discussion through quotation or emphasis strategies, they are normalised as regular lexicon in the text of the article. Indeed, these are words that the intended audience (i.e., Quebec French speakers who may use *québécoismes*) are presumed to understand. Even the term *québécoisme* is not emphasised in the text or highlighted with inverted commas, suggesting that it too is a normal and natural term. Rather than highlighting local lexicon, then, the journalist highlights references to and uses of *français de France*. All definitions provided by *Le Petit Larousse* are placed in inverted commas. Since these are direct quotations, perhaps this is unsurprising; however, since the only other reference in inverted commas is the

reference to “français de France”, this reference is marked. Finally, the single reference to the French term *chewing-gum* is not marked by inverted commas or by italics, however it is marked by the suspension point (...), which functions to emphasise the term. Since *chewing-gum* is clearly a loan word from English, the effect is such that the authority of the international prestige language (i.e., the variety of French spoken in France) is noted with some irony – hence, it would seem, the inverted commas (“*français de France*”).

The third reference to *français de France* occurs in an article that discusses a Quebecois actor, Marc-André Grondin, working in France (Lussier, 2009b). The relocation of this actor to France is the pretext for the interview: Quebec actors are often “lost” to France because it is “practically impossible” for actors to make a living in Quebec cinema (*La réalité, c’est qu’un acteur désirant se consacrer exclusivement au cinéma ne peut pratiquement pas vivre de son métier au Québec*). When Quebec actors move to France, some “zealous zealots” (*zélotes zélés*) consider this national betrayal, in part because actors are obliged to adopt the French that is used in France (*français de France*). While the relationship between Quebec and France is described as “sometimes a bit twisted” (*nos rapports avec la France sont parfois un peu tordus*), France is not explicitly evaluated negatively in the article. What is negatively portrayed is French cultural dominance, and this is notable through discussions of language varieties. Although the journalist notes that Marc-André is obliged to master “French French” (*Marc-André doit évidemment maîtriser le ‘français de France’*), he also observes that the Quebecois are not the only French speakers forced to adapt while working in the French capital. Indeed, just as Belgian actors “erase” their accent (*goment leur accent*), Swiss actors “lose all traces of a Swiss accent” (*perd toute trace d’accent suisse*), and all actors from regional France “adjust their language” (*doivent ajuster leur langage*), so too Quebec actors are obliged to master *le français de France*. The journalist notes that this is sensitive territory for the Quebecois (*nous avons collectivement l’épiderme plutôt sensible à cet égard*), but the Quebecois are not presented as isolated in their purported linguistic inadequacy. Indeed, French cultural superiority is derided by the journalist, who claims that even actors originating from outside Paris must “sell their soul to camembert” (*ceux ayant vendu leur âme au camembert*) when they move to

the capital. These examples confirm observations about linguistic insecurity that were outlined in Section 3.2.3.

To conclude this section, the primary corpus contains little evidence of ideologies of standardised French. Although some instances where Quebec French is specifically noted show evidence of tension between a local vernacular and a standard language (either a local standard or a standard from France), not all instances are uniform. Two examples showed that *patois* and *joual* are sometimes clearly associated with cultural heritage and prestige, and two of the three references to *français de France* showed some disdain for the variety from France through quotation strategies and mockery of iconic French food (i.e., camembert). In sum, then, there is little evidence in the French primary corpus of ideologies of standardised French, suggesting that there is increased sense of linguistic security in the quality of language that is spoken in Quebec. However, there still appears to be *insecurity* in terms of concerns over the future of the French language.

## 5.6 IDEOLOGIES OF LANGUAGE ENDANGERMENT

In both the English and the French corpora, there is explicit mention of the French language being “threatened” (8 occurrences, *menacé*, 5 occurrences, respectively). In addition, language endangerment is often discussed in more subtle ways, particularly in the French primary corpus. References to the need to “promote” (*promouvoir*), “defend” (*défendre*) and “strengthen” (*renforcer*) French suggest an underlying assumption that Quebec needs to be “more French” (see Table 5.13).

<p>ier rang de la lutte pour <b>un Québec plus français</b>, mais les temps ont bien chang  vancer que <b>le Québec souverain sera plus français</b> ne signifie aucunement que la  à <b>“promouvoir l’usage et la qualité du français au Québec</b> dans le cadre de cer  pour <b>promouvoir</b> l’usage et la <b>qualité du français au Québec</b>.Caractère francophon  our préserver et <b>promouvoir le caractère français du Québec</b> quand on sait que le  plus que sur <b>le Québec, pour défendre le français</b> dans les forums internationaux  les idées, ou presque, pour <b>renforcer le français au Québec</b> (le français comme c</p>
--

**Table 5.13: Selected FPNC concordance lines showing language endangerment**

Individual articles describe French as a “minority language in North America” (*Extrêmement minoritaire en Amérique du Nord*) and the “Francophone space” in the Americas as “shrunken” (*rétréci*). The blame is almost inevitably placed on the

English language because it is argued that English, and no other language, threatens French (see Example 5.19).

**Example 5.19**

It is this language [English] that constitutes a threat. Still today [...] neither Chinese, nor Portuguese, nor any other language spoken in Quebec, except English, threatens French.

*c'est cette langue [l'anglais] qui constitue une menace. Aujourd'hui encore [...] ni le chinois, ni le portugais, ni les autres langues parlées au Québec, sauf l'anglais, ne menacent le français.*

(Dubuc, 2009)

In Montreal, the city with particular symbolic value in the struggle for French predominance (see Section 3.2.4), French is seen to be ceding to English (*le français s'est mis à reculer à Montréal au profit de l'anglais*). The effect is such that anglicisms and French-English bilingualism are seen as posing a threat to the French language (see discussion in Section 3.1.4). The concordance lines in Table 5.14 refer to bilingualism as a process imposed on French speakers against their will. This is achieved by transforming the adjective (*bilingue*) into verbs (“bilingualise”/ *bilingualiser*, “make bilingual”/ *rendre bilingue*) and by presenting bilingualism as a process with various stages (“a step towards anglicisation”, “bilingualism is ‘inevitable’”, “the antechamber to assimilation”) and a negative outcome (*assimilation, conséquences*) (see Table 5.14).

groupes anglo-montréalais désirent ardemment « <b>bilinguiser</b> » la métropole quel point ce type de bilinguisme n'est qu'une <b>étape vers l'anglicisation</b> Ne répétez pas nos erreurs. <b>Si le bilinguisme est «inévitable»</b> , app bilinguisme identitaire qui, au Canada, est l' <b>antichambre de l'assimilation</b> . ine <b>les conséquences d'un Montréal bilingue</b> (puis de plus en plus angl groupes anglo-montréalais désirent ardemment <b>rendre bilingues</b> la
--

**Table 5.14: FPNC concordance lines negatively evaluating bilingualism**

One example refers to bilingualism as the Trojan horse that “conquered” Louisiana, the Canadian West, Ontario, and the Acadian region of Eastern Canada, suggesting that bilingualism is part of a colonial-style conquest by English speakers.

However, discussions of endangerment do not only place the blame on the English language. French articles also stress the need for immigrants to learn French. Indeed, the French primary corpus shows that FRANÇAIS is the only lexical collocate of IMMIGRANT lemmas (*immigrant/e/s, immigration*) (5 occurrences), and concordance lines indicate the extent to which it is seen as important that French is adopted by immigrants (see Table 5.15).

dais. Pour promouvoir l'apprentissage du français par les immigrants, le gouvern ébécquois dont la langue maternelle est le français estiment que «les immigrants lusieurs stratégies: rendre les cours du français accessibles, jumeler les immig e l'intégration des immigrants, c'est le français et l'emploi.» Il se demande e
---

**Table 5.15: FPNC concordance lines with FRANÇAIS and IMMIGRANTS**

Here, it is stressed that language education (*apprentissage, cours du français*) and fluency in French are important for immigrants in Quebec. Thus, a large number of articles in the French primary corpus do seem to be united in the consensus that French is endangered.

One way to corroborate these findings is through the discourse analysis of downsampled articles. The Bélair-Cirino (2009) article reports on the results from a Leger Marketing survey on perceptions of language endangerment in Montreal (see Appendix 2 for entire article). Although the explicit topic is perceptions of language endangerment, the article contains a number of nominational strategies that provide insight into the explicit and covert ways in which social actors are included and excluded from categories according to the language they speak. Moreover, when this article is compared with an English newspaper article that deals with the same survey, the differences between the two suggest underlying ideologies that may exist in and differ between the French-speaking and English-speaking communities.

Bélair-Cirino's article uses the three usual categories for referring to people in Quebec: francophones, anglophones and allophones (see Section 1.2). The French language is a particularly important criterion for social categorisation, since in the article there are more references to French speakers (15 occurrences) than any other language speakers. The next most frequently referenced linguistic group is English-speaking, with ten references to *anglophones*, "the anglophone community outside

Quebec” (*la communauté anglophone majoritaire hors Québec*), and “English-speaking Quebecers” (*Québécois d’expression anglaise*). In addition, there are four references to English speakers alongside other linguistic groups (i.e., a merged English-and-other-language group: *anglophones et allophones, anglophone ou allophone*). Indeed, the lumping together of English speakers and allophones occurs several times throughout the article, with references often simply discussing *non-francophones* or “Quebecers whose first language is not French” (*Québécois dont la langue maternelle est différente du français*). In total, the category of linguistic ambiguity – that is, the category of social actors who may be English speakers or speakers of other languages but not French speakers – is the third largest, with nine linguistically ambiguous references. The differences in frequency between these references to identity categories are similar to the differences in frequency between identity categories across the French primary corpus more generally, where references to French-speaking identity (e.g. FRANCOPHONES and FRANCOPHONE, 313 occurrences, 238 occurrences, respectively) are more frequent than references to English-speaking identity (e.g. ANGLOPHONES and ANGLOPHONE, 189 occurrences, 84 occurrences, respectively), and far more frequent than references to the identity of speakers of other languages (e.g. ALLOPHONES, 17 occurrences).

Although the dominant trend throughout the article is to juxtapose French speakers with anglophones and allophones, there are several occasions when allophones are subsumed within discussions of anglophones, reducing the linguistic complexity (i.e., multilingualism) under discussion into a binary between English and French. The beginning of the article, for example, opens with the statement that, according to a recent survey, 90% of francophone Quebecers believe that the French language is threatened, but this opinion is shared by only 25% of anglophones and allophones. This survey, Bélair-Cirino continues, “brings to light an important gap between French-speaking and English-speaking Quebecers’ perceptions of French language vitality in Montreal” (*Le sondage met en lumière un fossé important entre les perceptions des Québécois d’expression française et ceux d’expression anglaise sur la vitalité de la langue*). What is notable, then, is that this “important gap” was revealed through survey data elicited not only from francophone and anglophone

sources, but also from allophones. However, the perception gap that Bélair-Cirino highlights is instead one existing between francophones and anglophones. A similar reduction of multilingualism to bilingualism (or “erasure” of non-French non-English individuals, see Section 2.2.3) presents itself midway through the article, where again we see that the survey results, which blend anglophone and allophone data (*un point de vue que partagent 20% des anglophones et allophones questionnés*), are subsumed within a subsequent sentence which refers only to anglophones: “Probably because [anglophones] do not understand the extent to which the French language is threatened” (*«Probablement parce que [les anglophones] ne comprennent pas à quel point la langue française est menacée», suppose Jack Jedwab*). Here again, the linguistic complexity of Quebec’s population, and moreover the linguistic complexity of the survey data, is reduced to a binary juxtaposition between anglophones and francophones. Although it is the information source (Jack Jedwab) who states “anglophones” rather than “anglophones and allophones”, it is the journalist who presents Jedwab’s quote in such a way that it seems to reduce anglophone/allophone complexity to anglophone homogeneity.

Although Quebec has never been inhabited only by English speakers and French speakers, these are the principal categories used to represent social actors in the text. French speakers and English speakers are foregrounded and other language groups are backgrounded. There are, for example, only token references to allophones, which moreover only occur in conjunction with references to anglophones (*anglophones et allophones*, 3 occurrences; *anglophone ou allophone*, 1 occurrence). Since discussions of allophones do not occur on their own, these references appear to serve only to increase the numerical presence of anglophones rather than to include allophones’ perspectives within the survey report. Indeed, it would seem that allophones are treated merely as statistics that are used to support – if not enhance – a line of reasoning that uses “English” as a label for all those who are antagonistic to French language maintenance. In van Leeuwen’s (2003 [1996]: 49) language, the term “allophone” is an aggregate category used to “regulate practice and manufacture consensus opinion”. In this case, the consensus opinion not only concerns the role of language in society, but also more specifically the inclusion and exclusion of social actors and the binary reductionism of linguistic and perspectival



complexity in Quebec. In other words, the categorisation conflation of allophones with anglophones serves to draw boundary lines between those who feel French is threatened (French speakers) and those who don't (everybody else, who also tend to speak English). It also enhances the argument for why the *francisation* of immigrants (i.e., allophones) is so important (see Section 3.2): if immigrants spoke French and were integrated into the dominant French-speaking community of Quebec, then they would not naturally align with the English perspective; instead, like other French speakers, they would understand that French is threatened.

In a more recent commentary in *Le Devoir*, Jedwab (2011) has criticised this tactic of reductionism. Jedwab, the Director of the Association for Canadian Studies who commissioned the survey on which the Bélair-Cirino article reports, is a regular contributor to research and debates on language issues in Canada (see e.g. Jedwab, 2007, 2011). In his submission to *Le Devoir* in October 2011, Jedwab questions the concern over the declining francophone demographic on the island of Montreal: a recent study had uncovered that francophones no longer constitute the majority (i.e., 50% or more of the population) on the island of Montreal, but Jedwab argues that such a statistic does not mean that francophones are no longer the majority since they are still the largest language group on the island (see discussion in Section 3.2.4). No other single language group has replaced francophones as the dominant linguistic group on the Island because “non-francophones” do not constitute a language category:

non-francophones do not constitute a linguistic group. Montrealers do not define themselves as being “non-francophones”; they define themselves as anglophones, allophones, or mixed. Lumping together anglophones and allophones into a single imagined category encourages many francophones to erroneously associate all ethnocultural minorities with the English language.

*les non-francophones ne constituent pas un groupe linguistique.  
Aucune Montréalais ne se définit comme étant un non-francophone, mais plutôt anglophone, allophone, ou mixte.*

*Regrouper les anglophones et les allophones dans une seule catégorie imaginaire encourage plusieurs francophones à associer, faussement, tous ceux issus des minorités ethnoculturelles avec la langue anglaise.*

(Jedwab, 2011)

Despite his useful observations on this point, it is important to note that Jedwab's interpretations of statistics on French language endangerment have repeatedly been contested by statisticians and demographers (see e.g. Castonguay, 2010; Paillé, 2011). Still, the notable reduction of multilingualism to bilingualism in the case of the Bélair-Cirino article suggests the important function of the English language within discourses and ideologies of French language endangerment.

The function of the English language is crucial when the linguistic labels are under consideration. Bélair-Cirino uses slightly less variable expressions to discuss English speakers in comparison with French speakers. As mentioned, while there are many labels for French speakers, only four labels are used to refer to English speakers (see Table 5.16).

1. *Francophones* (6 occurrences)
  2. *Québécois francophones* (3 occurrences)
  3. *Québécois d'expression française*/"French-speaking Quebecers" (2 occurrences)
  4. *les personnes qui s'expriment en français* "people who speak French"(1 occurrence)
  5. *moins de 54 % de la population montréalaise parle français à la maison* "less than 54% of the Montreal population speaks French at home"(1 occurrence)
  6. *Québécois dont la langue maternelle est le français* "Quebecers whose first language is French"(1 occurrence)
  7. *francophones du Québec* "francophones from Quebec"(1 occurrence)
- 
1. *Anglophones* (7 occurrences)
  2. *anglophones du Québec* "anglophones from Quebec"(1 occurrence)
  3. *la communauté anglophone majoritaire hors Québec* "the majority anglophone community outside Quebec"(1 occurrence)
  4. *[Québécois] d'expression anglaise* "English-speaking Quebecer"(1 occurrence)

**Table 5.16: Labelling of social groups in Bélair-Cirino, 2009**

Given the variety of these alternatives, it is notable that twice throughout the article still other terms are used to imply “French-speaking”. In these cases, the term *Québécois* is used in such a way to refer to only French-speaking Quebecers, but this is not stated explicitly (see Examples 5.20 and 5.21).

**Example 5.20 (emphasis added)**

Jean Charest’s government “gives the entire Quebec population the feeling that he’s not really ready to act. There is a feeling of inaction, and that worries Quebecers a lot,” explains Alain-G. Gagnon, director of the Centre for Interdisciplinary Research on Diversity in Quebec (*CRIDAQ*).

*Le gouvernement de Jean Charest «donne le sentiment à l’ensemble de la population québécoise qu’il n’est pas véritablement prêt à agir. Il y a un sentiment d’inaction, et ça inquiète beaucoup les Québécois», explique Alain-G. Gagnon, directeur du Centre de recherche interdisciplinaire sur la diversité au Québec (CRIDAQ).*

**Example 5.21 (emphasis added)**

“There is maybe a feeling of concern, but if 90% of Quebecers really think that French is really threatened, that seems a bit high to me,” he added.

*«Il y a un sentiment peut-être d’inquiétude, mais que 90 % des Québécois pensent véritablement que le français soit véritablement menacé, ça m’apparaît un peu élevé», ajoute-t-il.*

In Examples 5.20 and 5.21, Gagnon’s use of the term *Québécois* hides the fact that in the Léger Marketing survey he was referring to, it was found that 90% of *francophone* Quebecers believed French to be threatened. Thus, Gagnon’s omission allows for the representation of Quebec as a monolingual French-speaking territory to be naturalised (cf. Lisée, 2007: 98). In addition, this labelling strategy also serves to make language endangerment not only an issue for French speakers (who, internationally, also have concerns over their language; see e.g. Moïse, 2007); it also suggests that language endangerment a national issue for all Quebecers.

At this point, it is useful to compare the French-language article to an English language article reporting on the same Leger Marketing survey.<sup>9</sup> In the English primary corpus, three major city newspapers and one national newspaper – all owned by the CanWest media conglomerate – published nearly identical articles on June 22, with the by-line of Marion Scott in all cases save one (which is anonymous) (see Anonymous, 2009e; Marian Scott, 2009a, b, c). The Montreal *Gazette* edition (Marian Scott, 2009) is the example that is chosen for analysis here. This edition is parallel to the other three (*National Post*, *Ottawa Citizen*, *Vancouver Sun*) but is the longest version. The comparison of this English article with the French article (Bélair-Cirino, 2009) will include the representation of social actors and strategies of collectivisation and perspectivation. Through this comparison, it becomes apparent that the French and English-speaking journalists have reported the survey findings differently, in different languages, to different audiences.

The English article (Marian Scott, 2009c) includes references to social actors that are classified according to language: French speakers (“French-speaking Quebecers”, “francophones”, “French Canadian”), English speakers (“English-speakers”, “anglophones”), those who do not speak French (“non-francophones”), and those whose mother tongue is neither French nor English (“allophones”). There is also mention more generally of immigrants, Quebecers and Montrealers. In terms of collectivisation, this article uses language as the primary criterion of social categorisation. However, in contrast to the French article where English speakers were categorised alongside allophones (*anglophones et allophones/anglophone ou allophone*), in Scott’s rendition English speakers are categorised alongside immigrants (“English speakers and immigrants”), suggesting that both language and citizenship are meaningful group indicators. In addition to these social actors, Scott draws on two individuals as sources for information: Jack Jedwab (Director of the Association for Canadian Studies who commissioned the survey) and Lysiane Gagnon (*La Presse* columnist whose article is cited). In sum, Scott’s article reports that perspectives on the status of French are divided between French-speaking Quebecers, English-speakers, and immigrants – an important difference from the

---

<sup>9</sup>Although the French-language article (Bélair-Cirino, 2009) was obtained through downsampling procedures detailed in Section 4.3.3, the English language articles were selected for comparison rather than by using downsampling procedures. See Appendix 9 for English article.

French article, which presented the perspectives as divided between French-speaking Quebecers, English speakers, and *allophones*.

The term “allophone” by definition is not synonymous with “immigrant”: while “allophone” refers to someone whose first language is neither English nor French, this person is not necessarily an immigrant to Canada. Interestingly, Scott first uses the term “immigrant” but later uses the terms “non-francophone(s)” and “allophone(s)”. Her interchangeable use of these terms implies that they refer to one and the same group. The effect of Scott’s nominational strategy makes the interpretation of the survey findings notably different (see Example 5.22).

**Example 5.22 (emphasis added)**

That [francophones’] concern has intensified as allophones – residents whose mother tongue is neither French nor English – have increased.

Had Scott continued to use the term “immigrants” in Example 5.22, the effect of the statement would have been considerably different. It is likely that Scott opted for “allophones” rather than “immigrants” because linguistic labels (i.e., “allophones”) are more politically correct than ethnocultural labels (i.e., “immigrants”). Indeed, had Scott continued to use the term “immigrants” in Example 5.22, she arguably would have portrayed francophones as intolerant, if not xenophobic. Still, Scott’s representation of the situation is such that intolerance is precisely the representation that is achieved: according to her rendition, there are two polarised camps, one comprised of francophones/French-speaking Quebecers and the other comprised of everyone else (English speakers and allophones/immigrants). Furthermore, in Scott’s text, the francophones’ “concern” is somewhat ambiguous because the anaphoric reference to “the future of French in the city” (i.e., the subject of their concern) is interrupted by an vague quote from Lysiane Gagnon (see Example 5.23).

**Example 5.23**

A 2008 survey found 79 per cent of francophones worried about the future of French in the city.

Quebecers have long been suspicious of “the cosmopolitan metropolis ... represented in the collective imagination as a threat to French-Canadian survival,” La Presse columnist Lysiane Gagnon wrote last month.

That concern has intensified ...

In Example 5.23, Scott switches from concerns over language according to survey findings to concerns over immigration (i.e., concerns over “allophones”). Furthermore, rather than citing the number of fluent French speakers or the level of French used at work (common benchmarks for language status, see Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.4), Scott cites findings on the mother tongue of Montreal residents. The effect is such that readers have no access to information concerning whether or not French is endangered (i.e., the subject of the Leger Marketing survey) and no access to information about why French speakers would believe French is threatened (i.e., the findings from the Leger Marketing survey). Furthermore, and perhaps most importantly, Scott provides no information source to confirm the connection between the rise in the “allophone” population and the rise in concern over language endangerment. It is, then, an assumption and implicature on the part of the journalist that the level of immigration affects francophones’ concerns over language status; the swiftness of the switch between survey findings and demographics suggests that this may be assumed common and shared knowledge in the newspaper readership.

One final comparison of the English and French stories on the Leger Marketing survey is relevant to a discussion of ideologies of language endangerment: a comparison of the perspectival strategies employed. As discussed in Section 4.2.2.2, perspectival strategies involve the expression of perspectives of the relevant interlocutor. This often involves intertextuality and interdiscursivity through the use of words or phrases (i.e., quotations) that are central to that perspective; systematic or lengthy quotations may indicate reliability of sources (van Dijk, 1991; Wodak, 2009: 320). Both the English and the French articles quote Jack Jedwab, who commissioned the Leger-Marketing survey, at length, suggesting his credibility and reliability as a source of information. However, the quotations from Jedwab are notably different in English and French. While in English Jedwab is predominantly used as a source for determining the implications of these results and suggesting

solutions, in French, Jedwab is primarily used as a source for explaining and interpreting the survey results.

Both the English and French articles use quotes from Jack Jedwab to summarise the survey findings (see Table 5.17). Although in the English quotation Jedwab highlights the “gigantic gap between francophones and non-francophones” whereas in the French quotation Jedwab notes the “unanimity among francophones”, both summarise the different perspectives and ultimately convey the same information.

<p>“There is a gigantic gap between francophones and non-francophones on whether they think French is threatened,” said Jack Jedwab, the association’s executive director.</p>	<p>“We can see that there is near unanimity among francophones [...] who think that the French language is threatened in Montreal, which isn’t the case for non-francophones,” remarked the Director of the Association of Canadian Studies, Jack Jedwab.  <i>«On voit qu’il y a une quasi-unanimité auprès des francophones [...] qui pensent que la langue française est menacée à Montréal, ce qui n’est pas le cas chez les non-francophones», fait remarquer le directeur de l’Association d’études canadiennes (AEC), Jack Jedwab.</i></p>
--	--

**Table 5.17: Jedwab quotes used to summarise the Leger-Marketing survey**

In the French article, four different quotes (Examples 5.24-5.27) from Jedwab are used to explain, rationalise and interpret the survey findings both in terms of why French speakers are concerned about their language and why the perspectives of francophones and anglophones differ. With regard to the former, Jedwab outlines that two specific sources (Marc Termote’s study and the “offensive” by the *Office québécois de la langue française*) that have had an “unquestionable impact” on public opinion (Example 5.24); with regard to the latter, Jedwab contextualises the different perspectives of anglophones and francophones (Examples 5.25-5.27).

**Example 5.24**

The demographer Marc Termote’s study on demo-linguistic perspectives in Quebec and the Montreal region, which provided a broad outline of the minoritisation of people who speak French at home in the metropolis by 2021, and the offensive of the *Office québécois de la langue française* have undoubtedly had an impact on

public opinion, thinks Mr. Jedwab. “It has been a turning point,” he confirmed.

*L'étude du démographe Marc Termote sur les perspectives démolinguistiques du Québec et de la région de Montréal, qui soulignait à grands traits que les personnes qui s'expriment en français à la maison deviendront minoritaires dans la métropole d'ici à 2021, et l'offensive de l'Office québécois de la langue française ont eu un impact indubitable sur l'opinion publique, pense M. Jedwab. «Cela a été un tournant», affirme-t-il.*

**Example 5.25**

“Non-francophones don't see the situation in the same way. From their perspective, French is progressing across the province [because the proportion of] non-francophones learning French as a second language [is growing],” he added.

*«Les non-francophones ne voient pas la situation de la même manière. Dans leur esprit, le français progresse à travers la province [parce que la proportion de] non-francophones qui apprennent le français comme langue seconde [croît]», ajoute-t-il.*

**Example 5.26**

“Probably because [anglophones] do not understand the extent to which the French language is threatened,” assumes Jack Jedwab  
*«Probablement parce que [les anglophones] ne comprennent pas à quel point la langue française est menacée», suppose Jack Jedwab*

**Example 5.27**

“Anglophones have the feeling of being a minority when faced with the French language situation. Francophones, for their part, seem to believe that anglophones do not understand the French language situation,” Mr. Jedwab explains.

*«Les anglophones ont le sentiment d'être minoritaires vis-à-vis de la situation de la langue française. Les francophones, eux, ont l'air de croire que les anglophones ne comprennent pas la situation de la langue française», fait savoir M. Jedwab.*



In addition to the quotes from Jedwab, Bélair-Cirino provides five additional explanations for the survey results according to Alain-G. Gagnon of the *Centre de recherche interdisciplinaire sur la diversité au Québec*. Gagnon argues that francophones' perspectives on their language have been affected by the “weakness” (*mollesse*) of the Charest government and its inactivity on the language front, the failure of the Bloc Québécois to adopt certain language policies, the Harper government's apathetic approach to court challenges, culture funding cuts, and cuts to Radio-Canada. In sum, then, the French article includes information from two separate external sources to explain why French speakers might be concerned about their language and why the perspectives of francophones and anglophones differ.

In contrast, in the English article Jedwab is used only to provide one interpretation of the survey findings. This interpretation closely parallels Jedwab's summary of the survey findings (see Jedwab's quote in Table 5.17), and provides no new information or perspective on the situation. Rather, the quote from Jedwab simply re-states that English speakers and French speakers have different perspectives (see Example 5.28).

**Example 5.28**

The conflicting perceptions of the status of French reveals [sic] fault lines remain between language groups, Jedwab said.

This quote from Jedwab is the only approximation to an explanation by a substantiated source that English readers are provided. There are no other explanations, rationalisations or interpretations – apart from the implication that French speakers become more concerned as the allophone population increases. Since the connection between francophone linguistic insecurity and the allophone population is unsubstantiated (see discussion above), and because Scott does not refer to any source for the data she cites, the data is questionable both in terms of its relevance and its origin. In sum, then, English readers are not provided explanations for the results of the Leger-Marketing survey either in terms of why French speakers might be concerned about their language or in terms of why the perspectives of

francophones and anglophones differ. In contrast, French readers are provided explanations for both.

The English article continues to cite Jedwab extensively, but the quotations are used to determine the implications and suggest solutions rather than explain the findings. Indeed most of his suggestions for solutions are uninventive and repetitious, such as Examples 5.29 and 5.30, which both call for dialogue but in different ways. Similarly, both Examples 5.31 and 5.32 predict the consistency of language tension in the future.

**Example 5.29**

He called for dialogue between Montrealers to promote understanding between language groups.

**Example 5.30**

“People will have to sit down and explain to each other why they disagree,” he said.

**Example 5.31**

“Whatever the future holds in the ongoing language debate, the issue of French being threatened in Montreal will be evoked the most frequently,” he said.

**Example 5.32**

Jedwab predicted sensitivity over French’s future in Montreal is here to stay.

Thus, even though Scott draws on Jedwab as a source extensively, she does not include explanatory or interpretative statements such as those included in the French article. The only approximation to using Jedwab as an explanatory source occurs in Example 5.33.

**Example 5.33**

While the survival of French in Montreal has been a perennial concern, Jedwab said he has never seen such unanimity among

francophones on the topic. “This creates a high level of insecurity among francophones in Montreal,” he said.

In this example, Jedwab explains that “this” creates a high level of insecurity among francophones in Montreal; however, the reference is ambiguous because there are no anaphora or cataphora to which Jedwab refers. It is unclear, then, what it is that creates a level of insecurity; thus, this quotation does not serve to explain or interpret the survey findings. In sum, while in the French article quotations from Jedwab serve to summarise, explain, contextualise and interpret survey findings, in the English article quotations from Jedwab are used to predict future scenarios and suggest solutions. In other words, these quotations do not indicate that French is endangered, and moreover they cast doubt on French language endangerment.

Perhaps the most notable Jedwab quotation that is missing from the English article is Example 5.26: “[anglophones] do not understand the extent to which the French language is threatened”. This quote explains that francophones and anglophones have different perspectives because anglophones do not understand the situation of the French language. Since this explanation is notably missing from the English article, and because there are no explanations for French linguistic insecurity apart from the increase in the allophone population, the effect of Scott’s construal is such that francophones appear wary of, if not xenophobic towards, non-francophones. It is notable that Jedwab, who states in the French article that anglophones do not understand French language endangerment, is not solicited for similar comment in the English article.

Not only are francophones represented negatively in the English article, French language endangerment is also not presented as a credible issue. The English article begins with the lead “Is French threatened in Montreal?” Since it is in the lead where the most essential information is generally found, it determines to some extent how article content is meant to be understood (Cotter, 2010: 170; van Dijk, 1991: 118; see Section 4.2.2.2). The function of this particular lead is that, as a question strategically placed at the beginning of the article, doubt is cast on the issue of French language endangerment. In addition, “the survival of French in Montreal” is described as “a perennial concern” – a description that arguably diminishes the

impact and the importance of endangerment by presenting it as a regular affair (see Example 5.33). Also, due to the location of this information in the dependent clause (on dependent/independent clauses see Halliday and Matthiesson, 2004: 380), it appears to be less newsworthy. New (i.e., newsworthy) information tends to occur in independent clauses (Cotter, personal communication). The lack of “newsworthiness” is also manifest because there is no information source supporting the statement. Thus, it may be assumed to be common knowledge that French language endangerment is a perennial concern. In sum, then, language endangerment is not presented as a pressing issue but rather as a perennial concern that faces francophones alone – anglophones and immigrants/allophones do not believe the French language is threatened.

Attempts to discredit French language endangerment are not limited to this single article. Support for this finding can be found across the English primary corpus. For example, an editorial in *The Record* uses quotation strategies to question, if not deride, the very idea that the use of English at the St. Jean Baptiste celebrations might constitute a “threat” (see Example 5.34).

**Example 5.34**

A prime example of this has occurred as the sponsor of an “alternative” St-Jean-Baptiste Day celebration has decided that two English-language acts, scheduled to appear, may not do so because their presence might confuse people and pose a “threat” to the French language in Quebec.

(McDevitt, 2009)

The author of a letter to the editor in *The Gazette* also questions the idea of a threat to the French language, using modalisation, interjections, and rhetorical questions (see Example 5.35).

**Example 5.35**

Did your article really say a bluegrass group and a country singer were banned from the St. Jean Baptiste Day celebrations because

their singing in English would constitute a threat to the French language?

For crying out loud, the lyrics of bluegrass and country music are a threat to the English language. For that reason alone, they are wildly popular to English speakers.

(Moore, 2009)

Another editorial in *The Gazette* (Anonymous, 2009d), entitled “Francophones have little reason to fret so”, uses a number of predicative and intensifying strategies to discredit the argument that French is endangered. This is achieved through the positive evaluation of anglophones (“more bilingual than ever”; “fortunately”), their efforts to speak French (“bilingual”; “better”; “still more instruction in French”), “Frenchness” (“solid”; “enduring”; “predominantly”; “increasingly accepted”), the island of Montreal (“economically and culturally vibrant”; “irreplaceable”), and an emphasis on objective information (“fair-minded”; “what the facts really are”). At the same time, “inaccurate” facts are negatively evaluated (“tendentious”; “fester”), as are emotions (“distinct hardening”; “disquieting”; “tender”; “sensitivity”), because they lead to linguistic troubles (“squabbles”; “alarming”; “sudden”; “chilling”; “roiling”; “increase in resistance”), such as the “demonizing” and “restricting” of English. Indeed, the veracity and possibility of French language endangerment is negatively evaluated (“little reason”, “no decline”; “inaccurate”; “alleged”; “inaccurate”; “non-issue”; “no crisis”; “not even cause for”; “manufactured”; “spurious”). This negative representation of language endangerment contrasts with its more or less unmitigated acceptance in French newspapers. Thus, English-language and French-language articles provide considerably different facts and perspectives on language endangerment in Quebec.

In sum, two articles (Bélair-Cirino, 2009; Marian Scott, 2009c) provide different perspectives on language endangerment in Quebec and reflect ideologies of endangerment that appear to be reported in similar ways more widely throughout the English and French corpora. In the French article, the report of the Leger Marketing survey is used as a vehicle for the dissemination of ideologies of French language endangerment: French and English speakers’ opinions on language endangerment differ because of recent events and findings that have revealed fractures in the

French fabric of Montreal and also, at least in part, English speakers do not understand the extent to which French is threatened. In contrast, the English article begins by asking if French is threatened in Montreal, implying a binary, contestable outcome, and the question is never answered. French speakers' concerns over their language are not substantiated in the article and instead they are framed as protectionist if not intolerant of speakers of other languages. Importantly, the differences between these articles have serious implications: the English article (Marian Scott, 2009c) is taken from *The Gazette*, one of the most widely-circulated newspapers in Canada (see Table 4.1) and the only English-language daily broadsheet published in Montreal, the second largest city in Canada. The perspective adopted in this article thus has a potentially wide audience. In addition, the three near-same versions were published on the same day elsewhere. All four newspapers are owned by the CanWest media conglomerate, which shares resources and wire stories. The other three newspapers besides *The Gazette* include a national newspaper (*National Post*), the only English daily broadsheet in the national capital (*Ottawa Citizen*), and the only daily broadsheet published in Vancouver – Canada's third largest city (*Vancouver Sun*). In other words, three of these newspapers are “hegemonic” dailies (i.e., with no direct or comparable competition in their immediate location), and the other is one of only two national newspapers. All four have very large readerships, and thus the perspective of the single article just examined has a much wider audience than it would initially seem. Thus, while English readers may have their suspicions of Quebec xenophobia or linguistic paranoia confirmed in their CanWest newspapers, French readers in Quebec might find the *Le Devoir* article and its assumptions unproblematic – indeed, French readers may be reassured in their perspective on language endangerment, or even have their linguistic concerns heightened by the article.

As a result, these differences between French and English Canadian newspapers suggest “how newspapers with different audiences, identities, political commitments and hence editorial policies mediate the information they receive” (Richardson, 2007: 106-7). The impact of this mediation is that newspapers publish a guided (misguided?) perspective. The articles can plausibly lead to misunderstandings between English speakers and French speakers or reinforcement of positions. Indeed,

a report on the divide between anglophones' and francophones' perspectives on language may result in a deeper divide.

## 5.7 CONCLUSION

The aim of this chapter was to highlight evidence of language ideologies and Quebec nationalism in a corpus of French Canadian newspapers. Frequencies, collocations, and concordance lines indicate that Quebec is the nation predominantly under discussion in the French primary corpus and national statuses tend to be positively evaluated as empowering features of social groups. The findings also suggest that monolingual language ideologies, ideologies of language as a core value, ideologies of standardised French, and ideologies of language endangerment permeate the French primary corpus, albeit to differing extents. Ideologies of monolingualism and ideologies of endangerment are both salient throughout the corpus. For example, language issues and particularly French language issues are discussed in French newspapers far more than in English newspapers, and QUÉBEC lemmas have a semantic preference for FRANÇAIS lemmas. Frequent collocation trends that juxtapose Frenchness in Quebec with the “rest of Canada” and highlight francophones' location “outside Quebec” suggest a portrayal of Quebec as the epicentre of all things French in Canada; this trend was corroborated by a downsampled article (Rioux, 2009). Ideologies of language endangerment were also prominent, occurring throughout the French newspapers not only in metalanguage, but also in a range of topics more generally. In contrast, the English newspapers cast doubt on or discredit French language endangerment.

Findings concerning ideologies of language as a core value and ideologies of standardised French were much more difficult to tease out of the corpus. The ubiquity of the identity labels *québécois* and *francophone* suggest a move away from French Canadian nationalism toward Quebec nationalism and collocations between “our” and “their” language suggest that the French language is strongly linked to the people of Quebec. However, despite the amount of research literature on standard language ideologies, only a limited number of examples were found in the corpus. Importantly, the findings that were found in support of these ideologies did not emerge on their own. Rather, these were drawn out of the corpus using specific

## Chapter Five: Discourses of Quebec national identity

search terms and techniques. As a result, even if these ideologies do exist to some extent in newspapers, they are certainly not dominant or omnipresent.



# 6. DISCOURSES OF ENGLISH

## CANADIAN NATIONAL IDENTITY

### 6.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter explores how language ideologies and English Canadian nationalism are embedded in Canadian newspapers. As in Chapter Five, some details will first be provided on the data in order to contextualise the findings, which are presented in Sections 6.2 to 6.7.

The data used for analysis in this chapter come from across the entire country, from all 12 English language newspapers selected for analysis. Some newspapers tend to produce more articles than others (see Tables 4.14 and 4.15), which skews to some extent the composition of the English primary corpus. This skew was unavoidable due to the objective of the corpus construction, which was to collect all articles from all selected newspapers over a specific time period. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that some newspapers are more strongly represented in the primary corpus than in the reference corpus. This suggests that, regardless of the overall production of a newspaper, some newspapers discuss language issues more regularly than other newspapers. For example, although national newspapers and newspapers from Atlantic Canada produced the most articles between June 15 and July 8, 2009 (and as a result they comprise the larger part of the English reference corpus), newspapers from Quebec, in fact, contain the most references to the language-oriented core query terms in comparison with their overall production, suggesting the salience of language issues in Quebec. More specifically, between June 15 and July 8, 2009, 12.76% of all articles in *The Record* and 10.8% of all articles in *The Gazette* contained at least one core query term, whereas only 8% of articles in the *Moncton*

*Times & Transcript* and 5.7% of articles in the *Halifax Herald* contained at least one core query term. This is the first indication that the salience of language issues may differ across the country. Thus, although the entire English corpus is used for the exploration of English Canadian nationalism and its associated language ideologies, it is not presumed that all English-medium newspapers endorse this national discourse. Rather, the entirety of the corpus is used for comprehensiveness, and often the French primary corpus and the International Corpus of English-Canada (ICE-CAN) (Nelson and Columbus, 2010) are used for comparison or to illustrate points.

As in the French primary corpus, raw frequencies are not particularly revealing of national discourses or language ideologies in the English primary corpus. The most frequent word of interest, the core query term FRENCH, is ranked 61 on wordlist, with an overall frequency of 1489. CANADA is the next most frequent word of interest, ranking 79 on the list with a frequency of 1228. References to ENGLISH occur 791 times, ranking 108 on the list of the most frequent words in the corpus. Since these three words are extremely topical in an exploration of English Canadian nationalism, and because these words are not salient in terms of frequency, it is useful to see how they stand in terms of statistical significance. Indeed, when the English primary corpus is compared against the English comparator corpus (i.e., the sum of all the articles published over that time period), the results are much more interesting for a study of language ideologies and nationalism (see Table 6.1).

Positive key word	Frequency	% of words in corpus	Reference corpus frequency	% of words in reference corpus	Keyness score
FRENCH	1489	0.16	1490	0.019	2816.72
ENGLISH	791	0.08	791	0.010	1496.52
LANGUAGE	672	0.07	678		1264.41
FEDERER	341	0.03	536		463.42
WIMBLEDON	417	0.04	809	0.010	463.39
HOLDS	423	0.04	973	0.012	387.27
FRANCE	425	0.04	1003	0.013	376.82
CALL	1016	0.11	4083	0.054	354.07
EVERY	974	0.10	4055	0.053	310.31
INFORMATION	916	0.10			

**Table 6.1: Top ten English keywords**

The three keywords with the highest keyness scores (i.e., the words that are the highest ranked on the keyword list) are FRENCH, ENGLISH and LANGUAGE, and references to QUEBEC, FRANCOPHONE, FRANCOPHONES and – in an interesting parallel to the French keyword *BURQA* – MUSLIM all occur in the top twenty keywords on the list. Again, as was the case in French, many of these keywords simply confirm the composition of the English primary corpus: it is unsurprising that many core query terms are statistically significant because they were used in the creation of the English primary corpus (see Section 4.3.2). There are also notable keywords such as FEDERER and WIMBLEDON, which suggest that some core query terms may not necessarily refer (exclusively) to language issues. Indeed, if – as these keywords seem to suggest – references to the French Open tennis tournament (e.g. FRENCH OPEN, 131 occurrences) tend to dominate over references to the French language, this has implications for the salience of language as a topic of discussion in the English primary corpus. Still, there are numerous other keywords that indicate how language may be linked to other topics besides tennis. Within the top 50 keywords, references to HISTORY and CULTURE, references to specific categories of people (ACADIAN, WOMEN, IMMIGRANTS, STUDENTS), and references to Quebec’s national holiday (ST JEAN) all suggest the various ways in which language may be adopted in different contexts to serve different purposes. It is the objective of this chapter to provide more substance and context to these salient keywords and to explore how they may be related to language ideologies and discourses of national identity in English-speaking Canada.

This chapter follows a similar format to Chapter Five, but builds on the findings on Quebec nationalism by contrasting them with similar and different findings on English Canadian nationalism. First, Section 6.2 discusses findings on English Canadian nationalism. The subsequent four sections present findings on language ideologies: Section 6.3 monolingual ideologies, Section 6.4 ideologies of standardised Canadian English, and Section 6.5 ideologies of instrumental English. Each of these sections draws on both quantitative and qualitative data as well as the downsampled articles. As in Chapter Five, findings should be considered cumulative and overlapping rather than stand-alone claims. The objective of this chapter, like the

previous one, is to establish the extent to which the language ideologies outlined in Section 3.3 exist in English language newspapers. If they do exist, it is then necessary to establish how they differ, where they tend to be located, and what their implications are for nationhood.

## **6.2 ENGLISH CANADIAN NATIONALISM**

Before discussing the language ideologies that are proposed to support English Canadian nationalism, it is important to ascertain whether English Canadian nationalism appears to be salient in the English primary corpus. It is rather challenging to find evidence of this “absent” nation (Charland, 1986: 198) that “dares not speak its name” (Resnick, 1995), the nation whose members have “little or no sense of group identity” (Kymlicka, 1998: 155) (see Section 3.3). Nevertheless, there are two dominant findings that suggest the existence of English Canadian national discourse.

The first finding pertains to patterns containing references to Canada and its province. Frequencies from the English primary corpus show that discussions of Canada (CANADA, 1228 occurrences) are more frequent than discussions of Quebec (QUEBEC, 504 occurrences). However, references to QUEBEC occur far more frequently than ONTARIO (236 occurrences), NEW BRUNSWICK (194 occurrences), MANITOBA (130 occurrences), NOVA SCOTIA (94 occurrences), ALBERTA (55 occurrences), BRITISH COLUMBIA (33 occurrences) and YUKON (32 occurrences) – indeed, all the provinces and territories from which corpus data were drawn, and in fact all provinces and territories in Canada. Interestingly, the frequency of references to these provinces does not seem to align with the origin of the newspapers, the majority of which (39.78%) is comprised of articles from Ontario-based national newspapers (see Table 6.2; see also Section 5.4).

National papers (Ontario-based):	39.78% of primary corpus
Atlantic Canada:	25.85% of primary corpus
Ontario:	8.64% of primary corpus
Prairies:	9.77% of primary corpus
Quebec:	8.64% of primary corpus
BC and Yukon:	5.2% of primary corpus

**Table 6.2: Composition and breakdown of components of the EPNC**

Given the composition of the English primary corpus and the fact that Ontario is the most populous province, it would be understandable if references to ONTARIO were the most frequent. However, since newspapers from Quebec comprise such a small proportion (8.64%) of the overall English primary corpus, it is surprising that references to QUEBEC are more frequent than references to other provinces. Furthermore, the fact that references to QUEBEC are only surpassed by references to CANADA suggests a perspectival strategy wherein Canada receives pride of place, but where Quebec also has an important function. Quebec may be referred to so frequently because it is often juxtaposed with Canada rather than included in it; this would also explain why other provinces are referenced less frequently – they are often subsumed within synecdochic references to “Canada”.

This theory is substantiated by two patterns in the English primary corpus. Just as HORS QUÉBEC and RESTE DU CANADA are of high frequency in the French primary corpus (see Section 5.2), in the English primary corpus, too, there are notable references to OUTSIDE QUEBEC (5 occurrences) and REST OF CANADA (11 occurrences). In fact, OUTSIDE (201 occurrences) does not collocate with CANADA or any other province; in terms of locations, it collocates only with QUEBEC (13 occurrences), MONTREAL (6 occurrences) and PARIS (6 occurrences). Notably, it also collocates with FRENCH (5 occurrences) but not ENGLISH. Examples refer to individual francophones or francophone communities “outside of Quebec”, Members of Parliament and Canadian Forces personnel from “outside Quebec”, and francophones “outside Quebec”. The effect is such that Quebec tends to be represented as the epicentre of Frenchness in Canada (see Table 6.3).

## Chapter Six: Discourses of English Canadian national identity

someone who was **francophone** but who was **outside of Quebec**. And he was a very re especially for a **francophone** who grew up **outside of Quebec**. Mr. LeBlanc remained ations. "All the **francophone** communities **outside of Quebec**, obviously because of re also inclusive, and have members from **outside Quebec**. And we've come a long w was sponsored by Conservative MPs in and **outside Quebec**. Bill C-268 proposes "mi tant, but only 12 per cent of any region **outside Quebec speak** even remotely comp ange its method of counting **francophones outside Quebec** and anglophones inside t

**Table 6.3: EPNC concordance lines with OUTSIDE and QUEBEC**

The pattern REST OF CANADA also shows that it is Quebec that tends to be contrasted with the "rest of Canada" (see Table 6.4).

**QUEBEC**  
nly when tensions between **Quebec** and **the rest of Canada** are high. Even then, the ing it between the **Quebec** caucus and **the Rest of Canada** as nothing since **Meech L** u saying they were put into power by **the rest of Canada** in order to defend an an illier said about a dozen women from **the rest of Canada** have sent him their best crisis arises, with **Quebec** accusing **the rest of Canada** of ignoring its democrat

**FIRST NATIONS**  
ren on reserves than for children in **the rest of Canada**: "**First Nations** children ren on reserves than for children in **the rest of Canada**: "**First Nations** children -living gap between **aboriginals** and **the rest of Canada**. The campaign is separat

**Table 6.4: EPNC concordance lines with REST OF CANADA**

Although immigrants, British Columbia, and Toronto are also contrasted with "the rest of Canada" (1 occurrence each), Quebec is most frequently contrasted (5 occurrences), closely followed by the First Nations (3 occurrences) (see Table 6.4). It is notable that Quebec and the First Nations are contrasted most frequently with "the rest of Canada" because Quebecers and First Nations are nations in Canada. The discursive distancing strategy employed here does not allude to the groups' status in Canada; rather, this strategy differentiates between and contrasts Canada and these national groups. Since both Quebec and the First Nations are distinct linguistic and national groups, the contrast implies that "the rest of Canada" is a *different* linguistic and national group, that is, an English nation

The findings on the patterns OUTSIDE QUEBEC and REST OF CANADA in the English primary corpus parallel findings in the ICE-CAN corpus (Newman and Columbus, 2010), where 90% (20 occurrences) of all references to REST OF CANADA occur in the context of discussions of Quebec, and three examples refer to OUTSIDE QUEBEC but no references to OUTSIDE+[other province] (see Table 6.5).

## Chapter Six: Discourses of English Canadian national identity

<p>e partner, but it is unlikely that the  e new fashion of entrepreneurship. The  re clubs in Toronto. Parizeau said  d that <b>Quebec</b> is not understood in  mic union between the province and  economic links between <b>Quebec</b> and  daily in public discourse about "the  s declining outside of <b>Québec</b>. Yet  chair political analysts felt that  that the needs and aspirations of  e, 10 seconds But I want to say to  the right wing that's blowing from  the constitutional wrangling with  s more difficult to sue here or in  anada off or split <b>Quebec</b> off from  hey think it's too little too late  ot interested in offers So I think  coming he can't blame Guy Bertrand  e part this isn't a humiliation on  ss which depends uh on Ontario and</p>	<p>the <b>rest of Canada</b> would be willing to take <b>Quebec</b>  <b>rest of Canada</b> was relieved and complacent. Be  <b>rest of Canada</b> should start thinking seriousl  ." A senior B.C. official said  Premier Robert Bourassa said  <b>rest of Canada</b> ... which will have to be exam  <b>rest of Canada</b>" and all its institutions, is  <b>rest of Canada</b> watched as <b>Québec</b> passed a Bil  <b>rest of Canada</b> rejected them, not the Accord  <b>rest of Canada</b> must be addressed in anyconsti  <b>rest of Canada</b> that <b>Quebec</b> too has needs and  <b>rest of Canada</b> that it will be Marois' job to  <b>rest of Canada</b> will be over once and for all  <b>rest of Canada</b> But of course every generaliza  <b>rest of Canada</b> The trouble with that solutio  <b>rest of Canada</b> doesn't want it because they  <b>rest of Canada</b> is starting to call their blu  <b>rest of Canada</b> Guy Bertrand's a founding memb  <b>rest of Canada</b> and also this is coming he can  <b>rest of Canada</b> for eighty or ninety percent o</p>
--	--

**Table 6.5: REST OF CANADA and OUTSIDE QUEBEC in ICE-CAN**

In sum, these patterns indicate a marked distinction between Quebec and the “rest of Canada”. This difference suggests that all provinces except Quebec tend to be surmised within references to “Canada”, whereas Quebec tends to be discussed on its own – or in comparison with Canada. Moreover, the juxtaposition of a French-majority province with English-majority Canada suggests a default allusion to a united English-speaking community, if not nation.

The second finding which lends support to the discursive construction of English Canadian national identity pertains to the discourse prosody of *NATIONALE* and *NATIONALIST*. The term *NATIONALE* is not an English word: it is the French translation equivalent of the English term “national”. However, in the context of the examples from the English primary corpus, *NATIONALE* is a loan word with negative discourse prosody that has been adopted into English-medium discourse countering Quebec nationalism. The adoption of a loan word where there is a clearly well-established equivalent reflects an ideological use of the loan term. A word may be adopted into a language because of the adoptive culture’s assumptions about the word’s meaning in the culture from which it derives. For example, Stubbs (2001: 176) examines the German terms “Luftwaffe”, “Third Reich” and “Nazi”, which have been adopted into the English language even though translation near-equivalents exist in English (i.e., “air force”, “Third Empire”, “National Socialism”, respectively). He argues that there is often a “clear connection between loan words and culture” (Stubbs, 2001: 176) in the perpetuation of stereotypes between groups

that speak different languages (see Hill, 1995a, b; Kelly Holmes, 2004). In the vast majority of cases here, *NATIONALE* is used to discuss Quebec's national holiday.

The use of French loan words is very unusual in the English primary corpus and *NATIONALE* is not the only word that has been borrowed: *FETE* is also relatively frequent. Unlike *nationale*, the word "fete" is naturalised as an English word (borrowed from French), but it is used rarely in Canada and does not occur in the ICE-CAN corpus. *NATIONALE* only occurs three times in the ICE-CAN corpus: twice with reference to the now-dissolved political party *Union nationale*, and once with reference to Quebec's *Assemblée nationale*. Thus, neither loan term is in frequent use in English Canada, and neither tends to be used generically. In the English primary corpus, only 8% (3 occurrences) of instances of "fete" are used generically to mean "party" or "to celebrate"; the remaining 92% (33 occurrences) of references refer to Quebec's national holiday. With only three exceptions, all 33 uses of the term *NATIONALE*, which occur across six of the twelve sampled newspapers (*Globe and Mail*, *National Post*, *Gazette*, *Ottawa Citizen*, *Record*, *Moncton Times & Transcript*), refer to Quebec's national holiday, the "Fete nationale". Arguably, both *FETE* and *NATIONALE*, and in particular when used in combination, are terms used to index the French nature of Quebec's national holiday.

The explicit and arguably deliberate use of the French term *nationale* rather than the English term "national" may be an active choice to *not* refer to St. Jean Baptiste Day as Quebec's "national holiday". In fact, the use of the French word indexes the Quebec national holiday to its French-speaking population. Indeed, the French nature of the national holiday is emphasised by frequent (8 occurrences) explicit contrasts with English elements ("English", "anglo", "anglophone") (see Table 6.9). Although eight concordance lines make the linguistic contrast explicit, numerous other concordance lines (20 occurrences) also discuss language issues more broadly in relation to Quebec's national holiday. Fifteen of these concordance lines come from articles where one particular story was repeatedly mentioned: a ban on two English bands from playing on Quebec's national holiday. The attempt to block English language Montreal-based bands Lake of Stew and Bloodshot Bill from performing at the St-Jean Baptiste festivities sparked a small "language ideological debate"



(Blommaert, 1999a) in numerous newspapers, which involved widespread criticism of Quebec's national holiday.

Numerous concordance lines explicitly disparage the holiday through evaluative lexis (*exclude, hardline, heckling*), evaluative grammar (modals such as *will, ought to*), scare quotes ("la Fete nationale"; "Les Geants' of Quebec history"), reference strategies ("also referred to as Fete nationale"), questioning strategies ("La Saint-Jean? La Fete nationale? A party for the Parti?"; "Is it the Fete nationale or Fete nationaliste?"), and contrastives ("Quebecers were welcome to attend Fete nationale events, but..."; "June 24<sup>th</sup> is the Fete Nationale. Of all Quebecois. But who is a Quebecois?"). Indeed, even concordance lines that seem neutral at first glance tend to be part of an overall negative evaluation of Quebec's national holiday in each article. Only 10% (3 occurrences) of all instances of *FETE NATIONALE* were found to be relatively neutral and not negative in their evaluations. These neutral instances either refer only to Quebec's national holiday in passing, or else they provide perfunctory information (details and contact information) for the events (see Table 6.6).

<b>CONTRASTS WITH ENGLISH</b>	
he two <u>English</u> bands at this year's <b>Fete nationale</b> ought to be reminded of an in	<b>Fete nationale</b> concert for a predominantly F
<u>glish-language</u> acts to perform in a <b>Fete nationale</b> concert after all. And while	
sing in <u>English</u> in a neighbourhood <b>Fete nationale</b> concert after all. And while	
sing two <u>English</u> pop songs for the <b>Fete nationale</b> show. Maya's half-sister, Kai	
e to exclude two <u>anglo</u> bands from a <b>Fete nationale</b> concert tomorrow - a decision	
ng <u>English-language performers</u> to a <b>Fete nationale</b> concert. Then their applause	
exclude two <u>anglophone</u> bands from a <b>Fete nationale</b> concert tomorrow -- a decisio	
<u>bands</u> will stay on the roster for a <b>Fete nationale</b> celebration after all. Lake o	
<b>DISCUSSION OF ANGLO BANDS</b>	
on June 24, is <b>also referred to as Fete nationale</b> . The event is billed as an al	
an alternative event to the annual Fête nationale.	
x-hour program <b>celebrating</b> Quebec's <b>Fete Nationale</b> . The Societe Saint-Jean-Bapti	
tions of June 24 ( <b>La Saint-Jean? La Fete nationale? A party for the Parti?</b> ) and	
Lepage, who will be MC of the main <b>Fete nationale</b> concert. It refers to the kin	
rst meets the eye. June 24th is the <b>Fete Nationale</b> . Of all Quebecois. <b>But</b> who is	
<b>returned</b> to the line-up of a local <b>Fete Nationale</b> celebration after a <b>ban</b> on th	
e everyone feel Quebecois too at La <b>Fete Nationale</b> de la St. Jean et la St. Pat.	
e the province "Montreal." So <b>Bonne Fete Nationale to all 7 million of us Montre</b>	
age A4 THE GREAT BIG STEW Is it the <b>Fete nationale</b> or <b>Fete nationaliste?</b> Opinion	
power, that la Saint-Jean became la <b>Fete nationale</b> . Then-premier Rene Levesque s	
Jean, St. John the Baptist Day, "la <b>Fete nationale</b> ", this is the day when all Qu	
ng by Pauline Marois on this year's <b>Fete nationale</b> . Marois's Parti Quebecois isn	
6 million in government funding for <b>Fete nationale</b> activities from 2008 to 2011,	
ly meaningful to most of us on this <b>Fete nationale</b> . It's the opening lyrics of t	

**Table 6.6: EPNC concordance lines with *NATIONALE***

Thus, the examination of the French loan words *FETE* and *NATIONALE* has suggested that there are negative connotations surrounding Quebec's national

holiday. This is achieved by several different means. First, the use of French loan words rather than their English equivalents (i.e., “national holiday”) suggests that St-Jean Baptiste has a marked status. Second, the use of French loan words suggests that St-Jean Baptiste is for French speakers (and by extension, not for English speakers). Third, nearly all concordance lines are unanimous in their negative evaluation of FETE NATIONALE. These findings have important implications for an analysis of English Canadian nationalism when the discussions of Quebec’s national holiday are compared with the discussions of Canada’s national holiday. “Canada Day” is only ever referred to by its English name (CANADA DAY, 83 occurrences), never by its translation equivalent *fête du Canada*. This naturalises the idea that Canada’s holiday takes place in English and perhaps is a holiday for English speakers or for “true Canadians”. Canada Day is also only referred to as Canada’s “national holiday” twice in the English primary corpus. The avoidance of the label “national holiday” suggests that the function and status of Canada Day is understood by newspaper readers (i.e., it is shared knowledge within the community). The avoidance of the term “national” may also suggest the negative connotations surrounding nationalism, which would support previous literature on English Canadians’ rejection of nationalism (e.g., Kymlicka, 1998; Resnick, 1995; see Section 3.2.1).

Negativity towards nationalism is evident when NATIONALIST is examined. Concordance lines indicate that NATIONALIST has a semantic preference for terms connected with unstable movement (“ignite”, “agitation”, “movement”, “fuel”, “fervour”, “passions”, “awaken”, “separatist”, “stir up”, “provoking crises”, “bastion”), often with religious undertones (e.g. “ayatollahs”, “zealots”, “sentiment”). Notably, Quebec is the nation predominantly under discussion: although there are singular references to NATIONALIST with respect to France, Iran, Afghanistan, Scotland and Canada and three references to Acadia, there are 13 references to Quebec (see Table 6.7).

## Chapter Six: Discourses of English Canadian national identity

### QUEBEC

gly seen as the unique possession of the **nationalist movement** and the **sovereigni**  
on June 23 because of **agitation** by some **nationalist organizations**. After a wide  
accident, the truth reveals itself. The **nationalist movement in Quebec** has for  
and mostly negative, even on the part of **nationalist commentators**. It was remini  
l leaves the fete’s programming to a few **nationalist ayatollahs** from the **Montrea**  
er party happy than to win over the **soft-nationalist ADQ voters in Riviere-du-Lo**  
about the **St. Jean** festivities and a few **nationalist zealots** who tried to stop a  
a strategy of **provoking crises to awaken nationalist fervour**. But note that many  
er 50% again. Why? The reasons are many. **Nationalist sentiment in Quebec** will ne  
l previous **PQ** governments and toe a soft **nationalist line** that would exclude ref  
try. But in the past, the **fuel to ignite nationalist passions** has always been fo  
ec, especially when it comes to reaching **nationalist voters outside Montreal**. He  
l should strive to be a global city or a **nationalist bastion**, whether or not the

### ACADIA

buted to **Acadie** without subscribing to a **nationalist viewpoint**. “He was a great A  
ian, but not necessarily a great **Acadian nationalist**,” said Nadeau. “He was more  
the Trudeau philosophy than the **Acadian nationalist philosophy**.” Nadeau said LeB

### CANADA

wever quite different from this romantic **nationalist fairy tale**. “They find that

### SCOTLAND

le imagined that in the 1950s a **Scottish nationalist student** named Ian Hamilton

### AFGHANISTAN

ts from India) in Karachi, and a **secular nationalist separatist movement** in Balu

### IRAN

ked the language of martyrdom to **stir up nationalist sentiment**. So the appearanc

### FRANCE

he crowd felt, puffing up its chest with **nationalist pride**. For Audi, well, Stadl

**Table 6.7: EPNC concordance lines with NATIONALIST**

One specific example positively evaluates a lack of nationalism. In the downsampled article “The quintessential Canadian”, Mazerolle (2009) praises the late Governor General of Canada, Roméo Leblanc, in part because he “contributed to Acadie *without subscribing to a nationalist viewpoint*” (emphasis added). Indeed, this article aligns Leblanc’s many achievements with “the Trudeau philosophy”, suggesting that they support federal, bilingual Canada. Combined, these examples suggest a negative discourse prosody of the term NATIONALIST, which facilitates the negative evaluation of Quebec nationalism (see Winter, 2007: 493).

The negative discourse prosody surrounding the terms NATIONALIST and *NATIONALE* could be explained by returning to the initial definition of “nationalism” (see Section 2.3.1). Nationalism is an ideology constructed for understanding the “nation”, and often involves a desire for autonomy. Since national minorities are groups that tend to seek independence from dominant groups, minorities tend to benefit most from, and thus employ, nationalist rhetoric. In other words, “nationalism” can be used as a legitimising strategy for sustaining the political culture of a minority group (see Kymlicka, 1998: 165; see Section 2.3.1). In contrast, dominant groups tend not to use “nationalism” to maintain the status quo; rather, majority forms of nationalism are often naturalised in discourse and become

manifest as “patriotism” (see Ignatieff, 1994: 11, 2000: 124; Oakes and Warren, 2007: 14; Winter, 2007: 483). Concordance lines in the English primary corpus show positive evaluation of PATRIOTISM, including adjectives (“own”, “true”, “strong”, “free”, “more”, “divine”, “beautiful”, “quite”, “many”, “deeply”, “moving”), adverbs (“very much”), nouns (“love”, “pride”, “mentor”, “gold”, “nobleness”, “dream”, “flair”, “heart”), and verbs (“do”, “will”, “encourage”, “will”, “propel”, “aspiring”, “contributed”, “bedecked”, “adding”, “topped off”, “care”, “vow”). A lack of patriotism and the pretence of patriotism are negatively evaluated (“the Opposition Liberal leader’s own patriotism has been questioned”; “if patriotism can be a matter of convenience?”; “patriotism was a sham”; “fear of appearing non-patriotic”). Notably, extreme patriotism is also negatively evaluated – arguably because it is too emotive and unstable – in ways similar, it would seem, to nationalism (“overwrought with patriotism”; “rampant patriotism”; “relentless patriotism”).

Through this lens, then, we can begin to understand the function of the terms NATIONALIST and *NATIONALE* within the English primary corpus. First, the terms tend to be used to refer to Quebec because Quebec is the significant national minority in Canada. Second, both terms have negative discourse prosody because, according to the literature outlined in Section 1.3, newspapers are produced by and reproduce the status quo in which a single group tends to dominate; it would reasonably follow that a majority-leaning and majority-run institution would not endorse minority ambitions or are oblivious to them. Third, Karim (1993) has argued that the Canadian newspaper industry tends *not* to employ minorities; thus, it would follow that those who produce newspapers in Canada, as majority group members, do not align with minority movements (i.e., nationalism) or do not even consider them. Finally, it is plausible that national movements threaten to upset the status quo: in the current state of affairs, Canada is a sovereign country with a prestigious international reputation; perhaps more importantly, Canada is a united country that includes Quebec. Quebec’s national movement may be perceived as a threat to both Canada’s international reputation and to the status quo of a united Canada. The few (7 occurrences) references to NATIONAL UNITY in the English primary corpus show that “unity” is positively evaluated as something that is sought (“work for”, “seek”, “calling for”), achieved (“achieve”), inclusive (“includes”), with positive

results (“boost confidence”, “give us a better voice”), and is part and parcel of seeing endurance through to success (“keeping alive”, “siding with”, “stands firm”, “manages”, “stick with”, “confront”, “work with”), as seen in Table 6.8.

<p>boost confidence and achieve a <b>national unity</b> government.”Un  to work with rivals to form a <b>national unity</b> government to  s the beginning of the end for <b>national unity</b>, or it stands  y’s supreme leader calling for <b>national unity</b> and siding wit  e an issue of public policy or <b>national unity</b>, I try to make  nessant promotion of Canada’s <b>national unity</b>. He did so as  pledged Saturday to work for a <b>national unity</b></p>
--

**Table 6.8: EPNC concordance lines with NATIONAL and unity**

Combined, these concordance lines suggest why the perception of the threat to unity (i.e., Quebec nationalism, which is associated with Quebec sovereignty) is negatively evaluated (on the Quebec “threat” to Canada, see Section 3.4.1).

As a result, the examination of *NATIONALE* and NATIONALIST suggests that nationalism is often negatively evaluated, particularly through its depiction as emotive, unstable, and even volatile. It is perhaps unsurprising that English Canadian nationalism is rarely explicit, since any positively self-representing nation would seek to distance itself from the negative discourse prosody associated with *nationalism*.

To conclude this section, then, there were three primary findings that suggested evidence of English Canadian nationalism in the English primary corpus. First, frequencies of references to CANADA suggest that it is the predominant location under discussion. The fact that Quebec is discussed more than any other province suggests that other provinces tend to be subsumed within references to “Canada”, which represents the provinces (except Quebec) as united, and perhaps a united nation. Second, the collocations of NATIONAL suggest that while Canada is not frequently represented as a nation apart from its institutions, CANADA collocates more frequently with NATIONAL than any other location. Finally, the negative discourse prosody surrounding the terms *NATIONALE* and NATIONALIST indicate why there may be reluctance to identify English Canada as a nation, even if it is implied to be a nation in various contexts. To explore the English Canadian nation

further, language ideologies that support the discourse of English Canadian national identity will be explored in the following sections.

### **6.3 MONOLINGUAL IDEOLOGIES**

In this section, findings relating to monolingual ideologies will be presented. It is argued here that one of the key defining features of English Canadian nationalism is the use and role of the English language. Monolingual ideologies naturalise the understanding of Canada as a monolingual English-speaking society. Indeed, since English-speaking Canada consists of a very diverse population, the role of English may be fundamental to the nation: it may serve to unite the diversity (a similar argument is used in the United States, see Ricento, 2005). There are four findings that suggest evidence of monolingual ideologies; all of these rely on assumptions that English is the only language of status in Canada.

The first finding pertains to the frequency of linguistic terms. “English” Canada appears to be represented as a monolingual nation in a very different way from how Quebec is represented as a monolingual nation. While French is marked, highlighted, and flagged in the French primary corpus (see Section 5.3), the English language often goes unmentioned in the English corpus. Whereas 15.9% of all French newspaper articles over a three-week period contain references to language, over that same three-week period, only 7.86% of all English newspaper articles contain references to language. These initial numbers suggest the different emphasis placed on language issues between English and French Canadian newspapers or perhaps the more “banal” nature of language in English-speaking Canada (Billig 1995). Also suggestive of monolingual English ideologies is the fact that references to the French language are more frequent than references to the English language in the English corpus. In fact, FRENCH occurs nearly twice as often as ENGLISH (1489 versus 791 occurrences). This is arguably because the English language is naturalised and unmarked in English Canadian newspapers.

The second finding that lends support to monolingual ideologies emerges from the comparison between the cluster “only English” with “only French”. One article from *The Globe and Mail* (Perraux, 2009), revealed through an expanded concordance

line, negatively evaluates rural Quebec in part due to the French monolingualism. The topic of the article is ostensibly the “plight” of young bachelor farmers who are finding it increasingly difficult to find partners. However, the content and structure suggest a different focus. Typically, a story angle (or the most critical or newsworthy information) is located at the beginning of an article (Cotter, 2010). This article, however, focuses on a single farmer in Quebec and does not mention facts regarding the isolation of single farmers (e.g. according to Statistics Canada) until well into the second half of the article. In fact, the majority of the article focuses on the case of one individual farmer’s bachelorhood in small town Quebec. Comparisons with urban, English-speaking areas of Canada suggest that French monolingualism is an important factor in isolation. This is achieved through the positive lexical and grammatical evaluation of urban, English-speaking Canada and the negative evaluation of rural, French-speaking Quebec.

The lexis used in association with English-speaking Canadians and English-speaking Canada (i.e., Toronto and Western Canada) includes such positive items as “hearten”, “warm”, “best”, “convenience”, “excitement” – in sum, English Canadians’ “attention” is “enjoy[able]” (see Example 6.1).

### **Example 6.1**

Corn grower Mario Bouthillier said about a dozen women from the rest of Canada have sent him their best wishes, but no date offers, after reading about the plight of single farmers in *The Globe and Mail*.

In contrast, rural, agricultural areas are negatively evaluated. Since Bouthillier’s “little corner of the world” where “most people speak only French” is used as the case study in the article, and because no examples are provided from English-speaking Canada, the implication is such that areas are represented as most unfortunate if they are monolingual French-speaking. Indeed, a study from Statistics Canada is cited as showing that *in Quebec* the situation has worsened (“doubled in the past 40 years”), but no other area of Canada apart from Quebec is noted. Bouthillier’s French-speaking area is negatively represented on several occasions.

For example, “warm responses” were received from English-speaking *Globe and Mail* readers, but the paper “unfortunately” has “limited reach” in Bouthillier’s area, “where most people speak only French”. Indeed, Bouthillier himself describes his area as “my little corner of the world”. This is an area that has “a serious demographic problem in agriculture” because of young farmers’ “plight” and “increasing difficulty” finding partners willing to take on the “rigours and isolation of farm life”. These difficulties are emphasised through the contrast with English-speaking areas (see Example 6.2).

### Example 6.2

A Quebec farmer looking for love is heartened by the warm responses he’s received from Toronto and Western Canada. Now, if he could just get some Quebec women to drop him a line.

The “rest of Canada” has migrated toward urban “conveniences”, “big” cities, full of “excitement” and “advantages”. Indeed, it was only once the “good-humoured” Mr. Bouthillier was discussed in the *Globe and Mail* that he was “heartened” and able to “enjoy” attention from single females. The effect is that Ange-Gardien, the isolated (and yet only one hour from Montreal) area where Mr. Bouthillier lives, is negatively evaluated as a place where people speak “only French”.

This negative representation of “only French” occurs two other times throughout the English primary corpus; in all three cases, the status of the French language is arguably diminished (see Table 6.9).

bilingual, his wife Nathalie spoke <b>only French</b> and -- since we children had <b>only</b> engine - to small-town MNAs who speak <b>only French</b> and have no experience of Montreal?
---

**Table 6.9: EPNC concordance lines with ONLY FRENCH**

Other examples where ONLY collocates with FRENCH suggest the special, and even exceptional, status of the French language in Canada. Whether FRENCH serves as an adjective (5 occurrences) or as a noun (8 occurrences), the language or the language-indexed noun is highlighted as marginalised (see Tables 6.10 and 6.11).



## Chapter Six: Discourses of English Canadian national identity

Formula	Frequency
Only + French (adj) + noun	3
Noun + in + French (noun) + only	3
Noun + only + verb + [in/to] + French (noun)	3
French (adj) + noun + only + [verb]	1
Only + [pers pronoun] + French (adj) + noun	1
French (noun) + verb + the only + noun	1
Verb + French (noun) + only + verb	1

**Table 6.10: Formula of ONLY + FRENCH**

École élémentaire Bastion, the only **French**-immersion school in the town  
 entirely bilingual, his wife Nathalie spoke only **French** and -- since we children ha  
 an **French** Memramcook Valley. His was the only 'French' family in the village; hi  
 er and her siblings took over the city's only **French** bookstore to save it from c  
 nglish only, with two per cent in **French** only and 18 per cent in both official l  
 English or the complete plan (in **French** only), visit <http://saintlaurent.ville>.  
 English only and two per cent in **French** only, a mere 18 per cent of businesses  
 at and had taken his shirt off. He would only respond to **French**. The captain req  
 t seemed that the meat and potatoes were only available in **French**. "At the federa  
 municates by screaming in gibberish that only his **French** lawyer (who also has a  
 sed in the **French** culture. **French** is the only language spoken in the classroom a  
 ch of their school years studying **French** only to graduate without being able to

**Table 6.11: EPNC concordance lines of ONLY + FRENCH**

Interestingly, FRENCH collocates with ONLY more than ENGLISH collocates with ONLY in the English primary corpus (20 versus 14 occurrences). As mentioned, most instances where FRENCH collocates with ONLY highlight the exceptional status of the French language. When ENGLISH collocates with ONLY, however, 57% of occurrences discuss English in contrast with French (8 out of 14 occurrences). Concordance lines discuss, for example, an Acadian singer who refused a record deal because it meant "having to sing *only in English*" (i.e., not in her first language, French). Two other concordance lines discuss the "English-only" stream of education (i.e., not French immersion or monolingual French education). Only two concordance lines use the word "only" in such a way that the English language is portrayed as inadequate. Indeed, in the first of these two cases, the word "only" serves to represent both English and French monolingualism as inadequate: the author laments that "we children had *only English*" when his step-grandmother spoke "*only French*" (see Example 6.3).

**Example 6.3**

My father's family was a large one and because Grandmother and Grandfather Belliveau lived their lives in their ancestral Memramcook Valley, we as children saw less of them than my mother's people who were nearby. And while Grandfather André was fluently bilingual, his wife Nathalie spoke *only French* and – since we children had *only English* – there was little communication even though she understood a good deal living in a tiny village which was mostly English-speaking.

(Belliveau, 2009; emphasis added)

In this case, both languages are reduced and isolated on the basis of monolingualism because neither French nor English is adequate to communicate with the other person. In the second example, the concordance line clearly evaluates English skills alone as inadequate (see Example 6.4). Notably, though, Example 6.4 also serves to derogate the monolingualism of French-speaking Quebec.

**Example 6.4**

I was lucky enough to speak both languages so I could stay around after graduation, but my friends *who only spoke English* left to broaden their opportunities due to the shrinking ones here in a more and more unilingual French Quebec.

(Pole, 2009; emphasis added)

These two representations of English as inadequate are in the minority. Most highlight English “only” when it is necessary to contrast it with French. Indeed, of the 14 collocations between ENGLISH and ONLY, five of these directly refer to French (FRENCH, 4 occurrences; FRANCOPHONES, 1 occurrence) and another seven of these reveal, through expanded concordance lines, that English is being contrasted with French (see Table 6.12).

**FRENCH REFERRED TO DIRECTLY:**

as unilingual **French**, placed in an **English-only** school where he had to learn English  
e only **French** and -- since we children had **only English** -- there was little communica  
y of **non-francophones** think the opposite - **only** 24 per cent of **English-speakers** and a  
per cent of its business signs in **English only**, with two per cent in **French** only and  
ent of commercial signs in Moncton **English only** and two per cent in **French** only, a me

**FRENCH IMPLIED:**

s **bilingual**, when in practice workers need **only English**, has the unintended affect of  
not **translated** into **English** until 1906 and **only** became Canada's anthem in 1980 to hon  
y would normally have gained in an **English-only** stream, said director of curriculum r  
round after graduation, but my friends who **only** spoke **English** left to broaden their o  
e the two **English** acts disinvented, and not **only** because we learned a new expression:  
n record deal when it meant having to sing **only** in **English**. J.Y. <rican record deal w  
n record deal when it meant having to sing **only** in **English**. J.Y. Revision date: Frida

**Table 6.12: Concordance lines of ENGLISH and ONLY**

These findings suggest that English tends to be discussed predominantly when contrasted with other languages, and specifically, French. In other words, English often goes unnoticed in English-speaking Canada. The concordance lines in Table 6.8 indicate that the English language is mentioned only because individuals (such as the Acadian singer) or extraordinary events (such as a proposed city bylaw in New Brunswick requiring bilingual signage) highlight English monolingualism in contrast with the reality of linguistic (i.e., French) minorities. Another concordance line argues that only English is necessary – in other words, French is unnecessary (see Example 6.5).

**Example 6.5**

There are skilled immigrants who would be well-suited for the federal public service, but they might not speak both English and French, so some measure of language training might be necessary. Conversely, the foolish practice of designating so many Ottawa-based jobs as bilingual, when in practice *workers need only English*, has the unintended affect [sic] of keeping out immigrants.

(Anonymous, 2009a; emphasis added)

As a result, although these differences in collocation trends between ENGLISH and ONLY and FRENCH and ONLY are subtle, they do suggest a discursive tendency that not only flags the French language as different and exceptional, but also demonstrates how the dominance of English is unproblematic and unnoticed. Thus, the analysis of the clusters ONLY ENGLISH and ONLY FRENCH suggest that the

English language tends to be unmarked unless it is necessary to compare it with other languages.

The third finding on monolingual ideologies pertains to the stand-alone nature and collocability of linguistic labels. When the terms *ANGLOPHONES*, *FRANCOPHONES* and *ALLOPHONES* are compared in English and French, findings suggest different ways of discussing linguistically-indexed individuals. The term *ANGLOPHONES*, for example, occurs in both the English primary corpus and the French primary corpus. In the English primary corpus, 42.5% of occurrences of *ANGLOPHONES* collocate with *FRANCOPHONES* (9 occurrences), *FRENCH* (6 occurrences) and *ALLOPHONES* (5 occurrences). In the French primary corpus, only 17.9% of occurrences of *ANGLOPHONES* collocate with *FRANCOPHONES* (20 occurrences), *ALLOPHONES* (10 occurrences), and *FRANÇAIS* (4 occurrences). In both languages, the term *FRANCOPHONES* appears to be much more capable of existing on its own (i.e., not compared with another language or language group), with only 15% of occurrences of *FRANCOPHONES* in the English primary corpus collocating with *ANGLOPHONES* (9 occurrences), *FRENCH* (9 occurrences), and *ENGLISH* (no occurrences), and only 10.4% of occurrences of *FRANCOPHONES* in the French primary corpus collocating with *ANGLOPHONES* (20 occurrences), *FRANÇAIS* (8 occurrences), and *ALLOPHONES* (5 occurrences). In other words, in both the English and the French primary corpora, discussions of francophones can occur on their own; in contrast, discussions of anglophones tend to take place in discursive contexts where other language groups are also under discussion. Thus, in English and to some extent in French, *ANGLOPHONES* is a term that tends not to be used on its own; rather, it is often used in opposition with other languages or linguistic labels.

Concordance lines demonstrate the various ways in which the term *ANGLOPHONE/S* is used in contrast with the French language. Most instances explicitly juxtapose the term *ANGLOPHONES* with *FRANCOPHONES* (6 occurrences), or juxtapose fluency in French with being anglophone (6 occurrences). One line suggests that Quebec is French-speaking by juxtaposing “anglophones”

with “Quebec” (“anglophones who have weathered Quebec’s political storms”) (see Table 6.13).

<p>have a facility for languages. Well, <u>anglophones</u> are just as smart as <u>francophones</u>.”          atural fear <u>when speaking French</u> that <u>anglophones</u> <u>feel more than francophones</u> (who sp          er cent of <u>non-francophones</u> <u>feel that anglophones</u> <u>speak French</u> at a satisfactory leve          007). &lt;/p&gt;&lt;p style="margin-top:0px;"&gt; <u>Anglophones</u> <u>speak satisfactory French</u>: 36 per c          onsidered a <u>francophone</u> is a Canadian <u>anglophone</u> who also speaks <u>French</u>. Not content          n English. After all, the majority of <u>anglophones</u> who have weathered <u>Quebec’s</u> politic          kely to be able to speak English than <u>anglophones</u> are to speak <u>French</u>, with 43.4 per          ts of eyes to see if <u>francophones</u> and <u>anglophones</u> can appreciate the humour. In this          into <u>heavily-francophone</u> regions than <u>anglophones</u> might do. But as long as Montreal I          rtunities to use the <u>French</u> language. <u>Anglophones</u> will develop their skills in conte</p>
---

**Table 6.13: EPNC concordance lines ANGLOPHONE/S, FRANCOPHONE/S**

In contrast, the fact that the term FRANCOPHONES most often occurs on its own suggests that those who are not labelled as “francophones” tend to be anglophones. Thus, “Englishness” seems to be normalised and taken for granted in English Canadian newspapers (cf. on the normalisation of heterosexuality versus homosexuality in corpus data, Baker 2010: 126).

One exception to this generalisation occurs in a downsampled article (Anonymous, 2009c), which discussed the fact that “Moncton-area Orthodox Christians are hoping to establish an English-language mission serving all Orthodox Christians in the area”. The specification that this mission is English implies that there are other languages (or another language) commonly spoken in Moncton, which of course is accurate: 49% of Monctonians are English-French bilingual, and another 4% do not speak English at all. Although this example does not explicitly discuss the French language alongside English, it is the exception rather than the rule: most other findings suggest that the English language and speakers are discussed alongside the French language and speakers.

The final indicator of monolingual ideologies is that the English language is presented as the language of integration for Canada. For example, one editorial in the *Calgary Herald* (Corbella, 2009) clearly argues that English is a delineating marker between Canadians (implied: English-speaking) and others. The editorial, entitled “No surprise burka-clad women didn’t write in”, focuses on whether the burka should be banned in Canada. In the debate over burka banning, the columnist writes that she received a great deal of mail but none from women who wear burkas. This,

she argues, is because they have not learned English as a result of their isolation and lack of freedom. The columnist emphasises that those who wear burkas should speak English in order to not be isolated (see Example 6.6).

**Example 6.6**

Several days ago, a Calgary Muslim man asked me if I wanted to run a column by a niqab-wearing woman. “Of course,” was my answer. A day later, he wrote this: “There aren’t a lot of Niqabis in Calgary who feel they’re fluent enough in English, and by definition they’re a shy bunch!” He didn’t refer to them as women wearing niqabs but as “Niqabis.” They are defined by their garb which only leaves a slit for their eyes. Is it any wonder they are so isolated they haven’t learned English and that “they’re a shy bunch?”

(Corbella, 2009)

The assumption of Corbella’s (2009) article is that irrespective of the gender/culture dimension, English is necessary for integration into and participation in Canadian society. Another contributor (Wai, 2009) notes that in her experience some people “have no English despite having been in Canada for years”. Their lack of fluency is noted in part because of the length of time spent in a country that is implied to be English-speaking. These examples parallel the assumptions made in a downsampled article discussing immigrant employment (Ravindran, 2009; see Appendix 7 for entire article).

In a letter to the editor, Ravindran (2009) stresses the need for immigrants to have access to English education in order for them to be able to earn beyond “hand to mouth” wages. The implication is that English skills are required for any job that pays above minimum wage because English is the language that is spoken most widely in Canadian society (see Example 6.7).

**Example 6.7**

Non-English-speaking immigrants arriving with families face a significant dilemma: seek low-paying work that will provide only

hand-to-mouth wages or attend English classes and generate little-to-no income.

Indeed, Ravindran (2009) argues that fluency in English is crucial for integration into Canadian society (see Example 6.8).

### **Example 6.8**

Government programs such as English Language Services for Adults do facilitate economic and cultural integration into Canadian society, but I believe more pragmatic solutions need to be implemented.

The English language figures in discussions of integration with regard to immigration. ENGLISH collocates with IMMIGRATE lemmas eight times, and no other languages are collocates. English is therefore implied to be necessary for the integration of immigrants, since English monolingualism is the norm in English Canada.

Finally, in addition to these findings related to monolingual ideologies, it is worth noting that they tend to be more salient in some areas of Canada than others. Two findings suggest that these ideologies may be predominant in Western Canada and the Prairies. This is the area of Canada most disconnected from the history of New France and with the smallest French-speaking populations. This is also an area which has historically been opposed to bilingualism (see Sections 3.3 and 3.4). The first indication of regional specificity is that the newspapers *Calgary Herald*, *Whitehorse Star*, and *Vancouver Sun* contain the smallest proportion of language vocabulary in relation to the overall number of words (5.74%, 6.5% and 8%, respectively). This may indicate that languages are relatively unimportant because only one language is used – English. The second indication is that there is a dearth of references to languages, language speakers, and foreign language terminology in the newspapers the *Vancouver Sun*, *Whitehorse Star*, *Calgary Herald* and the *Winnipeg Free Press*. These newspapers contain significantly fewer references to ENGLISH and FRENCH, significantly fewer references to French-speaking areas of Canada (e.g. QUEBEC, [New] BRUNSWICK), and significantly fewer French words than

newspapers in the rest of Canada (the significance of these findings was established through the KeyWord process).

It is rare for French terms to be used in English (see Section 6.2), but newspapers from central and Eastern Canada tend to use the words DE and LA quite frequently (1366 and 692 occurrences, respectively). Newspapers from Western Canada and the Prairies contain statistically significantly fewer references to DE and LA than newspapers from the rest of Canada ( $p \leq 10^{-11}$ ). Although DE and LA have multiple functions in English, they are often used to index French nouns, for example, places (e.g. La Grande-Motte, Lac La Biche), people (e.g. proper names: de la Goublaye), and institutions (e.g. Maison de la culture, La Francophonie). Given that they are used in a variety of contexts, it is notable that they are used significantly less in Western Canada. The absence of these terms suggests that French has not played a historic role in the area (otherwise place names may have been French), that French speakers are few (otherwise they would be named more frequently in the news), and that there are few French institutions in Western Canada and the Prairies. For example, LA FRANCOFONIE is not once mentioned in the newspapers from Western Canada and the Prairies, whereas newspapers from Ontario, New Brunswick, and Quebec all mention La Francophonie at least once.

To conclude, monolingual ideologies do seem to permeate the English primary corpus through the unmarked and naturalised status of the English language. This naturalisation was shown through the frequency of linguistic terms (i.e., FRENCH and ENGLISH), the comparison of the clusters ONLY FRENCH and ONLY ENGLISH, the stand-alone nature of French labels (e.g. “francophone”) versus the largely dependent nature of corresponding English labels (e.g. “anglophone”), and the assumption that English is the language of integration. Positive and negative keywords also suggest that monolingual ideologies also may be more salient in Western Canada and the Prairies than anywhere else in the country.

#### **6.4 IDEOLOGIES OF STANDARDISED CANADIAN ENGLISH**

Previous research has suggested that Canadian English is sometimes used to differentiate Canada from its close allies and neighbours – namely, the United



Kingdom and the United States (Boberg, 2010; Casselman, 2006; Fee, 2007; Lilles, 2000; Rea, 2006). One way in which this distinction is made is through the standardisation of Canadian English and the promotion of this variety. However, despite the findings of research on Canadian English, and despite the fact that the majority of this research has taken place relatively recently (e.g. Boberg, 2010), there is no mention of “Canadian English” in the English primary corpus. Interestingly, there is only one reference to “Canadian English” in the ICE-CAN corpus – which, in fact, is drawn from a letter confirming an individual’s willingness to contribute his/her text “on Canadian English” to the corpus!

Although there are no explicit references to “Canadian English” in the English primary corpus, there are some prescriptive discussions of language in Canada. For example, numerous concordance lines emphasise the necessity and the benefits of speaking English. Similarly, speaking poor English or little English is negatively evaluated. Some concordance lines (3 occurrences) simply note an ability to speak English (“can speak”, “able to speak”); others (8 occurrences) note a lack of fluency (“didn’t speak”, “refused”, “speak little”, “not speak”, “speak neither”, “didn’t speak very good”; “halting”; “to improve”; “make sure his English was understood”; “isn’t very strong”; “no English”). There are also seven references to “broken English” (see Table 6.14).

**MODALIZED**

ou for two years and **can speak** English or French. Q. I will eror and the Empress **can speak** English, but at no point duri ore likely to be **able to speak** English than anglophones are

**LACK OF FLUENCY**

three."My mother **didn't speak** English," Frank said.At first but they might **not speak both** English and French, so some m Polish man, who **did not speak** English and had spent hours a ly explained she did **not speak** English. After that, we excha d Mamma also to speak to us in English **which she refused**. Sh on, and a few who **speak little** English. At least one worker s who speak **neither French nor** English. The raison d'etre of ear."He **didn't speak very good** English, but the big fish tur says the director, in **halting English**."At the beginning of ian. He intends to **improve his English** so he can volunteer a ipal portfolio, to **improve his English**. Charest recalled the owski, wanted to **make sure his English was understood** last w owski, wanted to **make sure his English was understood** last w s while in Moncton.He says his **English isn't very strong**, bu aid in his **gradually improving English**. "Now, we're couple y before him, is **not at ease in English**, although he made a c a huge number of them have **no English at all**. I volunteered ; his mother Nathalie spoke **no English** but somehow managed t e. Most of the clients have **no English** despite having been i ound. Dziekanski, who spoke **no English**, eventually began thr

**BROKEN ENGLISH**

usually passed along in **broken English** and riddled with grammat etsova said in slightly **broken English**. "They don't have to put usually passed along in **broken English** and riddled with grammat about Canada, but spoke **broken English**. Then again, we could ba es. I was questioned in **broken English** for about 20 minutes - s Jar Binks, the clumsy, **broken-English** speaking alien from "Sta Jar Binks, the clumsy, **broken-English** speaking alien from Star

**Table 6.14: EPNC concordance lines: fluency in English**

The downsampled article discussed previously (Ravindran, 2009; see Appendix 7) also stresses the need for fluency in English in order for immigrants to obtain well-paying jobs. However, none of these prescriptive discussions of English note which variety of English is meant to be spoken; more specifically, no articles mention Canadian English at all.

Ideologies of standardised Canadian English may underlie discussions of accents in the English primary corpus when foreign accents are compared against a Canadian standard (i.e., unmarked) accent. There are three references to “heavily accented English” in three separate newspapers (*The Halifax Herald*, *Moncton Times & Transcript*, *National Post*), and two of the three are used in discussions of Canadians. The fact that accents are noted in these cases suggests that English is to be spoken in a certain way in order to blend in, and perhaps in order to appear authentically Canadian (Karim, 1993). Indeed, one example (Delaney, 2009) refers to “heavily accented English” within the context of a report on citizenship for new Canadians. One individual who had recently taken the oath of citizenship is quoted

as saying “I believe in this country there are lots of open-minded people, and that’s very important for me”. However, she is noted as speaking with “heavily accented English”; her language skills perhaps reify her status as a new – and thus not unmarked – Canadian. As a contrast, local accents are sometimes noted in the French primary corpus. For example, in one case an accent is described as “French mixed with Québécois” (*accent français mâtiné de québécois*), another is a “broad” Acadian accent (*accent chiac bien assumé*), and another accent is “thick Québécois”, which is difficult to understand (*un gros accent québécois. Même moi, je ne les comprends pas toujours/* “a thick Quebec accent. Even I didn’t always understand”). Other times a Canadian French accent is sufficient to identify an individual (*québécoise que vous reconnaîtrez par son accent/* “Quebecer, that you’d recognise from his accent”), or the accent is remarked because it is “so Canadian” (*tellement canadien!*). In some cases, a Canadian French accent is appreciated as part of the culture (*le sourire, l’accent et l’humour qui priment toujours/* “the smile, the accent, and the humour that always win”). References to accents in the French primary corpus stand out because there are so few references to Canadian accents and to Canadian English more generally in both the English primary corpus and in the ICE-CAN.

Thus, although previous research has suggested that differences between Canadian and American English were once widely-recognised (see e.g. Fee, 2007), no evidence of these linguistic differences was found in the English primary corpus. There are frequent references to the United States in the English primary corpus: THE UNITED STATES (181 occurrences) is the most frequent three-word cluster that is not a discourse marker and often collocates with CANADA (24 occurrences); and AMERICAN collocates with CANADIAN (9 occurrences) and AMERICANS with CANADIANS (8 occurrences). Although there is one reference to “American English” in the English primary corpus, there are no references to “Canadian English”. As mentioned, there is only one reference to “Canadian English” in the ICE-CAN, but there are no references to “American English”. Given this dearth of examples, then, there is no evidence that Canadian English is compared against American English in the English Canadian newspaper articles in this dataset, nor in the ICE-CAN corpus.

In sum, although Canadian English has recently been standardised and is sometimes said to be used as a distinguishing feature faced with the United States (see Casselman, 2006; Fee, 2007; Lilles, 2000; Rea, 2006), there were no references to Canadian English and no references discussed the connection between Canadian English and Canadian identity. Only the occasional indication of prescriptivism and the remark of a foreign accent suggest that there is a linguistic norm in Canada. Thus, there is little evidence of ideologies of standardised Canadian English in the English primary corpus.

### **6.5 IDEOLOGIES OF INSTRUMENTAL ENGLISH**

One reason why the English language is at the heart of “English” Canadian nationalism is because it is seen as a valuable language of communication both nationally and internationally. In other words, it has real, valuable currency in society because fluency and skills in English have been “commodified” (Heller, 2003b) as marketable resources. English is an international language and what some might call a “hegemonic” or “imperial” language (see e.g. Phillipson, 1997). Because it is a common language for many diverse groups of people, English tends to be seen as serving functional, utilitarian and “instrumental” (Gardner and Lambert, 1959: 267) purposes. In general, then, it does not seem to have sentimental value the way that, for example, French is a crucial symbol of Quebec national identity (see Section 3.1.3). Perhaps because of its value and undisputed international status, the English language tends to be naturalised and embedded in the English primary corpus. This section will outline three findings, the first highlighting the assumptions made about the value of fluency in English, the latter two highlighting the preeminent role that the English language plays in multilingualism and in international contexts.

First, as discussed in Section 6.4, in the English corpus there are several references to a lack of fluency in English. This may suggest that English should not only be spoken, but it should also be spoken well because of its status as an international language of communication. To explore this hypothesis, we can compare representations of fluency in English in the English and French primary corpora to

see how the English language is perceived by French speakers. Notably, a lack of fluency in English is also negatively evaluated in the French primary corpus (5 occurrences). In the French primary corpus, there is only one positive evaluation of English skills (*parlant un bon anglais*, 1 occurrence), but there are three references to “poor English” (*parlait mal anglais*), one reference to “barely speaking English” (*parlait à peine anglais*), and one reference to unintelligible English (*son anglais était pratiquement inintelligible*). In contrast, the French primary corpus contains only positive – not negative – evaluations of French (7 occurrences). Neither *À PEINE* nor *ININTELLIGIBLE* (the negative evaluation terms used to describe a lack of fluency in English) collocate with *FRANÇAIS*, and *MAL* only collocates with *FRANÇAIS* twice – neither instance using *MAL* to evaluate French skills (see Table 6.16).

<p><b>ENGLISH: NEGATIVE EVALUATIONS</b>  ford, même si elle <b>parlait mal</b> anglais. Je n’aime pas la télé trop léché  ford, même si elle <b>parlait mal</b> anglais. Je n’aime pas la télé trop léché  ford, même si elle <b>parlait mal</b> anglais. Je n’aime pas la télé trop léché  e d’abord (il <b>parlait à peine</b> anglais) et musical par le fait qu’il n’e  les parce qu’il ne <b>parlait pas</b> anglais, mais il connaissait toutes les c  guide de parler français: son <b>anglais était pratiquement inintelligible</b></p> <p><b>ENGLISH: POSITIVE EVALUATION</b>  nes vêtus à l’occidentale, parlant un <b>bon anglais</b>, ou encore des étudiants, des jour</p> <p><b>FRENCH COLLOCATING WITH MAL</b>  ferais donc tourner pas <b>mal</b> de chansons en <b>français</b>. Comme C4, le producteur de L’Aut  que la Régie A existe, c’est pas <b>mal</b> plus <b>français</b> à Campbellton alors qu’avant, c’é</p>
--

**Table 6.15: FPNC concordance lines, evaluations of English and French**

Although findings are small in number, they suggest that English skills may be important to French speakers as well as English speakers. This would confirm recent arguments made by researchers (e.g., Cardinal, 2008: 69; Oakes, 2010), who have noted that francophones want to improve their fluency in English (see Section 3.2.1). They would also support Garvin’s (1993) conceptual framework of language standardisation (see Section 2.1.4), which posited that when a language has predominantly instrumental value, individual fluency in a standard language is highly prized. In contrast, if a language has a predominantly integrative value, then expectations for individual fluency in a standard language may be lower. According to both English and French newspapers, English has a predominantly instrumental value in Canadian society, and thus fluency in English is seen to be very important.

The next finding pertains to the function of the English language within discussions of multilingualism. Concordance lines from the English primary corpus reveal that discussions of languages are not limited to English and French: at times, Arabic, Latin, and German are also mentioned. However, in all cases save three, multilingualism explicitly includes fluency in English as well as another or multiple other languages (see Table 6.17).

<u>SPEAKING MULTIPLE LANGUAGES</u>
<p>sers to speak either <b>Arabic</b> or English into their phone, hea  ou for two years and who speak English or <b>French</b>. These peop  tually speak <b>Latin</b>, as well as English, <b>French</b> and a smatter  e than <b>francophones</b> (who speak English), but francophones ar  pan&gt;Re: [<b>Immigrants</b>] who speak English find better jobs, Wes  <b>aiwanese</b> children how to speak English, before returning to  who speak <b>languages other than</b> English will be connected to</p> <p>years and who speak <b>English</b> or French. These people could be  rson born in Russia who speaks French (and <b>English</b>) must als  ght not speak both <b>English</b> and French, so some measure of la  their mother tongue, know both French and <b>English</b>, and speak  es feel that <b>anglophones</b> speak French at a satisfactory leve  ian <b>anglophone</b> who also speaks French. Not content with that  s <b>English</b> and the other speaks French."We need to tell (fami  rson born in Russia who speaks French and <b>English</b>. About the</p>

**Table 6.16: EPNC concordance lines of multilingualism**

Thus, although skills and fluency in multiple languages are noted in the English primary corpus, English continues to play an important role. For example, in one downsampled article (Blatchford and Leeder, 2009), the qualities of a Canadian military officer are extolled, including her multilingualism – which includes the English language (see Example 6.9).

**Example 6.9**

“She got far more high-level attention than a normal RMC [Royal Military College] grad would get,” said a now-retired senior officer who once lobbied for her. But then, he said, she deserved it – she was trilingual (English, French and Portuguese), and she had that marvellous intellect and work ethic.

(Blatchford and Leeder, 2009)

The officer’s linguistic abilities are positively represented as merit for unusual praise, and discursively paired with her overall “marvellous intellect and work ethic”. This representation indicates the way that language skills can serve as an

asset and a symbol of intelligence, but importantly the English language figures among these praised assets. In bilingual or multilingual contexts, English is sometimes favourably represented in contrast with other languages. One downsampled article (Anonymous, 2009g) highlights the power and hegemony of the English language in comparison with French (see Example 6.10).

**Example 6.10**

while the power of attraction of English ensures that it is the common language of multicultural Toronto, French would hardly be as dominant as it is in Montreal without some legislative assistance.

(Anonymous, 2009g)

Another newspaper explains how the French language serves little purpose on the West coast of Canada. Bilingualism, the journalist writes, would be better served by legislation furthering Mandarin or Spanish, which are implied to be more valuable languages than French (see Example 6.11).

**Example 6.11**

We are also woefully baffled by the French language spat, finding it hard to relate to or even take seriously the perennial debate that is all things francophone. You want bilingual? Try Mandarin. Or, lately, Spanish.

(Fralic, 2009)

These examples indicate the instrumental value that English is seen to possess in Canada. The value of English is not limited to Canada, however; findings also show that English is valued in diverse circles internationally.

Indeed, English may be represented as a valuable language in part due to its status on the international stage. The perceived instrumental value of English may reflect what Kulyk (2010: 84) calls the “ideology of understanding (or communication)”, which he argues “sees language primarily as a conduit for conveying information and thus prescribes the use of a language that is best understood for all participants

in a given communication act”. The ideology of understanding suggests that languages are particularly valuable if they can function in diverse contexts, such as international situations. The English primary corpus shows that whereas FRENCH collocates with DISTRICT (2 occurrences) and CITY (1 occurrence), ENGLISH collocates with WORLD (4 occurrences). While these examples are few, they suggest overall trends equating the English language with international, and perhaps important, worldly affairs, whereas French is equated with more local – and perhaps, as a result, parodied – concerns in the Canadian context (see Table 6.18).

<p>found little resonance in the English-speaking <b>world</b>. Even they ventured into the largely English-speaking Ontario <b>world</b> restaurant in London. He’s the English-speaking <b>world’s</b> lead restaurant in London. He’s the English-speaking <b>world’s</b> lead</p> <p>r had been closed by the local French-speaking <b>district</b> because ly takes place in a nearly all French-speaking <b>district</b>. From Ties - he can’t tell he’s in a French-speaking <b>city</b>. He goes</p>
--

**Table 6.17: EPNC concordance lines with ENGLISH and FRENCH + location**

These concordance lines suggest that English serves communicative roles not only within a local community, but more broadly within the international community.

Downsampled articles also suggest the important role of the English language in communication in international contexts. Most of the downsampled articles with the lowest proportion of core query terms (see Section 4.3.4) tend to discuss language in passing in such a way that languages, and particularly fluency in languages, are presented as assets to individuals rather than as social goods. The English language in particular is framed as an invaluable asset that enables individuals to access opportunities that otherwise would be unavailable to them. For example, the article “India’s gay community fights for ‘dignity’” (Nolen, 2009) represents fluency in English as a positive trait of the educated elite in Indian society. According to this description, being educated and fluent in English allows gay men and lesbians more freedom, both on the Internet and in elite establishments (see Example 6.12).

### Example 6.12

Gay and transgendered Indians, especially those who belong to the visible *hijira* (transgendered) and *kothi* communities, and femme and proud boys like Rajiv, are particular targets for police brutality



carried out in the name of 377 [the section of the Indian Penal Code that criminalizes homosexual acts between consenting adults]. *An elite of educated, English-speaking gay men and lesbians moves relatively freely*, meeting on the Internet or at dedicated queer nights at upscale bars; their money insulates them from the threat of police harassment.

(Nolen, 2009, emphasis added)

Fluency in English is a coveted skill, it would seem, since another downsampled article discusses the English language education of a Japanese royal prince. In this case, the English language is paired with “international etiquette” and “democratic principles”, suggesting the important value of the English language in geopolitics (see Example 6.13).

### **Example 6.13**

Elizabeth Gray Vining was engaged to teach him *English, international etiquette, democratic principles and – Ms. Vining being a Quaker – pacifism*. The director of the Prince’s education, Shinzo Koizumi, a former university president, taught his young charge the maxim that “Heaven never created a man above or below another man” and instructed him to emulate Britain’s King George V as a constitutional monarch who placed himself at the service of his people.

(Valpy, 2009, emphasis added)

Finally, another downsampled article refers to how a lack of fluency in English can have hugely detrimental effects. The article “Sterilized, stigmatized” (York, 2009) discusses the non-consensual sterilisation of HIV-positive African women. The article explains how Hilma Nendongo was asked to “sign some papers” as she entered the hospital for a C-section; although Nendongo signed these papers, she was unaware that they confirmed her acceptance of sterilisation. The story, then, is that because she barely spoke English she was unable to participate in actions that concerned her directly; more specifically, she was unable to communicate with her

doctor. Indeed, since Nendongo “barely spoke English” (she was unable to read the doctor’s handwriting apart from a few words), the implication is that part of the reason for her suffering is her lack of English fluency (see Example 6.14).

**Example 6.14**

A few weeks after giving birth to a baby boy by Caesarian section, Hilma Nendongo went back to hospital to have the stitches removed. A nurse glanced at her medical record and casually asked her a horrifying question.

“Oh,” the nurse said, “did they tell you that you had been sterilized?” Ms. Nendongo, a 30-year-old villager from northern Namibia *who barely spoke English*, tore through her personal health card, looking for a clue to what had been done to her in the state hospital.

She couldn’t read any of the doctor’s scrawled handwriting, except for the word “stop” and the word “closed.” She later discovered the sickening truth: this was a common code for a tubal ligation, the most frequent form of sterilization in Namibia.

She suddenly remembered that the hospital staff had told her to sign some papers as she entered the operating room for her C-section. Nobody had explained the papers.

“It was a very big shock,” she said, brushing back tears. “I was very emotional. I cried a lot. I wanted a sister for my three boys, and now I can’t have one.”

(York, 2009, emphasis added)

These downsampled examples, alongside more generally sampled concordance lines from the English primary corpus, all serve to show how the English language is represented as an asset with real, operable instrumental value not only in Canada, but also internationally. According to this line of reasoning, rather than questioning or critiquing the role of English in places such as Africa, Japan, and India, the

importance of English is strongly asserted: fluency in English can help in a variety of situations, including health, safety, career progress, and international relations.

To conclude, three dominant findings were found in support of ideologies of instrumental English. Evaluations of fluency in the English and French primary corpora revealed that fluent English is represented as a valuable asset in both English-speaking and French-speaking Canada. When multilingualism is discussed, rather than naturalising the role of English (which is often the case; see Section 6.2), English tends to be noted and is sometimes highlighted as more valuable than other languages. Finally, fluency in English is noted to be a valuable asset in international contexts, where it provides opportunities for individuals and at times enables them to avoid discriminatory or dangerous practices. It is worth noting that the ideology of instrumental English does not always directly support the English Canadian national discourse. In many cases, Canada is not mentioned and the English language is discussed completely apart from its function and role in Canadian society (to say nothing of the Canadian “nation”). However, the widespread naturalisation of the value and role of the English language internationally may contribute to understandings of the important and valuable role of the English language in Canada. The reinforcement of the value of the English language allows for its continued and perhaps exclusive use to be legitimised in Canada. Thus, although not all examples of ideologies of instrumental English explicitly support the English Canadian national discourse, because the international value of English supports the role of the English language in Canadian society, these ideologies arguably still play a part either directly or more peripherally in the legitimisation and perpetuation of the discourse.

### **6.6 CONCLUSION**

This chapter aimed to establish the extent to which the language ideologies outlined in Section 3.3 occur in English Canadian newspapers. The findings from the English newspaper corpus suggested, to differing extents, evidence of monolingual ideologies, ideologies of standardised Canadian English, and ideologies of instrumental English. Ideologies of standardised Canadian English were not as salient as predicted, given the amount of previous research that has discussed

## Chapter Six: Discourses of English Canadian national identity

Canadian English as a symbol of Canadian identity – particularly when faced with the United States. In comparison with the French primary corpus, evidence of language ideologies was altogether more difficult to establish because English language ideologies are so embedded. The status and role of the English language in English Canadian society, then, appears to be very much naturalised and made commonsense, indicating the extent to which ideologies are “effective” (in Williams’ sense; see Section 2.2.2) in English Canada.

# **7. DISCOURSES OF PAN-CANADIAN NATIONAL IDENTITY**

## **7.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter builds on evidence from the previous two chapters to examine language ideologies and discourses of pan-Canadian national identity in the French and English corpora. This examination will begin with an overview of discourses of pan-Canadian national identity before turning to the language ideologies that were presented in Section 3.4, which include bilingual ideologies, ideologies of languages and identity, and ideologies of languages as commodities. Before discussing the findings, however, it is useful to consider the data being examined.

Since this chapter discusses pan-Canadian nationalism, which is by definition bilingual, the data include newspapers in both languages. Thus far, findings have been presented to show support for overarching discourses of Quebec and English Canadian national identity, and as such findings have primarily indicated the differences rather than the similarities between the English and French newspapers. In this chapter, findings will be presented to show some of the similarities between the English and French data in the form of a common discourse of pan-Canadian national identity. Section 7.2 will present findings on the pan-Canadian discourse of national identity, and Section 7.3, 7.4, and 7.5 will present findings on, respectively, bilingual ideologies, ideologies of languages and identity, and ideologies of languages as commodities. Section 7.6 will draw together some of the common threads of this chapter and conclude the analysis component of this thesis.

## 7.2 PAN-CANADIAN NATIONALISM

As with Chapters Five and Six, an important first step in the analysis is to ascertain the salience of discourses of pan-Canadian national identity, and accordingly this section presents four main findings.

First, the frequency of CANADA lemmas indicates a similar focus on the country in both corpora. Canada is frequently discussed in both English and French newspapers and there is notably no significant difference between references to CANADA with respect to the overall size of the French and English corpora. Although there are 2194 CANADA lemmas (Canada, Canadian/s, Canadien/ne/s) in the French primary corpus and 3084 CANADA lemmas (Canadien/ne/s, Canadian/s, Canadian's, Canadiana, Canada, Canada's) in the English primary corpus, in each case these lemmas comprise 0.13% of the total words and are similarly distributed: CANADA lemmas occur in 30% of English texts and 28% of French texts. The similarity between these frequencies may indicate a parallel emphasis on Canada within French and English newspapers.

Also, although Section 5.2 discussed how CANADA lemmas (*CANADIEN/NE/S*) are less frequent collocates of *NATIONAL/E* than *QUÉBEC* lemmas, the fact that Canada is associated with the lemma *NATIONAL/E* indicates that it may be recognised as a nation. This recognition of Canada's national status is even more salient in the English corpus, where the lemmas CANADIAN (19 occurrences), CANADA (15 occurrences), and CANADA'S (11 occurrences) collocate more frequently with NATIONAL than any other lemma. This may suggest that Canadian nationalism is more topical in the corpus than any other version of nationalism (see Table 7.1).

Collocate	No. texts in which collocation occurs	Total collocations
CANADIAN	16	19
CANADA	14	15
CANADA'S	10	11
FRENCH	7	7
ENGLISH	7	7
QUEBEC'S	5	5
QUEBEC	4	5

**Table 7.1: Selected EPNC collocates of NATIONAL**

However, most instances where NATIONAL refers to Canada in fact discuss institutions rather than to emotive, affective, ethnic, or cultural aspects of the Canadian nation. Indeed, frequent references to the National Gallery (4 occurrences), National Historic Sites (10 occurrences), the National Ballet (2 occurrences), the Canadian National Scottish Heavy Events (4 occurrences), and National Institutes (4 occurrences) – for example – while “flagging” Canada as a nation (Billig, 1995), do little to suggest how Canada forms a nation apart from its institutions (Heller, 1999b; McRoberts, 1991: 24). While there are collocates that discuss nationalism apart from institutions (ANTHEM, 10 occurrences; HISTORY EDUCATION, 5 occurrences; HOLIDAY, 2 occurrences; MOTTO, 2 occurrences; and SPORT, 1 occurrence), these refer to what are arguably artificially constructed prototypical national hallmarks rather than inherent features of the “nation”. The dearth of explicit national characteristics is in fact noted in one concordance line, which remarks: “To be Canadian [is] to cast doubt on what it mean[s] to be Canadian” (Brown, 2009). Thus, references to national institutions and collocation between CANADA lemmas and NATIONAL flag Canada as a nation, although it may be a nation that consists primarily of its institutions.

While it may be that Canada is being represented – or at least flagged – as a nation, references to “Canada” do not necessarily indicate discourses of pan-Canadian national identity. This is because the term “Canada” is used to index both the pan-Canadian nation as well as the English Canadian nation (see Section 3.3 and Chapter Six). Interestingly, this phenomenon exists in both English and French. As seen throughout Chapter Six, it is common practice in English to discuss a predominantly English-speaking nation under the label “Canada”. Such is also the case in the French language, where the label “Canada” is often used to discuss the English-majority

parts of the country outside Quebec. For example, one article, entitled “Mon condo au Canada” (My condo in Canada) (Marissal, 2009), discusses the journalist’s second home in Vancouver. Although the journalist lives and works in Montreal, which is evidently part of Canada, the title of the article refers to Vancouver as though it were in another country. He describes the city as one with an “undeniable *Canadian* character” (*un indéniable caractère canadien*), and notably code-switches, using the English term “Canadian” (in italics with a lower case “c” in correct French adjectival form) rather than the French term *canadien*. The use of the borrowed English word rather than the French form arguably connotes the Englishness implied to be inherent in what it means to be Canadian. This example is not unique: several other references to “Canada” in the French primary corpus imply that it is an English-speaking country. Also, although there are frequent references to “French Canadians/*Canadiens français*” (see below), there are few references to “English Canadians/*Canadiens anglais*” in either corpus (3 occurrences in English, none in French). The paucity of references to English Canadians suggests that English may be an assumed characteristic of Canadianness. In both English and French, then, the term “Canada” is often used to refer to an English-speaking country.

Nevertheless, there are findings that suggest that “Canada” is used to refer to the federal bilingual country outlined in Section 3.4. An examination CANADA in the English primary corpus shows that Canada is described as “officially bilingual”, “a unique mosaic”, and “a democracy” – key characteristics of pan-Canadian identity. There are few descriptions of this type in the French primary corpus when the collocations of CANADA are explored. However, there are six references to a survey that found that a majority of Quebecers feel that “Canada is the best country in the world” (*le Canada est le meilleur pays sur Terre/ du monde*); such a statement suggests that Canada includes Quebec and is thus a bilingual country. There are also 32 references to “French Canadian/s” (*canadien/ne/s français/e/s*) in the French primary corpus and 30 references to “French Canadian/s” in the English primary corpus. These labels suggest that, despite the fracturing of the French Canadian nation that resulted from the territorialisation of Quebec’s nationalism movement (see Section 1.2), there are still French speakers who align with (or are aligned with) the Canadian federation rather than with specific French-speaking areas of the



country (Acadia, French Ontario, etc.). These references may indicate a representation of a pan-Canadian bilingual nation.

The third indication that pan-Canadian nationalism figures in the newspapers emerges as a result of the high frequency of references to *fête du Canada* (43 occurrences) and “Canada Day” (83 occurrences). Not all representations are positive, however: some of the concordance lines in the French primary corpus indicate some misgivings about the Canadian national holiday. For example, two instances argue that the “party” on July 1 does not consist of Canada Day celebrations, but rather of watching Montreal’s annual moving day ritual, when at least 236,000 Quebecers move home on the same day (see Grescoe, 2001: 17-18). Another example (St-Jacques, 2009) discusses the tension between Quebec and Canadian nationalism that becomes salient as a result of artists’ participation in national holidays. Despite these examples, there are far more references to celebrating the holiday than anything else. The only lexical collocate of FÊTE DU CANADA is, in fact, CÉLÉBRER. In the English primary corpus, too, CELEBRATIONS is a top lexical collocate of CANADA DAY, with nine references, and CELEBRATE and CELEBRATING are also collocates.

Finally, evidence of pan-Canadian national identity also emerges from the positive evaluations of bilingualism, multiculturalism, and federalism. As noted in Section 3.4, the fundamental bases of pan-Canadian nationalism are the bilingualism and multiculturalism policies that unite the country. It would logically follow that references to these policies would figure in discussions of the pan-Canadian nation. Karim (2008: 58) has noted that “multiculturalism has been an almost consistent concern in Canadian newspapers since the establishment of the policy in 1971”. However, multiculturalism was not necessarily found to be a focus in the English and French newspapers. Although MULTICULTURAL (29 occurrences) is a keyword in English, no MULTICULTUREL lemma (*multicultur/el/le/s, multiculturalisme*) is a keyword in French. This may suggest that multiculturalism has more currency in English-speaking Canada than in French-speaking Canada; this would be unsurprising given that multiculturalism has typically been seen by French speakers as a revocation of the “two founding peoples” pact on which Canada is

understood to have been founded (see Section 3.4). Nevertheless, when multiculturalism is discussed in either corpus, it is represented as a sign of progress (“we became multicultural”; “became a multicultural mosaic”; “development of multiculturalism”; “multicultural model”) and is associated with welcoming, diverse, and open-minded society (*accueillante, métissés, ouvert*) and something that should be defended against “divisive force[s]”. One article from *Le Droit* (Allard, 2009) notably cites findings from a Strategic Council survey for the CTVGlobemedia network, which found that hockey and multiculturalism are dominant symbols of Canadian identity, but “bilingualism is far behind” (*Sur le plan de l’identité, le hockey et le multiculturalisme (le bilinguisme est loin derrière) dominent le palmarès des symboles canadiens/* As for identity, hockey and multiculturalism (bilingualism is far behind) dominate the list of top symbols of Canadian identity). Notably, however, the journalist highlights that more than 90% of survey respondents affirmed that immigrants should adapt to Canadian customs and values, which he argues presents a contradiction with the multiculturalism policies. Thus, multiculturalism is more topical in English than in French newspapers, but since there are positive evaluations of multiculturalism in both, this may suggest alignment with pan-Canadian nationalism.

Federalism is also a central component of pan-Canadian nationalism. In both French and English articles, federalism is sometimes asserted as a privilege. For example, one article highlights the advantages of federalism for Quebec (see Example 7.1).

### **Example 7.1**

Federalism also has advantages, precisely because it leaves room for people with overlapping identities and geographies. What other formula would let us reconcile (legitimate) strong Quebec state aspirations with the equally legitimate desire for a large economic and political area? I don’t know of any. Any (realistic) political formula should accommodate shared sovereignties.

*Le fédéralisme comporte aussi des avantages, précisément parce qu’il laisse la place à des peuples dont les identités et les géographies se chevauchent. Quelle autre formule nous permet de*

*réconcilier l'aspiration (légitime) d'un état québécois fort et le désir, tout aussi légitime, d'un grand espace économique et politique? Je n'en connais pas. Toute formule politique (réaliste) devra s'accommoder de souverainetés partagées.*

(Polèse, 2009)

Another example argues that alignment with the federal government in no way prevents the preservation of Quebecers' distinctiveness, since Canada has largely been shaped by Quebec-born leaders (see Example 7.2).

### **Example 7.2**

Why can't the central government also be the government of Quebecers? Haven't we practically monopolized running it over the past few decades? St. Laurent, Trudeau, Mulroney and Chretien – weren't they all Quebecers? [...] Accepting such supposedly “centralist” politics, I am convinced, in no way prevents the proper management of our public affairs, or, if you like, the preservation of our distinctive character.

(Berard, 2009)

In fact, columnist Andrew Cohen places federalism alongside “building the peace” and “encouraging mediation” as traits Canadians should embrace and sell to the international community (see Example 7.3).

### **Example 7.3**

We can embrace – and sell – an idea of ourselves as the good-governance nation, for example. That would mean, among other roles, keeping the peace, building federalism, writing codes of conduct, monitoring elections and encouraging mediation. We can also trumpet a sense of self as a green society, the greenest in the world, harnessing conservation. Or a knowledge society, harnessing the Internet.

(Cohen, 2009)

Thus, although both English and French references to federalism are more negative than positive in their evaluations (7 versus 4 in English; 19 versus 2 in French), it is notable that there are more positive evaluations in the English primary corpus than in the French primary corpus.

In summary, there are four findings that indicate the presence of the pan-Canadian discourse of national identity. First, there are a similar number of references to CANADA lemmas in the English and French corpora and there are positive representations of Canada in both. Second, although there are findings in both corpora that suggest that Canada is often associated with Englishness rather than Frenchness, references to “French Canadian” and *canadien/ne/s français/e/s* indicate that the French language and speakers have an important role in the country. Third, frequent references to celebrating “Canada Day/ *fête du Canada*” indicate not only the presence but also the positive evaluation of pan-Canadian nationalism. Finally, the positive evaluation of multiculturalism and the frequent references to federalism serve to “flag” the pan-Canadian nation. Having established the presence of this discourse of national identity, then, we shall now turn to the language ideologies that support it.

### **7.3 BILINGUAL IDEOLOGIES**

In pan-Canadian nationalism, the nation is conceived of as united by shared and common official languages. As discussed in Section 3.4.1, ideologies of bilingualism reinforce the natural and commonsense status of these two languages in the country. Three main findings emerge from the French and English corpora and indicate bilingual ideologies.

First, findings suggest that bilingualism is discussed to a similar extent in English and French. This finding emerged from what is perhaps the most obvious place to start investigating bilingual ideologies: the lemma BILINGUAL. In the French primary corpus, the lemma BILINGUE (*bilingue/s, bilinguisation, bilinguise, bilinguisme*) occurs 113 times in the corpus in 32 texts (2.3% of texts in the corpus). Notably, however, these lemmas only collocate with CANADA lemmas (Canada,

Canadadien/ne/s) in ten instances, and most of these negatively represent Canadian bilingualism (see Table 7.2).

<p>a voie à une Saint-Jean <b>bilingue</b>? Le <b>Canada</b> anglais nous tend la main. Le <b>bilinguisme</b> Il y a déjà, au <b>Canada</b>, de nombreuses populations au <b>bilinguisme</b> identitaire qui, au <b>Canada</b>, est l'antichambre de la province officiellement <b>bilingue</b> au <b>Canada</b>. Cela étant dit, accord nque de confiance dans le <b>bilinguisme</b> <b>canadien</b>? «Il ne faut pas le voir ant déjà officiellement <b>bilingue</b>: le <b>Canada</b>. L'ancien président de ation comme un affront au <b>bilinguisme</b> <b>canadien</b> ou le signe d'un manque à une sorte de <b>bilinguisme</b> vaguement <b>canadien</b>? Je parle, bien sûr,</p>
---

**Table 7.2: FPNC concordance lines with BILING\* and CANAD\***

Three examples cast doubt on Canadian bilingualism by referring to “a lack of confidence in Canadian bilingualism” (*un manque de confiance dans le bilinguisme canadien*), arguing that Canadian bilingualism is “official” – not real (*Faudrait-il désormais s'adonner à une sorte de bilinguisme vaguement canadien? Je parle, bien sûr, du Canada officiel et non réel*), and contending that there is no such thing as a bilingual nation (*il n'existe pas de nation bilingue*). Even the concordance lines that do not show a negative evaluation of bilingualism directly sometimes occur within larger contexts of negativity being expressed towards bilingualism. For example, one reference discusses the decision of the International Organisation of La Francophonie to assign a grand witness to attest the presence of French in Vancouver during the 2010 Olympic Games – highlighting Canada's inability, as an officially bilingual country, to meet French language guidelines. Finally, the distribution of references to bilingualism within newspapers in the French primary corpus is notably unbalanced. The newspaper *Le Soleil*, which is based in Quebec City, contains only two BILINGUE lemmas, whereas the New Brunswick newspaper *L'Acadie Nouvelle* contains 34. These findings are perhaps unsurprising, given that Quebec City is predominantly French-speaking city (57% of the population speaks only French), whereas New Brunswick is an officially bilingual province (58% of the population claims to be bilingual). It would logically follow that bilingualism is more topical in New Brunswick than in Quebec.

In the English primary corpus, findings are not dissimilar: the lemma BILINGUAL (bilingual, bilingualism, bilingualism's, bilinguals) occurs 107 times in 66 texts (4.6% of corpus) and notably only collocates with CANADA lemmas (Canada,

Canada's, Canadian/s) in 14 instances. As with the French primary corpus, most of the references to bilingualism within Canada refer to the bilingual province of New Brunswick and to its largest city, Moncton. Indeed, in the English primary corpus, MONCTON collocates more frequently with BILINGUAL (5 occurrences) than any other location. The *Times & Transcript*, published in Moncton, is the English newspaper that contains by far the most references to BILINGUAL/S and BILINGUALISM (39 occurrences); in contrast, the newspapers the *Whitehorse Star*, the *National Post*, and the *Calgary Herald* only contain one BILINGUAL lemma each and the *Halifax Herald* does not discuss bilingualism at all.

One notable difference between discussions of bilingualism in the English and French corpora derives from the different distributions of BILINGUE and BILINGUAL lemmas within individual texts: while the lemma BILINGUE occurs 113 times in 32 French texts, the lemma BILINGUAL occurs 107 times in 66 English texts. This means that, on average, there are 3.5 references to bilingualism per text in French versus 1.5 in English. This suggests that bilingualism is more discussed in passing in English texts, which may indicate its largely commonsense status in English-speaking Canada. Indeed, while the English primary corpus contains 11 references to BILINGUALISM, it contains 94 references to BILINGUAL: thus, rather than discussing or debating bilingualism, English texts rather unproblematically describe people, places and things as “bilingual”. In contrast, the French primary corpus contains 42 references to BILINGUISME and 68 references to BILINGUE/S in only 32 texts. These findings suggest that it is more usual to discuss bilingualism in greater depth; for example, eleven articles contain three or more references to BILINGUE lemmas, suggesting a concentration on this particular subject in each article. Even when BILINGUE/S is used as a descriptor in the French primary corpus, many references are problematised by being placed in scare quotes or within rhetorical questions (see Section 5.3).

Another way that discussions of bilingualism are manifested in the data is through the commonplace reference to Canada's “official languages”. In the English primary corpus, the most frequent lexical collocate of OFFICIAL is LANGUAGES (26

occurrences), followed by LANGUAGE (13 occurrences); CANADA'S and CANADIAN (5 occurrences each) are also collocates (see Table 7.3).

g that learning **Canada's** other official **language** is not a top prior only know one of **Canada's** two official **languages** and who want to ta , speaking in both of **Canada's** official **languages**. He called the cere eaking one or both of **Canada's** official **languages**, share the country ister of **Canadian** Heritage and Official **Languages**, announced the app ister of **Canadian** Heritage and Official **Languages**. 2 to 5 p.m. Catch ister of **Canadian** heritage and official **languages**, announced the app

**Table 7.3: EPNC concordance lines with OFFICIAL and FRENCH, CANAD\***

There are also references to “both official languages” (10 occurrences), “two official languages” (5 occurrences), “an official language” (i.e. one of two official languages, 3 occurrences), and “either” and “first” official languages (1 occurrence each): these allude to the fact that there are *two* official languages in Canada. Similarly, in the French primary corpus, LANGUES (44 occurrences) and LANGUE (21 occurrences) are the most frequent collocates of the lemma OFFICIEL (*official/s, officielle/s, officiellement*). Although most references to LANGUE OFFICIELLE refer to French in Quebec (e.g. *la langue officielle du Québec*) rather than to the two official languages of Canada, most references to LANGUES OFFICIELLES discuss the Commissioner of Official Languages (9 occurrences), Canada's Official Languages Act (9 occurrences), or “the two official languages” (*les deux langues officielles*, 8 occurrences). The official status of two languages is sometimes used to substantiate other arguments. For example, one of the downsampled English articles (Howlett, 2009; see Appendix 4 for entire article) uses bilingualism as a topos for arguments about the constitutional education rights of French speakers in Ontario (see Section 3.4) (see Example 7.4).

#### **Example 7.4**

Because Canada is officially bilingual in English and French, parents in Ontario who learned French as their first language have a constitutional right to have their children educated in publicly funded French schools.

(Howlett, 2009)

This example presents the accepted information (i.e., “Canada is officially bilingual in English and French”) in the dependent clause, allowing the writer to “front” the more topical information (i.e., French speakers’ education rights) in the independent clause (this article is discussed in greater detail in Section 7.5).

The relationship between the two languages also becomes commonplace through their pairing together. Of the 376 references to ANGLAIS/E in the French primary corpus, 63 instances (17%) collocate with FRANÇAIS/E. In the English primary corpus, 14% (113 occurrences) of the 794 ENGLISH references collocate with FRENCH. In the English primary corpus, the most frequent ENGLISH clusters include FRENCH AND ENGLISH (34 occurrences), ENGLISH AND FRENCH (27 occurrences), and ENGLISH OR FRENCH (10 occurrences). In the French primary corpus, both languages are not always represented on an equal plane. While some concordance lines explicitly denote the equivalent status of the two languages (*autant en anglais qu’en français; tant en français qu’en anglais*, “as much in English as in French”), at other times the link between English and French is one of competition (e.g. *le français recule par rapport à l’anglais*/ “French is eroding faced with English), transfer (*de l’anglais au français*/ “from English to French”) and exception (*parle anglais et espagnol, mais pas français*/ “speaks English and Spanish but not French”).

There are also notable differences between how each official language is represented with regard to the country. While FRANÇAIS and ANGLAIS collocate in similar frequencies with CANADA (21 and 24 collocations, respectively), the predominant pattern with ANGLAIS is the noun phrase CANADA ANGLAIS (20 occurrences), whereas there is only one reference to CANADA FRANÇAIS. Most collocations between FRANÇAIS and CANADA refer to the French services provided by *Radio-Canada* (8 occurrences) or the French language within the rest of Canada (e.g. *le français dans le reste du Canada*). Interestingly, there are three times more collocations between ENGLISH and CANADA than between FRENCH and CANADA (18 versus 6 collocations), and there are five references to “English Canada” but only one to “French-speaking Canada”. Since many instances in which “English” collocates with “Canada” occur within discussions of Canadian national



politics (including discussions of Quebec), this again suggests that the English language has perhaps a stronger relationship with notions of “Canadianness” than the French language.

In conclusion, although bilingualism is discussed to a similar extent in both corpora, in the French primary corpus, bilingualism does not tend to be positively represented, in particular with relation to Canada, and bilingualism is by far more topical in New Brunswick than anywhere else. Similarly, in the English primary corpus, bilingualism tends to be discussed with a particular focus on the province of New Brunswick. Notably, representations of bilingualism differ between the French and English corpora because they are distributed differently within English and French texts: on average, there are 3.5 references to bilingualism per text in French versus 1.5 in English. Unlike in English texts, in the French primary corpus it is more unusual to simply label people, places, or things as “bilingual”; instead, bilingualism tends to be problematised in comparatively concentrated discussions. The commonplace pairing together of “English/ *anglais*” and “French/ *français*” and references to “official languages/ *langues officielles*” reinforce bilingualism in Canadian discourse; the naturalised status of these languages is sometimes used to justify arguments about other topics.

#### **7.4 IDEOLOGIES OF LANGUAGES AND IDENTITY**

Ideologies of languages and identity refer to the ways in which the French and English languages are linked to pan-Canadian identity in more integrative ways. In other words, these ideologies do not simply accept the role of the two official languages in Canada; rather, they presuppose that languages are fundamental components of Canadian identity. Although the data show mixed findings, evidence of ideologies of languages and identity take shape through positive representations of bilingualism and bilinguals, representations of bilingualism as a feature of Canadian identity (i.e. rather than merely as a feature of the Canadian state), and attempts to discredit Quebec nationalism.

In the English and French corpora, there are positive and negative representations of bilingualism and bilinguals. In the English primary corpus, bilingualism is linked to

being a “top student”, “lively”, “great”, and fun-loving (“our bilingual *joie de vivre*”). Bilingualism is described as an asset (“a bilingual workforce helped attract the gaming giant”), a key to success (“goes through doors that being bilingual allows him to do”), and more generally there are discussions of bilingualism as “important”. Negative representations of bilingualism tend to cite the inconvenience (“troublesome”) or impracticability of having two languages. One example in the *Vancouver Sun* argues that French issues are irrelevant to Western Canadians, who have more affinity with Mandarin and Spanish (see Example 6.11). Another example entitled “Defined by undefinability: Works just fine” (Brown, 2009) notes that much of what is intended to define “Canadianness” is contradictory. For example, Brown writes that “[n]early half of us think bilingualism is important, but only 12 per cent of any region outside Quebec speak even remotely competent French”. Rather than presenting this as a flaw, Brown lists this among other inconsistent characteristics that make Canadians “Canadian”.

In the French primary corpus, bilingualism is often evaluated negatively. As discussed in Section 5.6, bilingualism is represented as a step towards assimilation to the anglophone majority, with adjectives, adverbs, and verbs connoting loss and oppression (*manque*/ “lack”, *inévitabile*/ “inevitable”, *impérativement*/ “imperatively”, *tomber*/ “fall”, *render*/ “make”). Bilingualism is also often portrayed as an oppressive process through neologisms (*bilinguisation*, *bilinguiser*; “to make bilingual”). However, there are some positive representations of bilingualism. Some texts refer to the benefits and advantages of bilingualism (*bénéfique*, *avantages*), pride in bilingualism (*fiers*), and “belief in” official bilingualism (*nous croyons au bilinguisme*). One text explains that part of Montreal’s charm lies in its “bilingual character[, which] makes it interesting” (*Son caractère bilingue la rend aussi très intéressante*).

Ideologies of languages and identity also take shape by directly linking bilingualism with Canadian identity. In the English primary corpus, six concordance lines represent the official languages as a fundamental part of Canada (OUR/CANADA’S OFFICIAL LANGUAGES). Another example (Singfield, 2009) uses bilingualism as a description of Canadian identity: a radio station asserts its independence by

explaining that “we are [...] bilingual, Canadian and true to ourselves”. Canada’s Governor General, Michaëlle Jean, is described as “the very Canadian, contemporary, bilingual, multicultural, modern, worldly Ms. Jean”, which explicitly links bilingualism with other Canadian features, such as multiculturalism, as part of being “very Canadian” (Simpson, 2009).

In contrast, as discussed in Section 7.3, in the French primary corpus most collocations between CANADA and BILINGUE lemmas tend to represent bilingualism in Canada negatively. There are few collocations between NOUS lemmas (*nous, notre, nos*) and BILINGUE lemmas, and even fewer positive evaluations among the collocations that do exist. Apart from the references to the Canadian Commissioner of Official languages, there is only one collocation between LANGUES OFFICIELLES and CANADA (*les deux langues officielles du Canada/ “Canada’s two official languages”*). There is also only one reference to French as one of Canada’s two official languages: “In Canada, French is the language of one of the two founding peoples” (*Au Canada, le français est la langue de l’un des deux peuples fondateurs*). Also, there are only two references to Canada’s “linguistic duality” (*la dualité linguistique canadienne*). Only in the *Acadie Nouvelle* newspaper are there are some positive representations of bilingualism as an identity trait. For example, one article cites a spokesperson for the region of Campbellton, New Brunswick, who argues that the community wishes to remain bilingual rather than be forced to identify as “francophone” (see Example 7.5).

### Example 7.5

“We would like to tell the government that we want to stay bilingual because they are trying to force us to be francophones in the North. I fight for the English world in my area. If I were in Saint John, I would fight for francophones. If we only had one system, we wouldn’t have these problems,” proclaimed Pauline Diotte, an employee in the Campbellton hospitality establishment.

*“Nous voulons dire au gouvernement que nous voulons rester bilingues parce qu’il essaie de nous forcer à être des francophones dans le Nord. Je me bats pour le monde anglais dans mon coin. Si*

*j'étais à Saint-Jean, je me battrais pour les francophones. Si nous n'avions qu'une région, nous n'aurions pas tous ces problèmes", a clamé Pauline Diotte, une employée de l'établissement hospitalier de Campbellton.*

(Seymour, 2009)

Another text from *L'Acadie Nouvelle* covers the debate over bilingual signage in Dieppe; bilingualism and its place as a component of New Brunswick identity are central to this debate (see Example 7.6).

### Example 7.6

“We must affirm our identity and our collective engagement towards bilingualism. The debate is to find out if we believe in bilingualism, and if so, are we ready to clearly and unequivocally demonstrate this belief,” said the Common Front [for Bilingual Signage in New Brunswick] spokesperson, Martin LeBlanc Rioux.

*“Il faut affirmer notre identité et notre engagement collectif envers le bilinguisme. Le débat est de savoir si nous croyons au bilinguisme et si oui, sommes-nous prêts à en faire la démonstration claire et sans équivoque,” a soutenu le porte-parole du [Front commun pour l'affichage bilingue au Nouveau-Brunswick], Martin LeBlanc Rioux.*

(Robichaud, 2009)

The article goes on to cite Yvon Godin, Member of Parliament from the federal riding of Acadie-Bathurst, as saying: “New Brunswick is the only officially bilingual province and we are proud of that” (*Nouveau-Brunswick est la seule province officiellement bilingue et nous sommes fiers de cela*). The findings indicate, then, that bilingualism is an identity feature of New Brunswick, but it is unclear how this local identity fits within the larger Canadian context.

Although evidence of the identity value of official languages is not clear in the French corpus, in the English corpus evidence emerges from a downsampled text (Ferency, 2009; see Appendix 3 for entire article). The contributor in this example argues that “all students should have opportunities to become proficient and literate

in both official languages”. Rather than restricting access to French-language education to children whose parents are Canadian-born francophones, Ferenczy argues the education system should meet the demands of the population. Since “[t]he highest demand for French immersion enrolment comes from parents in diverse ethnic communities and new Canadians”, Ferenczy contends that it is “the responsibility of school boards, whether English or French, to meet parent demand”. Ferenczy’s argument in favour of official language education assumes the natural status of official languages within the country. By taking for granted the role of official languages in Canada, the logic of her argument in favour of access to language education needs no further justification. In other words, she relies on the “topos of authority” for her argument: if something is official, then it should be fostered (see Blackledge, 2005: 70; Wodak *et al.*, 2009: 37).

Finally, ideologies of languages and identity may emerge in the form of discrediting French-speaking Quebec, because bilingual pan-Canadian nationalism is believed to be the “better” alternative (see Section 3.4). As noted in Section 5.6, many English newspapers cast doubt on French language endangerment; collocations between FRENCH and QUEBEC also show numerous examples of discrediting Quebec nationalism. For example, one letter to the editor of the *National Post* (Laroche, 2009) complains about another letter writer who was allowed to “spew hatred” by writing “The French and their cousins, the Quebecois, are nothing more than racist xenophobes who want to rob everyone of their dignity and identity in order to preserve their own ‘Frenchness’”. Numerous other examples come from a *Gazette* text (Anonymous, 2009b) that provides a sample of comments made by online readers in response to an article about English-speaking bands being banned from performing at Quebec’s national holiday. A major theme throughout the comments pertains to the purported discriminatory actions of Quebec nationalists. One online reader describes the actions as “narrow minded”, and another explains that “[n]ot all Quebecers are racists and bigots”. Another writer compares the barring of English-speaking bands to racial discrimination: “If there was any question of black musicians being treated differently or the audience being segregated, all musicians would boycott the venue”. By representing discrimination against English-speaking bands in such negative light, writers perhaps unwittingly add support to pan-

Canadian identity. Underlying the condemnation of Quebec's policies is the implication that diversity – perhaps in the form of bilingualism, a Canadian characteristic – is superior.

In summary, there are linkages between bilingualism and Canadian identity in the English data, but these do not have parallels in French. In the French primary corpus, most collocations between CANADA and BILINGUE lemmas tend to represent bilingualism in Canada negatively. Bilingualism is predominantly discussed with relation to the province of New Brunswick, and it is unclear how this local identity fits within the larger Canadian context. Finally, many English newspapers attempt to discredit Quebec nationalism and French language policies, which, it has been argued, is also a trait of pan-Canadian nationalism (see Section 3.4).

## **7.5 IDEOLOGIES OF LANGUAGES AS COMMODITIES**

Boudreau and Dubois (2007: 104) define the “ideology of bilingualism” as one that relies on the “social, cultural and economic advantages of being bilingual as an individual and as a country”. Here, understandings of these bilingual advantages will be labelled “ideologies of languages as commodities”. Because pan-Canadian national identity has been founded on bilingualism policies, ideologies of languages as commodities support the role of languages within the pan-Canadian nation. Bilingualism is an important asset in Canada and languages are key to accessing jobs and services. Findings indicate the presence of ideologies of languages as commodities in three main ways.

First, examples positively evaluate bilingualism as an asset. As discussed in Section 7.4, there are both positive and negative evaluations of bilingualism in the English primary corpus, but most positive evaluations represent fluency in both languages as an asset. For example, bilingualism is described as a means of enabling individuals to achieve goals (“goes through doors that being bilingual allows him to do”) and a key to success (“bilingual bonuses”). Bilingualism is linked to other positive characteristics, such as intelligence (“top student who is bilingual”), ambition (“Multi-tasking is something Lefevre, a bilingual graduate of education and literature at McGill University, has mastered”), and popularity (“the perfectly bilingual

Leblanc [...] was a hugely popular choice”). The numerous articles that pay tribute to former Governor General Roméo Leblanc, who died on June 24, 2009, tend to include bilingualism among the accolades. For example, one article writes that as a young boy Leblanc “became perfectly bilingual and went on to excel in school”. Another example attributes Leblanc’s success in politics to his bilingualism: he was hired in the Office of the Prime Minister because former Prime Minister Lester Pearson “was looking for a new bilingual press secretary”.

In contrast, bilingualism notably tends not to be represented as an asset in the French primary corpus. Rather, it tends to be negatively evaluated, as discussed previously (see Sections 7.3 and 7.4). One exception is a text that comes from the French Ontarian newspaper *Le Droit* (Aubé, 2009). This text describes how attempts to impose bilingual signage on the Township of Russell have failed. Rather than forcing bilingual signage on anglophones who have “no understanding” of French “and never will” (*une langue qu’ils ne comprennent pas et qu’ils ne comprendront jamais*), the writer argues that the Council should have instead encouraged businesses to use bilingual signs by highlighting the financial advantages of bilingualism (see Example 7.7).

#### **Example 7.7**

The council should have encouraged businesses to use bilingual signage and promoted the financial advantages [of bilingualism] [...] the council should amend its ruling and promote the advantages of bilingualism. Consumers will decide the rest.

*Le conseil aurait dû encourager les commerçants à afficher dans les deux langues et promouvoir les avantages financiers [du bilinguisme] [...] le conseil devrait amender son règlement et promouvoir les avantages du bilinguisme. Les consommateurs décideront du reste.*

(Aubé, 2009)

Presenting languages as commodities, it would seem, is a simpler way of ensuring anglophones align with bilingualism. The emphasis on anglophones suggests that

this is not a shared perspective; in its appeal to anglophones – not francophones –, the text’s representation of bilingualism as an asset distinguishes it from other texts in the French primary corpus.

Because bilingualism is understood to be important in English-speaking Canada, the education system is seen as the democratic means by which all Canadians have equal access to language skills. Heller (2003c: 11) refers to this as the “distribution of linguistic capital” – a way for all individuals to access the socially valuable resource of language skills. In the English primary corpus, the importance of language education becomes evident in several different ways. For example, a large number of English keywords pertain to education and literacy (see Table 7.4).

Positive key word	Frequency	% of words in corpus	Reference corpus frequency	% of words in reference corpus	Keyness score
SCHOOL	866	0.09	6658	0.04	306.75
STUDENTS	397	0.04	2849	0.02	166.23
EDUCATION	312	0.03	2034	0.01	160.67
IMMERSION	57		65		158.06
LITERACY	85		213		145.49
SCHOOLS	225	0.02	1479	0.01	113.93
CLASSES	120	0.01	598		97.90
TEACHERS	129	0.01	787		75.49
COURSES	79		389		65.58
STUDENT	148	0.01	1172		48.47
TEACHING	78		472		46.33
KINDERGARTEN	55		279		43.70
CAMPUS	56		290		43.13
LEARNING	125	0.01	993		40.59
GRADUATES	61		373		35.54
TAUGHT	58		368		31.50
TEACH	56		354		30.64
ACADEMIC	60		394		30.44

**Table 7.4: English keywords pertaining to education and literacy**

Given that the primary corpus contains only newspaper articles with references to languages and the reference corpus is the general sample of newspaper articles, the large number of statistically significant words pertaining to education that emerge



from the comparison of these corpora suggests the role of education within discussions about languages in Canada.

Also, the keywords LANGUAGE, FRENCH, and ENGLISH have a large number of collocates pertaining to education. The keyword LANGUAGE (671 occurrences) collocates with SCHOOL (20 occurrences), SCHOOLS (15 occurrences), LEARNING (11 occurrences), LEARN (9 occurrences), TEACHING (6 occurrences), STUDENTS (6 occurrences), TRAINING (6 occurrences), CLASSES (6 occurrences), and EDUCATION (5 occurrences). The keyword ENGLISH (794 occurrences) also collocates with SCHOOL (21 occurrences), CLASSES (11 occurrences), UNIVERSITY (8 occurrences), INSTRUCTOR (6 occurrences), and TEACHING (5 occurrences). Finally, the keyword FRENCH (1489 occurrences) has the most collocates that pertain to education. It collocates with IMMERSION (48 occurrences), SCHOOL (45 occurrences), SCHOOLS (32 occurrences), EDUCATION (14 occurrences), STUDENTS (13 occurrences), LEARNED (8 occurrences), CLASSES (7 occurrences), KINDERGARTEN (7 occurrences), and STUDENT (7 occurrences). The collocation trends are not unrelated to the arguments being made in the articles. For example, one article (Rabson, 2009) argues that “[i]f Canada is to be a truly bilingual country, beefing up bilingual education is not just an asset. It’s a must”. Another article (Horrocks, 2009) describes the Quebec English School Boards Association as “determin[ed] to graduate bilingual students”.

Furthermore, two of the four English downsampled articles (Ferenczy, 2009; Howlett, 2009) discuss education. In fact, they both discuss the same issue: the expansion of French Ontario school admissions. With the changes, new students will be able to attend French-medium schools even if their first language is not French and they do not have a parent who is a Canadian-born francophone. Howlett’s (2009) article outlines that the announcement about Ontario’s French schools occurs at the same time when cuts are being made to French immersion programmes. The contrast that Howlett’s article highlights is that while Ontario’s French schools – intended for French Ontarians whose constitutional rights entitle them to French education – are opening their doors to more students due to the low enrolment of French Ontarians,

the programmes for English-speaking Canadians who wish to learn French are being cut. These cuts are evaluated negatively, with the government being described as “under siege over cuts to French immersion programmes”, and descriptions of communities calling for boycotts of the proposed alternatives (i.e. travelling to more remote schools where French immersion is still offered). Howlett also notes that while in 2008-9, under 92,000 students were enrolled in French Ontarian schools, around two million students were enrolled in English-language schools. Notably, although Howlett makes explicit throughout the article the contrast between French schools for French speakers and French programmes for English speakers, she cites the provincial education minister Kathleen Wynne as saying that the changes to the French school admission guidelines are “unrelated” to the cancellation of the French immersion programmes. Yet, Howlett’s contrast between the two has important implications: first, she implies that French speakers continue to be advantaged while the majority faces cuts; and second, she implies that although the English-speaking majority continues to demonstrate interest in the minority language, the infrastructure to support that interest is dwindling. The situation, then, is evaluated negatively because it does not endorse a democratic approach to language education that is so valued in the discourse of pan-Canadian national identity. In other words, French speakers have an educational advantage over English speakers in Ontario; since equality is highly evaluated within the pan-Canadian discourse of national identity (see Section 3.4), this advantage is evaluated negatively.

The other downsampled text is the letter to the editor (Ferency, 2009) discussed in Section 7.4. Ferency argues in favour of expanding admission guidelines for French-language schools in Ontario because “all students should have opportunities to become proficient and literate in both official languages”. Writing on behalf of the lobby group Canadian Parents for French, Ferency explains that her organisation “encourages initiatives to improve access to education in French”. Ferency writes in favour of expanding entrance requirements to non-French Canadian students (even if this expansion continues to exclude English-born Canadians who speak French; see Denley, 2009). Her positive evaluation of the changes to admission derives, it would seem, from the argument that language education should be available to all. The democratisation and expansion of official language education fits within discourses

of pan-Canadian nationalism, which advocates bilingualism as an asset for all. Indeed, Hayday (2005: 181) has argued that “the federal government helped to make these [language education] programs commonplace, part-and-parcel of Canadian education, and official bilingualism [thus] became part of the Canadian national identity” (Hayday, 2005: 181).

However, there is notably more discussion of education in the English primary corpus than in the French primary corpus. There are, for example, far fewer French keywords pertaining to education (see Table 7.5).

Positive keyword	Frequency	% of words in corpus	Reference corpus frequency	% of words in reference corpus	Keyness score
ÉCOLES	105	0.013	347		56.33
ÉLÈVES	145	0.018	563		55.79
ENSEIGNANTS	58		166		39.67
L'ÉCOLE	172	0.02	892	0.01	27.71

**Table 7.5: French keywords pertaining to education**

Also, the keywords LANGUE, FRANÇAIS, and ANGLAIS tend to collocate less with words pertaining to education. For example, the lemma FRANÇAIS (*français/e/s*) (1149 occurrences) only collocates with L'ÉCOLE (7 occurrences), L'ENSEIGNEMENT (7 occurrences), ÉCOLES (6 occurrences), and ÉTUDES (5 occurrences). The lemma LANGUE (*langue/s*) (502 occurrences) only collocates with ÉCOLES (6 occurrences), and the lemma ANGLAIS (*anglais/e/s*) does not collocate with any words related to education. This suggests a significantly different representation of languages from English newspapers.

One exception to this general rule is a downsampled article (Le Bouthillier, 2009), which discusses the Louis Mailloux revolt of 1875 in New Brunswick. This revolt sought to reverse the Common Schools Act of 1871, which had removed religious presence from schools, and in so doing effectively abolished French-medium education, which was predominantly Catholic-based (see Example 7.8).

**Example 7. 8**

A memorable event took place in Caraquet in 1875: the Louis Mailloux revolt – its name comes from the hero who died [...] – where, to save French Catholic schools, a protest broke out; the English came and blood was spilled.

*Un événement marquant eut lieu à Caraquet en 1875, la révolte Louis Mailloux - du nom du héros décédé [...] - où, pour sauver les écoles françaises et catholiques, une émeute se déclencha; les Anglais vinrent et le sang coula.*

Evidently, French-language education has played an important role for francophones in New Brunswick, as it has for francophones elsewhere in the country (see Hayday, 2005). Nevertheless, there is little discussion of education in the French corpus, in particular when compared with the English corpus.

One reason why languages have been transformed into commodities in Canada is because of the language policies that instituted the role of these languages within society. Notably, the Official Languages Act required that a large number of federal government jobs be listed as bilingual (see e.g. Gentil, Bigras and O'Connor, 2011: 83). The topic is discussed in another downsampled article (Anonymous, 2009g; see Appendix 1 for entire article), entitled “Vigilance essential for French”. Here, it is argued that “[t]he federal Official Languages Act has also turned proficiency in French into a professional asset rather than a cultural pursuit”. This downsampled article, which details how an anonymous contributor raised bilingual children within English-dominant Ontario, evaluates bilingualism positively, as an asset for the two children. Strong measures were taken to ensure exposure to French through reading, television, and education more generally. Indeed, the writer uses military metaphors to emphasise the efforts undertaken to “bulletproof” the children against English-speaking Ontario. One method was “rationing” English in favour of French. It was not until the family moved to French-dominant Montreal that the parents “let down [their] guard”. The contributor explains that these methods are common for francophone families who have to “guard” their kids against the pervasiveness of English. Nevertheless, these efforts were “paid off”, the contributor explains, since

the children are now able to “switch effortlessly from one language to the other”. This skill differentiates the children from most Canadians, who are not bilingual. Indeed, another example (Rabson, 2009) outlines the argument made by Manitoba Member of Parliament Shelly Glover that there are “too few” bilinguals graduating from Canadian schools (see Example 7.9).

**Example 7.9**

This week the House of Commons committee on official languages issued a number of recommendations to send a message to the nation’s education system, particularly English schools, that they aren’t producing enough bilingual graduates.

(Rabson, 2009)

The problem, Rabson notes, is that when students graduate from secondary education, even from French immersion programmes, most are not “bilingual enough to get a job in the federal government”. Employment in the public service, it would seem, is the benchmark for – and perhaps the goal of – bilingualism in English-speaking Canada.

One French article notably discusses the same story (Gaboury, 2009), citing the House of Commons report as stating that “post-secondary institutions [...] are not producing enough bilingual graduates to fill vacancies [in the public service]” (*les institutions post-secondaires canadiennes [...] ne forment pas suffisamment de diplômés bilingues pour combler ces postes*). The report notes that the federal government is the largest employer in Canada and must hire between 12,000 and 15,000 new employees each year to fill vacancies; 5000 to 6000 of these are bilingual vacancies that require post-secondary education. Since francophones tend to be more bilingual, their proportion of the public service workforce is far greater than their relative demographic presence in the country. The Committee’s report, then, is particularly focused on encouraging bilingualism among anglophone Canadians, whose linguistic credentials through secondary school, even in French immersion programmes, do not guarantee their fluency in English and French (*même un programme en immersion ne signifie pas qu’un étudiant aura les acquis*

*linguistiques pour occuper un poste bilingue/* “even an immersion programme does not mean that a student will have the linguistic knowledge required for a bilingual position”). The goal of the Committee’s report, then, is to increase the proportion of bilingual anglophones within the public service workforce.

Another way in which languages are represented as commodities takes shape in the English primary corpus through discussions of using languages and fluency in languages. There is a particular emphasis (19 references) in the English primary corpus to speaking and not speaking French (e.g. “doesn’t speak French”) (see Table 7.6).

<p><b>POSITIVE EVALUATION</b>  entative, bilingual and <b>speaking beautiful French</b>, a woman of fashion, grace and elegant paragraphs were delivered in her <b>excellent French</b>. Eisenhower followed with similar by spoke French. “I heard them speak <b>fluent French</b> and at first I said, you can’t (since McGuinty is well regarded for his <b>fluent French</b> - indeed, as one who thinks in French fully written, and delivered in <b>impeccable French</b> and English. Watch her with crowds, Russian as a mother tongue, but they <b>speak French fluently</b>, and use it in their daily</p> <p><b>LESS POSITIVE EVALUATION</b>  n her office, but none of them could <b>speak French well enough</b> to do the job. According to francophones feel that anglophones <b>speak French at a satisfactory level</b>, while only members of different ethnic groups in <b>accented French</b>, their common language. And sometimes</p> <p><b>LACK OF FLUENCY</b>  tside Quebec speak <b>even remotely competent French</b>, tant pis. This sort of national claim Hudak can only dream of such skill. “My <b>French is very poor</b>,” Hudak acknowledged a pet is the greatest travel companion. My <b>French is horribly rusty</b>, but I know what ended into French schools “speak <b>little or no French</b>.” If our French schools are prepared in Haliburton, Ont., and <b>doesn’t speak any French</b>. It was in Haliburton where Duchene Irish neighbor Mrs. McManaman who <b>spoke no French</b>. The village’s elementary school was share her affection for Paris. He <b>spoke no French</b>: “Though he came from Montreal he can</p> <p><b>MODALISED</b>  including some people who <b>can’t even speak French</b>. In essence, the new definition includes an embarrassed “Sorry, I <b>don’t speak French</b>.” But when he goes into another coffee shop. But the cashier persists. “I <b>don’t speak French</b>,” he sniffs. “Well, I don’t pay in French if francophone, the kind that <b>doesn’t speak French</b>. Ottawa-Vanier MPP Madeleine Meille told her party. “Mary Josephine <b>doesn’t speak French</b>, but she can sing and pray in her A</p>
---

**Table 7.6: EPNC concordance lines highlighting fluency in French**

Skills in French tend to be evaluated. There are 12 negative evaluations of fluency in French (e.g. “very poor”, “horribly rusty”, “little or no French”, “none of them could speak French well enough”), but also six positive evaluations of fluency in French (e.g. “beautiful”, “excellent”, “fluent”, “impeccable”). Importantly, however, English and French are not the only languages that are under discussion. The lemma LANGUAGE (language/s) collocates with FRENCH (73 occurrences), ENGLISH (79 occurrences), SIGN [language] (14 occurrences), PERSIAN (10 occurrences), CHINESE (7 occurrences), and INUIT and JAPANESE (5 occurrences, each). Fluency in multiple languages is evaluated positively, and the frequent assessments of fluency suggest the extent to which native-like fluency is valued. Indeed, the

lemma FLUENT (fluent, fluently, fluency) is used to describe English, French, Spanish, Latin, German, and Arabic. There are also eleven references to “language skills”, which are evaluated positively (e.g. “emphasised”, “improved”, “nurture”, “appropriate”), whereas a lack of language skills is evaluated negatively (“appalling”, “slowly wiping away”).

In the French primary corpus, there are only infrequent discussions of languages besides English and French. The lemma LANGUE (langue/s) collocates with FRANÇAISE (100 occurrences), FRANÇAIS (41 occurrences), ANGLAISE (18 occurrences), and there are eight generic references to “indigenous languages” (*langues autochtones*). There are a small number of references to the “Huron-Wendate language” (*langue huronne-wendate*, 2 occurrences), the Innu language (*langue innue*, 1 occurrence), and the Persian language (*langue persane*). The lemma PARLE (parler, parle/nt, “speak”) only collocates with FRANÇAIS (37 occurrences) and ANGLAIS (5 occurrences). It is perhaps unsurprising that French skills are topical in the French primary corpus, but it is notable that English skills too are often evaluated – and most evaluations are negative (see Section 6.5). While there are three generic discussions of speaking English (e.g. *parler anglais*), there is one mention to speaking English well (*parlant un bon anglais*/ “speaking English well”), and five references to speaking English poorly (e.g. *elle parlait mal anglais*/ “she spoken English badly”, *il parlait à peine anglais*/ “he barely spoke English”). There are also two mentions of not speaking English at all (e.g. *il ne parlait pas anglais*/ “he didn’t speak English”), and four mentions of speaking only English (e.g. *parler anglais, et anglais seulement*/ “speaking English, and English only”, *il parle just anglais*/ “he only speaks English”). These examples suggest the important place given to the knowledge of English in French-speaking areas of Canada. English skills are important, it would seem, because when they are absent they are noted through references to speaking English poorly or not speaking English at all.

The necessity for French speakers to be fluent in English also underpins some statements made in downsampled French articles. One example (Aubry, 2009) discusses the project to create the “best Canadian wine” (*le plus grand vin canadien*) in Osoyoos, British Columbia. The journalist cites an English-speaking source at

length – with no French translation – and concludes the section by stating that if there are any more question on the subject of the best climate for wine, readers can direct questions – in English – directly to the source (see Example 7.10).

**Example 7.10**

“We have the perfect climate for wine,” said [Shayn Bjornholm], before continuing: “We even have an extra two hours of sunshine over the best terroirs of California with an average of 17.4 hours of sunshine!” [...] For the rest, send your questions, in English, directly to Shayn (sbjornholm@washingtonwine.org)!

*«We have the perfect climate for wine», disait l’homme, avant de poursuivre: «We even have an extra two hours of sunshine over the best terroirs of California with an average of 17,4 hours of sunshine!» [...] Pour le reste, il faudra poser vos questions, en anglais, directement à Shayn (sbjornholm@washingtonwine.org)!*

In another example about gardening (Vigor, 2009), the journalist provides English translation for flowers under discussion. In noting that *plante chenille* is referred to as “Red Hot Cat’s Tail” in English, the journalist suggests that the French name is marginal and that the English name may be more familiar or more useful in other contexts to French speakers. In sum, fluency in English is suggested to be advantageous for francophones in many contexts.

In contrast, fluency in other languages is rarely mentioned. A downsampled text (Meurice, 2009; see Appendix 6 for entire article) is one of the rare examples that discusses multilingualism beyond just English and French. Although this letter to the editor cannot truly be said to support pan-Canadian nationalism, it nonetheless represents languages as assets. The writer explains that he invited a German couple to the Maison Saint-Gabriel, a tourist site, in Montreal. Since the wife spoke French, English, Portuguese and Spanish but her husband spoke only English and Spanish but not French, the group requested a guided tour in English. The tour guide’s English was “practically unintelligible” (*pratiquement inintelligible*), and the guests were forced to ask the guide to speak French instead. The guide’s excuse was that



she rarely had the opportunity to practise, which was met with incredulity by the visitors (see Example 7.11).

**Example 7.11**

How? In Montreal? This should make us ask ourselves if those who fight against English have succeeded to the extent that now we pass for cave-dwellers!

*Comment? À Montréal? C'est à se demander si ceux qui luttent contre l'anglais n'ont pas tellement bien réussi que nous passons maintenant pour des troglodytes!*

(Meurice, 2009)

The argument being made is not simply that if tours are offered in English and French that tour guides should be fluent in both languages, but also that since Montreal is by nature a bilingual cosmopolitan city, English should be spoken by front of house personnel, especially tour guides hosting international visitors. English is therefore represented as an asset, and to disregard this fact is to be out of contact with the rest of the world (*nous passons maintenant pour des troglodytes!*/"we pass for cave-dwellers!"). In the rest of the world, languages are tools to be used and people speak multiple languages; the author argues that the objective of protecting French should not supersede the use of English completely, because not speaking English means isolation from the rest of the world. The article thus positively evaluates cosmopolitan multilingualism rather than nationalistic monolingualism. While perhaps not explicitly aligning with any national discourse, this ideology is certainly not consistent with the Quebec national discourse as seen elsewhere. Instead, it is more consistent with the ideologies of language in the pan-Canadian discourse of national identity.

Another downsampled text (Lussier, 2009a) discusses an individual who is more hesitant to rely on English for success. The filmmaker Émile Gaudreault discusses his return to French-medium films despite the success and broader audiences he enjoyed when producing English films (see Example 7.12).

**Example 7.12**

[Gaudreault] next dedicated himself to two full-length English feature films, one of which (“Mambo Italiano”) met with international success. “Surviving My Mother”, despite critical acclaim, did not achieve the success that had been predicted. *De père en flic* thus marks the return to the francophone side. Even if the chances of overcoming the [linguistic] borders are slim, especially in the comedy genre, this choice nonetheless seems to be quite confirmed. “Making films in English complicates things,” remarks Gaudreault. “From now on I’d prefer to shoot in my language and work with our excellent actors”.

*[Gaudreault] s’est ensuite consacré à deux longs métrages en anglais, dont l’un, Mambo italiano, a connu une belle carrière internationale. Surviving My Mother, malgré un bel accueil critique, n’a de son côté pas obtenu le succès escompté. De père en flic marque ainsi son retour du côté francophone. Même si les chances de franchir les frontières restent plus minces, surtout dans le domaine de la comédie, ce choix, désormais, semble être très affirmé. “Tourner des films en anglais complique les choses, fait remarquer Gaudreault. Je préfère désormais tourner dans ma langue et travailler avec nos excellents acteurs.”*

Thus, it would seem that while the advantages of the English language are acknowledged in terms of the potential for international success, there still appears to be integrative attachment to the French language and culture. This article, then, would more clearly align with a discourse of a civic Quebec national identity wherein the value of the English language is recognised, but its role does not supercede the predominance of French as a core value of the Quebec nation (see Section 3.2.2).

In conclusion, there are several findings that indicate the presence of ideologies of languages as commodities. However, most of evidence is unbalanced, occurring to a much greater degree in the English primary corpus than in the French primary

corpus. For example, most positive evaluations of bilingualism in the English primary corpus link bilingualism with other positive characteristics, such as intelligence, success, and popularity, which are assets to individuals. In contrast, with rare exceptions, bilingualism tends not to be represented as an asset in the French primary corpus. Also, keywords in English, the collocates of the words LANGUAGE, FRENCH, and ENGLISH, and two downsampled articles indicate that the education system is represented as the democratic means by which all Canadians have equal access to language skills. In contrast, there are far fewer French keywords pertaining to education, and the keywords LANGUE, FRANÇAIS, and ANGLAIS tend not to collocate with words pertaining to education. Finally, an emphasis on fluency in languages – and not only English and French – indicates the commodity value of multilingualism in the English primary corpus. In contrast, although fluency in English and French is topical in the French primary corpus, there are only infrequent discussions of other languages.

## 7.6 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the objective of this chapter was to examine evidence of language ideologies and discourses of pan-Canadian national identity in the English and French corpora. The findings suggested evidence of the pan-Canadian discourse of national identity, and there were some similarities between English and French. For example, there were a similar number of CANADA lemmas and there were discussions of celebrating Canada Day in both corpora. However, language ideologies in support of pan-Canadian nationalism often differed in English and French. Findings with regard to bilingual ideologies showed that although bilingualism was discussed to a similar extent in both corpora, in the French primary corpus, bilingualism did not tend to be represented positively. Discussions of bilingualism were also distributed differently within French and English texts, since French texts often problematised bilingualism. With regard to ideologies of languages and identity, although there was evidence of bilingualism and official languages being linked to Canadian identity in the English primary corpus, there was little evidence of this in the French primary corpus. Indeed, most collocations between CANADA and BILINGUE lemmas tended to represent bilingualism negatively in Canada. Finally, with regard to ideologies of languages as

commodities, although the English primary corpus contained numerous different examples of the ways in which English and French – and indeed other languages – were represented as valuable social assets that are open to all through language education, in the French primary corpus, with few exceptions, bilingualism tended not to be represented as an asset and there was little discussion of language education. Furthermore, the French primary corpus was predominantly focused on the French language, with less discussion of English, and hardly any discussion of other languages, suggesting perhaps a less international view of languages as resources.

Given the patchy findings on language ideologies that support this version of nationalism, it is useful to note that the individuals who do possess the lauded language skills have important social positions and are represented as embodiments of the Canadian ideal. For example, former Governor General of Canada Michaëlle Jean is described as “*the very Canadian, contemporary, bilingual, multicultural, modern, worldly Ms. Jean*” (emphasis added), and former Governor General Roméo Leblanc, an Acadian from New Brunswick, is described as the “quintessential Canadian”. In another example, a speech given by Citizenship Judge Suzanne Pinel is noted because of her bilingualism: “[Pinel’s] bilingualism in switching smoothly between *our two official languages* was not only *natural* but *inclusive* and *so very right*” (emphases added). Examples such as these continue to reinforce – in English newspapers, at least – a bilingual ideal that would seem to form part of the pan-Canadian national imagination. The problem with this vision is that it seems to exist only in English-speaking Canada. Even the numerous texts that praise Roméo Leblanc in French-language newspapers tend not to describe him as an epitome of Canadianness. This continued disconnect between understandings of Canada and the roles that languages play in it will be discussed as the findings from all three analysis chapters are brought together in the final discussion.

# 8. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

## 8.1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

This thesis has explored the relationship between languages and national identity in Canada. In order to systematically approach the topic, the concepts of “language ideologies” and “discourses” were adopted as a way of comparing and contrasting understandings of languages and their roles in the nation. By drawing on previous research on languages and nationalism in Canada, a schema (see Table 3.1) was devised to compare and contrast language ideologies and discourses of national identity across corpus data from English and French newspapers. By exploring data according to this schema, it was possible to see what was unique to each language and what patterns were shared. Also, by approaching the corpus data according to the three dominant versions of nationalism, it was possible to evaluate the similarities and differences between them. Finally, by comparing language ideologies, it was possible to see the often very different ways in which they became manifested in the data in support of discourses of national identity. By examining the data in these dynamic ways, it was possible to answer the research questions set out in Section 1.4.

The first research question asked how the French and English Canadian media discursively represent languages and language issues in the news. In general terms, the findings showed that languages are represented as commodities, as national features, as living objects, and as tools to be used. Languages are represented as stand-alone items that are learned, spoken, taught and protected; they are also used as descriptors of people, places, and things. Representations of language issues reflect the ways in which languages figure in larger discussions of such things as education, employment, culture, and the nation. Language issues are rarely discussed

## Chapter Eight: Discussion and conclusion

without reference to wider issues facing the Canadian population, such as equal access, privileged positions, and encroachments on autonomy.

The very general themes outlined in response to the first question bring us to the more specific topics contained in the second question, which asked how representations of languages differed between English and French. Findings from the English and French newspapers revealed a number of similarities and differences between representations of languages and language issues. Perhaps the most notable finding is also the simplest: in French, language issues – and particularly issues pertaining to the French language – are discussed more frequently and more explicitly, whereas in English, language issues are less topical, and understandings of the English language in particular tend to be embedded and inexplicit. This is perhaps unsurprising, given that English Canada has a history of indifference towards the English language (see Section 3.3). In contrast, Canadian French speakers strove for several centuries to maintain and, later, legitimise and protect their language (see Section 3.2); thus, the French data exhibit greater metalinguistic awareness. This relatively simplistic finding forms the basis of most differences between English and French representations of languages and language issues in Canada.

Since the role of the English language tends to be naturalised and “common sense” in the English data, on the occasions where languages are discussed openly, it is predominantly foreign languages that are topical. Thus, issues associated with foreign languages involve the education, fluency, and employment related to these other languages – which tend to be spoken alongside English. In contrast, the most topical language in the French corpus is French – not a foreign language; accordingly, there are few discussions of education, fluency and employment in French. One exception to this generalisation is the English language, which has a privileged position in the French corpus. Representations of the English language in the French data are complex, with frequent allusions to the strained historical relationship between the two languages. English was the historical language of colonialism and also the foreign language that has most affected French speakers in Canada. For example, English has had a profound influence on the variety of French spoken in Canada and its dominant presence has impacted on the long-term viability

## Chapter Eight: Discussion and conclusion

of the French language (see Section 3.2). However, English is increasingly being seen as essential for participation within the larger Canadian and international communities. As a result, the frequent discussions of English, the evaluations of English fluency, and the denunciations of English as an agent in French language endangerment reflect the complexity of the role that the English language plays in the lives of most French speakers (see e.g. Oakes, 2010).

In contrast, the French language plays a decidedly less complicated role in the lives of most English speakers. History has shown the extent to which the French language has been resisted by English speakers in Canada (see e.g. Hayday, 2005), and it has only been since Canada enacted language policies in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century that English speakers have been motivated to engage with the French language at all. This engagement was arguably prompted by the privileged position that the French language acquired through the official language policies. In other words, the sanctioned role of the French language within the Canadian government made it a valuable commodity for English speakers. This role, combined with a globalising and multilingual economy, has led to other languages, too, being seen as commodities to be learned, taught, and used for social mobility and employment. The overarching evidence that languages are viewed according to their instrumental value (Sections 3.3.3 and 6.5) and as commodities (Sections 3.4.3 and 7.5) contrasts with the dearth of evidence suggesting that languages are perceived according to their integrative value. The opposite was true of the French corpus, where evidence indicating the integrative value of the French language by far outweighed the examples suggesting that any language – apart from English – has instrumental value.

This brings us to the final research question, which asked how the representations of languages related to understandings of national identity in Canada. To answer this question, it was important to rely on the schema (Table 3.1) that outlined the three dominant versions of national discourses in Canada: Quebec nationalism, English Canadian nationalism, and pan-Canadian nationalism. In the French corpus, evidence was found in support of monolingual ideologies, ideologies of language as a core value, and ideologies of endangerment – all of which support the Quebec discourse of national identity. There was little evidence of ideologies of standardised French,

which was surprising given the role of the standard in Quebec nationalism and the wealth of literature on this topic (see Section 3.2.3). Nevertheless, the other three language ideologies suggest that beliefs about the French language are embedded in conceptualisations of Quebec national identity. In the English corpus, evidence was found in support of unmarked monolingual ideologies and ideologies of instrumental English. In remarkably similar fashion to the French corpus, there was little evidence of ideologies of standardised Canadian English in the English corpus; in this case, however, the dearth of evidence is less surprising, given that English Canadians have historically been less concerned with their particular variety of English (see Section 3.3.2). Despite the lack of standard language ideologies, the evidence of monolingual ideologies and ideologies of international English suggest the largely embedded role that the English language plays in the English Canadian nation.

Finally, evidence in support of the pan-Canadian discourse of national identity was perhaps the most challenging to account for. This is because it meant searching for, at the same time, similarities between the English and French corpora and differences within each corpus. This was difficult because differences between the English and French corpora had already been found in the form of English Canadian nationalism and Quebec nationalism, and these findings were largely incompatible with pan-Canadian nationalism. Although both corpora contained evidence of the pan-Canadian national discourse, evidence of bilingual ideologies, ideologies of languages and identity, and ideologies of languages as commodities were all more heavily weighted – if not exclusively present – in the English corpus. The French corpus contained few positive evaluations of bilingualism – except bilingualism in New Brunswick – and negligible evidence of ideologies of languages and identity and ideologies of languages as commodities. The overall imbalance of evidence in English and French presents some challenging questions about the pan-Canadian model, which is crucially premised on bilingualism.

McRoberts (1997), among many others, has argued that although the pan-Canadian model was designed to unite the country, it was favoured primarily by English speakers. The model, McRoberts argues, has never been popular with French speakers, since bilingualism policies were coupled with multiculturalism policies, which undermine the bicultural basis on which Canada had previously been



understood to have been founded (see e.g. Fraser, 2006; Haque, 2012; Hayday, 2005; Innis, 1973). If the language ideologies that support the pan-Canadian discourse of national identity appear to be more salient in the English corpus than in the French corpus, then this reinforces the argument that the pan-Canadian model has not taken hold in French-speaking Canada. Indeed, findings suggest that the pan-Canadian model has not altered the fundamental beliefs about language that have existed in French-speaking Canada for several centuries. These include, first and foremost, the role of the French language, which could arguably be seen to underpin all other beliefs about language. For example, in Quebec nationalism, it could be argued that the nation should be monolingual because the French language is what unites the nation; it could be argued that standardised Quebec French should be promoted and preserved because it is a symbol of the nation; and it could be argued that the French language should be protected because it is central to the Quebec nation. These beliefs are perhaps so ingrained in French-speaking society that they cannot be altered by federal language policy.

In contrast, historical accounts of English-speaking Canada indicate that there are few historically-founded beliefs about language against which the pan-Canadian model had to compete. Indeed, there were numerous parallels between the ideologies of instrumental English in English Canadian national identity and the ideologies of languages of commodities in pan-Canadian national identity (see Sections 3.3.3 and 3.4.3, 6.5 and 7.5). The pan-Canadian model and its related language ideologies plausibly translated more easily into English because they were inherently compatible with ideologies already in circulation; furthermore, the pan-Canadian model supplemented a vision of national identity in English-speaking Canada, which had been worryingly hollow (see Section 3.3). Nowadays, as Saul (1997: 344-5), among others, has noted, “francophone Canada is at the core of how anglophones see the country and therefore themselves [...] It is simply a central characteristic of the nation”. However, as Conlogue (1996: 9) has noted, French speakers have not necessarily agreed to play this symbolic role in the pan-Canadian nation, and in reality anglophones have done little to give the myth substance. Accordingly, while findings in the English corpus suggest the extent to which the French language plays an important role in the national imagination (e.g. even based on the raw frequencies of FRENCH and ENGLISH, 1489 and 791 occurrences, respectively); with few

exceptions there is little indication in the French corpus that either the French language or bilingualism are seen as central to the pan-Canadian nation. Instead, French is strongly linked to Quebec and bilingualism to New Brunswick.

Although the imbalance of findings from the English and French corpora may suggest that the discourse has not taken hold equally in English- and French-speaking Canada, there is also the possibility that the asymmetry of the pan-Canadian discourse is essential to its function in uniting the country. As Blommaert (2006: 172) explains:

[any attempt to bridge the English-French gap in Canada] *needs* to produce asymmetrical discourses because every topic potentially has a different angle for Francophones than for Anglophones, and every message lands in a different interpretive universe. The shift in language thus involves a shift in style, in political persona, in viewpoint, in degree of alignment with audiences, in traditions of understanding it [...] In other words: the absence of symmetry is precisely the potential for a viable politics — hybridity is a necessity, not an option.

If complete uniformity between English and French understandings of a topic is impossible, then it logically follows that English speakers and French speakers should not be expected to produce exactly the same discourse. As Saul (1997: 422) explains, “whatever their point of view or politics, [those at the centre of these languages] can’t help but speak and write from within those attitudes”. Indeed, he goes on to contend:

our [Canadian] nationalism exists on a spectrum, from the impossibly generous idea that all people belong to all communities across to the exclusive and negative opposite in which each of us is limited to a single community [...] Our more realistic and indeed real attitude is that we all belong to several communities and do so at several levels (Saul, 1997: 438).

If Canada functions as a bilingual country, then it is because French and English speakers (and other groups, too) produce different discourses that enable them to share a common space and overarching identity. Still, sharing a space – like Blommaert’s “viable politics” – is not the same thing as sharing a nation. If the English corpus and the French corpus reflect different language ideologies and national discourses, then this does not prevent them from sharing a polity. However, since the discourse of national identity does not appear to be shared by some of the people it purports to represent, it may be that the pan-Canadian national identity is not viable except at the level of officialdom.

### **8.2 CONTRIBUTIONS OF THESIS**

This thesis has presented descriptive, methodological, and theoretical findings that contribute to the fields of sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, corpus linguistics, and Canadian studies in a number of ways.

First, this research has revealed a number of findings that enhance understandings of the status and function of languages in Canada. For example, findings from the French corpus contribute to a greater understanding of the roles that language plays in modern day Quebec. The findings from French newspapers notably indicate greater French linguistic security; since there is little evidence of ideologies of standardised French, this suggests a change from the past in which Canadian French was stigmatised and talk about the stigmatised variety was common (see Section 3.2.3). However, insecurities were expressed in terms of uncertainty over the status and role of French faced with English and other languages. For example, the collocation between FRANÇAIS and IMMIGRANT lemmas (*immigrant/e/s, immigration*), and the pervasiveness of ideologies of endangerment, suggest that there are still concerns over the “predominance” of French in Quebec. Also, the French corpus indicated the increasingly complex role that the English language plays in French-speaking Canada, with insecurities over the role of English in French language endangerment contrasting with assessments of English language fluency and the need to speak English in a globalised world (see Section 7.5).

## Chapter Eight: Discussion and conclusion

Findings also suggested the fact that languages, and especially the English language, continue to play a largely embedded role in English-speaking Canadian society. This finding is consistent with previous research (see Section 3.3). When the role of languages is not naturalised in English-speaking Canada, languages tend to be represented as commodities. Notably, this was only the case in the English corpus. One French example even explicitly noted that the commodity value of language is the only real way to “sell” multilingualism to English speakers (see Section 7.5). Because of the commodity value of language in English-speaking Canada, a strong emphasis on education permeated the English corpus. This may suggest that equal access to language learning is seen by English-speaking Canadians as part and parcel of democratic society. This view contrasts with French speakers’ historic struggle for French-medium education, which was premised on the right for inter-generational cultural transmission (see Sections 3.4 and 7.5). Since English newspapers exhibit primarily instrumental approaches to language and the French newspapers exhibit primarily integrative attachment to the French language, this suggests a fundamental divide in the role(s) that languages play in French- and English-speaking society. Importantly, this difference is not new: Haque (2012: 161) notes that the Commissioners of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in the 1960s found that anglophones were complacent about language maintenance and had little understanding of the role of language in intergenerational cultural transmission. Furthermore, the Commission’s recommendations for Canada’s bilingualism and multiculturalism policies were premised on the instrumental value of languages as commodities (Haque, 2012: 204-7). However, Ricento (2005: 355) notes that seeing languages as functional tools may reduce individuals’ capacity to comprehend other cultures’ integrative attachment to their language. The instrumental/ integrative divide in English- and French-speaking Canada may thus be a primary feature in the perpetuation of Canada’s “two solitudes”. Thus, the fundamentally different representations of languages in English and French newspapers may have implications for national cohesion and coherence.

One reason why the newspapers may contain different language ideologies is because they emerge from isolated journalistic communities (see Section 1.3). Since the Canadian media provide vital communication links, they putatively unite a country strained by immense size, regionalism, and a lack of common language and

culture (Pritchard and Sauvageau, 1999: 284). However, since the French and English Canadian media have emerged from different histories, since the journalists live in different communities and are members of different journalist associations, and since there are different stakeholders in English and French, it is perhaps unsurprising that they yield different news products. Nonetheless, the fact that they contain different language ideologies in English and French is no small matter. Fundamentally different understandings of the roles that English and French should play in the nation underpin many of the crises that have faced Canada since Europeans first arrived on the territory. These disagreements form the basis of misunderstandings of other, often seemingly unrelated topics (e.g. as discussed: education, national holiday celebrations, etc.). Notably, fundamentally different understandings of the role of the French language underpin the tension between English-speaking Canadians and Quebec nationalists (see e.g. Conlogue, 2002: 98; Saul, 1997: 311). If Canada is to be a united country with a more unified national discourse, then the media arguably have an important role to play.

The second major contribution of this thesis pertains to methodology. The findings presented here enhance the fields of corpus linguistics and discourse analysis through the elaboration of the cross-linguistic corpus-assisted discourse studies approach (C-CADS). By searching for similarities and differences within and between corpora of different languages, C-CADS affirmed the argument made by Tognini-Bonelli (2001: 139) (echoed by many others), that corpus work is above all comparative. Comparative research means searching for differences, not only between corpora, but also within corpora. A single language (i.e., medium of communication) does not necessarily index a singular national perspective, as Gagnon (2003: 111) found when she noted that *The Globe and Mail* and *The Gazette* differed in their representations of the 1995 Quebec referendum. Comparative research also means searching for similarities (see Taylor, forthcoming 2013). For example, the complicated nature of the search for pan-Canadian nationalism brought to light the importance of comparative research. The single term “Canada” was found to index different versions of the country (one English-dominant, the other bilingual) in both English and French. The complexity of the term “Canada” suggests the ways in which singular terms can symbolise different things even within a single language if they are “pulled this way and that by competing social interests”

(Eagleton, 2007: 195). Fairclough (2003: 131) notes that “[d]ifferent discourses may use the same words [...] but they may use them differently”, and he advocates the study of collocation patterns to disambiguate meanings. The comparison and contrast of collocation patterns within and across languages were just two of the techniques found to be useful in this C-CADS approach. The exploration of similarities and differences proved to be a dynamic means of accounting for competing discourses and language ideologies across languages.

The C-CADS approach was not entirely straightforward, however. One of the primary challenges was how to interpret findings that surfaced from the analysis. Notably, the interpretation of frequency required a thorough contextualisation of the different situations in English- and French-speaking Canada. As noted in Section 4.2.1, both high and low frequency items are equally important because whereas the former may indicate a subject is topical and thus frequently discussed, the latter may indicate that the subject is taken for granted and thus rarely topical. In the case of the monolingual ideologies presented here, high and low frequencies were ultimately interpreted to mean a similar thing in different cases: monolingualism is salient in English- and French-speaking Canada. To recap, while in the French corpus references to FRANÇAIS dominated, suggesting that French monolingualism is the norm, in the English corpus, references to FRENCH dominated, suggesting that English monolingualism is taken for granted and is thus the norm. While it may seem problematic to interpret opposite findings to mean the same thing in different cases, the interpretation is crucially based not only on frequency, but also on other findings and the wider literature. The use of such context is a crucial component in sociocultural analytic approaches, including discourse analysis.

The literature outlined in Sections 1.2, 1.3, and 3.3 highlights that French is the predominant, central feature of Quebec whereas English Canadians have historically been uninterested in their own language while also being resistant towards other languages. Findings seem to confirm this contradictory state of affairs. In the English corpus, even though references to FRENCH were far more frequent than references to ENGLISH in the English corpus, not all references to FRENCH referred to the French language. As noted in Section 6.3, many of these referred to the French Open tennis tournament, suggesting that perhaps language issues are simply not very

topical in English newspapers. Also, the fact that ANGLOPHONE tended to collocate with FRANCOPHONE, ALLOPHONE, and FRENCH (see Section 6.3), and the fact that discussions of multilingualism crucially include English alongside other languages (see Section 6.5) indicate that English is rarely a topical subject on its own: English tends only to be discussed when contrasted with other languages. However, this does not mean that multilingualism is typical; indeed, the opposite is true since other languages are framed in such a way that they are marked in contrast with an established English-speaking norm. These and other examples suggest that language issues, and especially English language issues, are simply not topical in the English corpus. This is arguably because of the linguistic security that English speakers are afforded with English as a national and international lingua franca. Crucially, then, interpretations of these frequencies did not occur in isolation but rather in full social and historical contextualisation and with consideration of collocation trends and concordances. The need for frequency to be interpreted through contextualisation is not unique to a cross-linguistic CADS approach. As noted in Section 4.2.1, contextualisation is central to any corpus linguistic assessment of frequency.

What was unique to the cross-linguistic CADS approach was the ability to compare and contrast findings across languages. By having carefully designed and compiled comparable corpora, comparisons were possible across languages using both corpus linguistics and discourse analysis. The dynamic combination of corpus linguistics and discourse analysis tools allowed for the findings to be contrasted across languages at micro and macro levels, and this enabled us to see how sometimes similar arguments were being made in different ways in support of oppositional versions of national identity. For example, the push for French predominance in Quebec is justified by the comparison with English predominance in English-speaking contexts; however, while English tends to predominate in these contexts without metalinguistic commentary, the opposite is true in Quebec. The complexity of this finding only became clear by (1) comparing the infrequent discussions of English in the English corpus with the frequent collocations between, for example, FRANÇAIS and QUÉBEC in the French corpus, and (2) by comparing more subtly framed issues such as the way the English language is framed as a language of cosmopolitanism and integration. In summary, the C-CADS approach affords the

## Chapter Eight: Discussion and conclusion

researcher a dynamic means of uncovering findings in corpora of different languages. While this approach is not entirely integrated and requires legwork on the part of the researcher to contextualise and interpret findings, the multifaceted design is unquestionably to the advantage of the researcher and enhances not only CADS specifically, but also discourse analysis more broadly by providing methodological and analytical support for findings as well as a multilingual alternative to the monolingual research that has thus far dominated the discipline.

Finally, the findings presented here also have theoretical implications, most notably pertaining to language policy. Thesis findings suggested that English Canadians may have adopted language ideologies that rely on the instrumental understandings of language that are inherent to Canadian language policies. In other words, by making English and French equal official languages of Canada, the Official Languages Act encouraged Canadians to become bilingual in order to access the benefits associated with another official language (see Section 3.4); the English corpus contained findings that were consistent with this type of instrumental (commodity value) approach to language. Thus, it would seem that Canadian language policies have impacted on society to the extent that they have altered previously-existing language ideologies in English-speaking Canada (according to historical accounts of English Canadians' language attitudes). In other words, language policy may have the capacity to influence discourse. At the same time, the inverse of this conclusion may also be true: since the French corpus exhibited instrumental approaches to the English language but not the French language, and since bilingualism was evaluated negatively (apart from in New Brunswick), the findings from French corpus were not consistent with federal language policy objectives. Indeed, the French corpus continues to exhibit strong integrative understandings of the French language, which – while not necessarily incompatible with federal language policy – is markedly different from the effect of this policy in English-speaking Canada. Notably, the rejection of societal bilingualism and the reinforcement of the predominance of French in Quebec are diametrically opposed to the Canadian bilingual model.

Thus, it may be that if the dominant language ideologies in a society are inconsistent with language policies, then it is unlikely that the policies will take root on the ground. If a language policy is to be effective, then it must be based on a negotiation



## Chapter Eight: Discussion and conclusion

of previous ideological discourse already in circulation in society and new ideological discourse that is intended to filter down into society (cf. “chains of discourse”, Blackledge, 2005: 13). Ricento (2006: 50) explains:

Understanding how ideas and beliefs become ideologies and how ideologies provide frameworks to coordinate the social interpretations and practices of dominant groups allows us to predict with some confidence how particular language policies and practices might be interpreted – and supported or opposed – by dominant or majoritarian social groups. Such understanding can also help advocates for particular policies or policy orientations develop strategies to counter such dominant ideologies in specific domains (for example, schools, the media) while, at the same time, realizing that all ideologies (including those we may support) have inconsistencies and contradictions, and so are at once vulnerable and resistant to change in the short term. Such a view is realistic and therefore more useful in developing practical and practicable strategies for advancing policy goal agendas.

Since there has been little research on language ideologies in Canada but considerable research on language policy (see e.g. Jedwab and Landry, 2011, Morris, 2010), this thesis presents a first step towards combining a corpus-assisted discourse study of language ideologies with policy research.

As a final theoretical implication, language education in Canada is widely seen as a means of bridging the “two solitudes”. However, Saul (1997: 424) contends that if French is to have a future in Canada, then the key to strengthening it is “in constantly seeking to understand the experience of those who use it – that is, their culture”. If Canada is to be a truly bilingual country, as policies would seem to intend, then perhaps the focus should not be more or less exclusively on language education. The findings outlined here have suggested that different approaches to language education are at the heart of different understandings of the function of language in English- and French-speaking Canada. In particular, French language education has been central to English Canadian engagement with bilingualism; however, the focus

on education continues to re-assert that languages have instrumental rather than integrative roles in society. Such an instrumental approach misses out on the more fundamentally important integrative role that the French language plays for French speakers in Canada; indeed, it has been the integrative role of the French language that has been the driving force for French-speaking Canadians to preserve their language and culture over the past four centuries. It is perhaps the case, then, that the Canadian bilingual model would be better served by improved cross-cultural education.

### **8.3 LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

As with any research project, this study has limitations as well as directions for further research. The first limitation pertains to the data. As Partington (2009: 281) notes, “a corpus is only representative of itself”. In this case, the corpus consists of newspaper articles. Although these were carefully sampled to include data in English and French from across the country, it was not possible to examine all Canadian newspapers: only the most widely-circulated newspapers were included, and in many cases newspapers were owned by a singular conglomerate that shared a single news story across numerous papers (e.g. see the case of Marian Scott [2009] in Section 5.6). It would be useful to build on the present corpus by examining local newspapers with more original content and regional perspective.

The corpus used here is also synchronic, meaning that the data were all collected within the relatively brief timespan of June 15-July 9 2009. At this point, the data are already nearly four years old; a future research endeavour could use more current data collected according to the same principles in order to create a larger, diachronic corpus. Also, if more historic data were collected that contained language attitudes in English and French-speaking Canada, then this would allow conclusions to be drawn from a historical perspective; this would help us to explain whether English Canadian, Quebec, and pan-Canadian discourses, and the language ideologies that support them, have changed over time.

Finally, a future project could expand on the current corpus to include data from other domains, such as news commentary (readily available online), diverse media

sources (e.g. blogs, Twitter, Facebook, etc.), and conversation or interview data. With a diverse data set, it would be easier to make arguments about discourses in Canada beyond those that are specific to newspapers. Since newspapers tend only to be read by an aging, middle-class Canadian demographic (see Newspaper Audience Databank, 2011), it is important to obtain data that emerges from, and is consumed by, other components of the diverse Canadian population. With such a dataset, it would be possible to better establish the coherence (or a lack thereof) of Canadian national discourses.

Another limitation to this study is the oversimplified categorisation of Canadians into an “English” and “French” binary. Indeed, while the focus here has primarily been on French in Quebec, there are important characteristics of the Quebec context that differ markedly from other French-speaking areas of Canada. There has been little space for discussion of Franco-Ontarians and Acadians, and even less for considerations of smaller French-speaking communities. In a similar way, English speakers in Canada have not been accorded the detail that is their due; this group comprises great ethnic, religious, historic, and cultural diversity that is inadequately accounted for by a common language. It would be useful for a future project to compare case studies of individual groups’ language ideologies so that the similarities and differences between these can be explored at a more local level.

Perhaps more significantly, there has been little discussion within this thesis of the First Nations and minority groups, and little mention of languages besides English and French. While English and French are the dominant groups in the country, other demographics are not insignificant. With a decline in francophone birth rate and a surge in aboriginal birth rate (Statistics Canada, 2006: 17), increased immigration, and one in five Canadians a visible minority (Statistics Canada, 2012: 3), the Canadian demographic is changing. These changes are reflected in the 2011 Census results, in which Statistics Canada opted to not use the traditional categories “anglophone”, “francophone”, and “allophone”, since these apparently no longer reflect the complex linguistic reality of Canada today (see Scott, 2012). Although Canada has never been a country consisting only of English speakers and French speakers, the terms “francophone”, “anglophone” and “allophone” have been used since the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism as arguably

essentialist group labels that enabled the people of Canada to be categorised according to their place in a society that was designed to be French-English bilingual (see Section 2.3). These labels served to reify the role of these languages in the country, with individuals identifying themselves or being identified according to these categories. While the decision by Statistics Canada, a federal government agency, to alter the terminology certainly reflects the broader changes in Canadian society, the replacement of essentialist group labels also indicates a change in frames of reference in the country. New frames of reference may lead to the gradual devolution of the bilingualism model on which Canada was based in the 1960s and 1970s. With this changing environment, there is considerable room for future research on the relevance of languages and nationalism in Canada.

### **8.4 CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, this study of the language ideologies and discourses of national identity in Canadian newspapers has shown the extent of ideological differences between English-speaking and French-speaking Canada. As Fletcher (1998) predicted, the Canadian media experience has remained one consisting primarily of “two solitudes”. If Canadians are bilingual (and most are not) and if they read the other language media (and most do not), they will not find languages or language issues represented in newspapers in any way similar to how they are represented in their own language media. Since most Canadians are not bilingual – and are not encouraged to be by the news media that reinforce the natural state of monolingualism – and since Canadians rarely engage with other language media, they are likely unaware of the communications divide. With this current state of affairs, the Canadian “two solitudes” may persist well into the future.

# REFERENCES

- Adams, M. (2008). *Unlikely utopia: The surprising triumph of Canadian multiculturalism*. Toronto: Penguin.
- Ager, D. (2001). *Motivation in language planning and language policy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Aitchison, J. (2007). *The word weavers: Newshounds and wordsmiths*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aldridge, M. (2001). Lost expectations? Women journalists and the fall-out from the 'Toronto newspaper war'. *Media, Culture & Society*, 23: 607-624.
- Alexander, J. C. (2004). From the depths of despair: Performance, counterperformance, and "September 11". *Sociological Theory*, 22 (1), 88-105.
- Al-Hejin, B. (2012). Linking critical discourse analysis with translation studies: An example from BBC News. *Language and Politics*, 11 (3), 311-335.
- Allaire, G. (2007). From "Nouvelle-France" to "Francophonie canadienne": A historical survey. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 185, 25-52.
- Allard, P. (2009). Unité, diversité, confusion. *Le Droit*, 4 July 2009, p. 20.
- Anctil, P. (2007). Sortie de crise linguistique au Québec. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 41 (2), 185-221.
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Androutsopoulos, J. (2007). Bilingualism in the mass media and on the internet. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism: A social approach* (pp. 207-230). New York: Palgrave.

## References

- Angus Reid Public Opinion. (2012). Appetite for sovereignty remains lukewarm in Quebec. Available: [http://www.angus-reid.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/2012.11.21\\_Quebec\\_CAN.pdf](http://www.angus-reid.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/2012.11.21_Quebec_CAN.pdf).
- Anonymous (2009a). Another kind of brain drain. *Ottawa Citizen*, 3 July 2009, p. A10.
- Anonymous (2009b). At montrealgazette.com readers weigh in. *The Gazette*, 16 June 2009, p. A4.
- Anonymous. (2009c). Divine liturgy to be held tomorrow. *Moncton Times & Transcript*, July 4 2009, p. E6.
- Anonymous. (2009d). Francophones have little reason to fret so. *The Gazette*, 23 June 2009, p. A22.
- Anonymous (2009e). Francophone Montrealers fear loss of their language. *Vancouver Sun*, 22 June 2009, p. B4.
- Anonymous (2009f). Welcome to Canada, Newbie. *Winnipeg Free Press*, 30 June 2009, p. A10.
- Anonymous. (2009g). Vigilance essential for French. *Toronto Star*, 1 July 2009, p. A17.
- Archer, D. (2009). Does frequency really matter? In D. Archer (Ed.), *What's in a word list?* (pp. 1-16). Farnham/Burlington: Ashgate.
- Aubé, J. (2009). Bilinguisme à Russell. *Le Droit*, 4 July 2009, p. 20.
- Aubry, J. (2009). Le plus grand vin canadien? *Le Devoir*, 19 June 2009, p. B6.
- Baker, P. (2004). Querying keywords: Questions of difference, frequency, and sense in keywords analysis. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 32 (4), 346-359.
- Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. London & New York: Continuum.
- Baker, P. (2009a). "The question is, how cruel is it?" Keywords, fox hunting and the House of Commons. In D. Archer (Ed.), *What's in a word list?* (pp. 125-136). Farnham/Burlington: Ashgate.
- Baker, P. (2009b). Introduction. In P. Baker (Ed.), *Contemporary corpus linguistics* (pp. 1-8). London: Continuum.

## References

- Baker, P. (2009c). Issues arising when teaching corpus-assisted (critical) discourse analysis. In L. Lombardo (Ed.), *Using corpora to learn about language and discourse* (pp. 63-98). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Baker, P. (2010). *Sociolinguistics and corpus linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Baker, P. and Ellece, S. (2011). *Key terms in discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., Khosravini, M., Krzyzanowski, M., McEnery, T. & Wodak, R. (2008). A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press. *Discourse & Society*, 19 (3), 273-306.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination* (Ed. Michael Holquist, Trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bauer, M. W. and Aarts, B. (2000). Corpus construction: A principle for qualitative data collection. In M. W. Bauer and G. Gaskell (Eds), *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound* (pp. 19-37). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Bayley P. and Bevitori, C. (2009). 'Just war' or just 'war': Arguments for doing the 'right thing'. In J. Morley and P. Bayley (eds.), *Corpus-assisted discourse studies on the Iraq conflict. Wording the war* (pp. 74 – 107). New York/London: Routledge.
- Beaty, B. and Sullivan, R. (2010). Introduction: Contexts of popular culture. In B. Beaty, D. Briton, G. Filax and R. Sullivan (Eds), *How Canadians communicate III: Contexts of Canadian popular culture* (pp. 11-34). Edmonton: Athabasca University Press.
- Beauchemin, J. (2006). La protection de la langue et de l'identité collective comme enjeu au sein de la conscience historique québécoise. In M. Pagé, and P. Georgeault (Eds), *Le Français, langue de la diversité québécoise: Une réflexion pluridisciplinaire* (pp. 131-151). Montréal: Québec Amérique.
- Beauchemin, Y. (2009). Rien n'est acquis. *La Presse*, 19 Jun 2009, p. A22.
- Bednarek, M. (2006). *Evaluation in media discourse. Analysis of a newspaper corpus*. London: Continuum.
- Bednarek, M. (2008). "An increasingly familiar tragedy": Evaluative collocation and conflation. *Functions of Language*, 15 (1), 7-34.

## References

- Behiels, M. D. and Hayday, M. (2011). General introduction. In M. D. Behiels and M. Hayday (Eds), *Contemporary Quebec: Selected readings and commentaries* (pp. 3-10). Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Bekerman, Z. (2002). The discourse of nation and culture: Its impact on Palestinian-Jewish encounters in Israel. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 26 (4), 409-427.
- Bélair-Cirino, M. (2009). Le français à Montréal: 90% des francophones sont inquiets. *Le Devoir*, 22 June 2009, p. A1.
- Béland, D. and Lecours, A. (2006). Sub-state nationalism and the welfare state: Québec and Canadian federalism. *Nations and Nationalism*, 12 (1), 77-96.
- Bell, A. (1991). *The language of news media*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bell, A. (1998). The discourse structure of news stories. In A. Bell and P. Garrett (Eds), *Approaches to media discourse* (pp. 64-104). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Belliveau, T. (2009). A family of heroes and hard workers. *Moncton Times & Transcript*. July 4, 2009, p. E4.
- Berard, F. (2009). Letter to an independantiste. *National Post*, June 20 2009, p. A23.
- Berber Sardinha, T. (1999). Using key words in text analysis: Practical aspects. *DIRECT Working Papers* 42. São Paulo and Liverpool. Retrieved from <http://www2.lael.pucsp.br/direct/DirectPapers42.pdf>.
- Berber Sardinha, T. (2000). Semantic prosodies in English and Portuguese: A contrastive study. *Cuadernos de Filologia Inglesa*, 9 (1), 93-109.
- Bernard, R. (1998). *Le Canada français: Entre mythe et utopie*. Ottawa: Le Nordir.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S. and Leech, G. (2002). *Longman student grammar of spoken and written English*. Essex: Longman.
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. London: Sage Publications.
- Blackledge, A. (2002a). The discursive construction of national identity in multilingual Britain. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 1 (1), 67-87.
- Blackledge, A. (2002b). "What sort of people can look at a chicken and think dofednod?": Language, ideology and nationalism in public discourse. *Multilingua*, 21 (2/3): 197-127.



## References

- Blackledge, A. (2005). *Discourse and power in a multilingual world*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Blackledge, A. and Pavlenko, A. (2002). Introduction. *Multilingua*, 21, 121-140.
- Blanchette, J. (2009). Deux longs mois à tuer. *Le Devoir*, 19 June 2009, p. B10.
- Blatchford, C. and Leeder, J. (2009). "Did we push her too much?" *The Globe and Mail*, 20 June 2009, p. A1.
- Blommaert, J. (Ed.) (1999a). *Language ideological debates*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Blommaert, J. (1999b). The debate is open. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language ideological debates* (pp. 1-38). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Blommaert, J. (1999c). The debate is closed. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language ideological debates* (pp. 425-438). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Blommaert, J. (2005a). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2005b). Situating language rights: English and Swahili in Tanzania revisited. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9 (3), 390-417.
- Blommaert, J. (2006). How legitimate is my language? *Target*, 18 (1), 163-176.
- Blommaert, J. (2007). Sociolinguistics and discourse analysis: Orders of indexicality and polycentricity. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 2 (2), 115-130.
- Blommaert, J. and Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 29, 447-466.
- Blommaert, J. and Verschueren, J. (1998). The role of language in European nationalist ideologies. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard and P. V. Kroskrity (Eds), *Language ideologies. Practice and theory* (pp. 189-210). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boberg, C. (2000). Geolinguistic diffusion and the U.S.-Canada border. *Language, Variation and Change*, 12, 1-24.
- Boberg, C. (2010). *The English language in Canada: Status, history and comparative analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boileau, F. (2011). Les héritiers de la Loi sur les langues officielles. In J. Jedwab and R. Landry (Eds), *Life after forty/ Après quarante ans: Official languages policy in*

## References

- Canada/ Les politiques de langue officielle au Canada* (pp. 121-130). Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Bolton, K. and Kachru, B. B. (Eds) (2006). *World Englishes*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Bondi, M. (2010). Perspectives on keywords and keyness: An introduction. In M. Bondi and M. Scott (Eds), *Keyness in texts* (pp. 1-20). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bouchard, C. (2002). *La langue et le nombril: Histoire d'une obsession québécoise*. Montreal: Fides.
- Bouchard, C. (2012). *Méchante langue*. Montreal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal.
- Bouchard, G. (1997). Ouvrir le cercle de la nation. Activer la cohésion sociale. Réflexion sur le Québec et sa diversité. *L'Action nationale*, 87 (4), 107-137.
- Boudreau, A. (2008). Le français parlé en Acadie: idéologies, représentations et pratiques. In *La langue française dans sa diversité*. Government of Quebec (pp. 59-74). Available: [http://www.spl.gouv.qc.ca/fileadmin/medias/pdf/actes\\_colloque\\_langue\\_francaise\\_2008.pdf](http://www.spl.gouv.qc.ca/fileadmin/medias/pdf/actes_colloque_langue_francaise_2008.pdf)
- Boudreau, A. and Dubois, L. (2007). *Français, acadien, acadjonne*: Competing discourses on language preservation along the shores of the Baie Sainte-Marie. In M. Heller and A. Duchêne (Eds), *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages* (pp. 99-120). London: Continuum.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). The economics of linguistics exchanges. *Social Sciences Information*, 16 (6), 645-668.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (J. Thompson, Ed., G. Raymond and M. Adamson, trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourhis, R. Y., Montrauli, E. and Amiot, C. E. (2007a). Language planning and French-English bilingual communication: Montreal field studies from 1977 to 1997. *International Journal of the sociology of language*, 185, 187-224.
- Bourhis, R. Y., Montreuil, A., Helly, D., and Jantzen, L. (2007b). Discrimination et linguicisme au Québec: Enquête sur la diversité ethnique au Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 39 (1-2), 31-49.

## References

- Boutet, J. and Heller, M. (2007). Enjeux sociaux de la sociolinguistique: Pour une sociolinguistique critique. *Langage et société*, 121-122: 305-318.
- Bouthillier, G. (1997). *L'obsession ethnique*. Outremont: Lanctôt.
- Breton, R. (1988). From ethnic to civic nationalism: English Canada and Quebec. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 11 (1): 85-102.
- Brice Heath, S. (1983). *Ways with words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, D. (2000) *Contemporary nationalism: Civic, ethnocultural and multicultural politics*. London: Routledge.
- Brown, I. (2009). Defined by undefinability: Works just fine. *The Globe and Mail*, 1 July 2009, p. A9.
- Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983) *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bucholtz, M. (2003). Sociolinguistic nostalgia and the authentication of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7 (4), 399-416.
- Bucholtz, M. and Hall, K. (2004). Language and identity. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 369-194). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Budach, G., Roy, S. and Heller, M. (2003). Community and commodity in French Ontario. *Language in Society* 32 (5), 603-627.
- Busch, B. (2006). Changing media spaces: The transformative power of heteroglossic practices. In C. Mar-Molinero and P. Stevenson (eds), *Language ideologies, policies and practices: Language and the future of Europe* (pp. 206-219). Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cameron, D. (2004). Out of the bottle: The social life of metalanguage. In A. Jaworski, N. Coupland and D. Galasiński (Eds), *Metalanguage: Social and ideological perspectives* (pp. 310-322). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. (2006). City of Ottawa sued over bilingualism bylaw. *CBC news*. 19 May 2006. Available: <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/story/2006/05/19/language-fri.html>.
- Canadian Heritage. (2009). *National Anthem: O Canada*. Accessed Feb 1, 2011: <http://www.pch.gc.ca/pgm/ceem-cced/symbbl/anthem-eng.cfm>.

## References

- Canadian Newspaper Association. (2008). *The scoop on daily newspapers in Canada*. Retrieved from <http://www.newspaperscanada.ca/daily-newspaper-paid-circulation-data>.
- Canadian Newspaper Association. (2009). *Circulation data report*. Retrieved from [http://www.newspaperscanada.ca/sites/default/files/2009CirculationDataReport\\_3.pdf](http://www.newspaperscanada.ca/sites/default/files/2009CirculationDataReport_3.pdf)
- Canadian Newspaper Association. (2010). *About newspapers*. Retrieved from <http://www.newspaperscanada.ca/daily-newspaper-paid-circulation-data>
- Canadian Tourism Commission. (2011a). *Canada with a French accent*. Retrieved from <http://uk.canada.travel/francophones>
- Cardinal, L. (2004). The limits of bilingualism in Canada. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 10 (1), 79-103.
- Cardinal, L. (2005). The ideological limits of linguistic diversity in Canada. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 26 (6), 481-495.
- Cardinal, L. (2008). Linguistic peace: A time to take stock. *Inroads*, 23, 62-70.
- Casselman, B. (2006). *Canadian words and sayings*. Toronto: McArthur & Company.
- Castonguay, C. (1979). Why hide the facts? The federalist approach to the language crisis in Canada. *Canadian Public Policy*, 5 (1), 4-15.
- Castonguay, C. (1999). Getting the facts straight on French: Reflections following the 1996 Census. *Inroads*, 8, 59-78.
- Castonguay, C. (2002a). Assimilation linguistique et remplacement des générations francophones et anglophones au Québec et au Canada. *Recherches sociographiques*, 43 (1), 149-182.
- Castonguay, C. (2002b). Nation building and anglicization in Canada's capital region. *Inroads*, 11, 72-87.
- Castonguay, C. (2010). La fin du libre-échange. *L'aut'journal*, 291, July 2010. Available: <http://archives.lautjournal.info/autjourarchives.asp?article=3804&noj=291>.
- Catenaccio, P., Cotter, C., de Smedt, M., Garzone, G., Jacobs, G., Macgilchrist, F., Lams, L., Perrin, D., Richardson, J. E., van Hout, T. and van Praet, E. (2011). Towards a linguistics of news production. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1843-1852.

## References

- Channell, J. (2000). Corpus-based analysis of evaluative lexis. In S. Hunston and G. Thompson (Eds), *Evaluation in Text. Authorial stance and the construction of discourse* (pp. 38-55). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Charland, M. (1986). Technological nationalism. *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory*, 10 (1-2), 196-220.
- Charland, M. (1987). Constitutive rhetoric: The case of the *peuple québécois*. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73, 133-150.
- Chronicle Herald, The. (2010) *Our History*. Retrieved from <http://thechronicleherald.ca/services/aboutus.html>.
- Cloutier, M. (2009). Minuit, le soir en français de France. *La Presse*, 3 July 2009, Arts et spectacles, p. 10.
- Cohen, A. (2009). A country in need of a smart brand. *Ottawa Citizen*, June 23 2009, p. A14.
- Collins, R. (2004). Rituals of Solidarity and Security in the Wake of Terrorist Attack. *Sociological Theory*, 22 (1), 53-87.
- Conboy, M. (2007). *The language of the news*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Conlogue, R. (2002). *Impossible nation: The longing for homeland in Canada and Quebec*. Toronto: The Mercury Press.
- Conrad, S. and Biber, D. (2000). Adverbial marking of stance in speech and writing. In S. Hunston and G. Thompson (Eds), *Evaluation in text. Authorial stance and the construction of discourse* (pp. 56-73). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Conrick, M. and Regan, V. (2007). *French in Canada: Language issues*. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Corbeil, J. P. (2011). L'information démolinguistique et le recensement canadien. In J. Jedwab and R. Landry (Eds), *Life after forty/ Après quarante ans: Official languages policy in Canada/ Les politiques de langue officielle au Canada* (pp. 29-52). Kingston: McGill-Kingston University Press.
- Corbella, L. (2009). No surprise burka-clad women didn't write in. *Calgary Herald*, 4 July 2009, p. A8.
- Cornellier, L. (2009). Pierre Falardeau et son Elvis. *Le Devoir*, 27 June 2009, p. E5.

## References

- Cotter, C. (2001). Discourse and media. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen and H. E. Hamilton (Eds), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 416-436). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Cotter, C. (2010). *News talk: Investigating the language of journalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cotterill, J. (2001). Domestic discord, rocky relationships: Semantic prosodies in representations of marital violence in the O.J. Simpson trial. *Discourse & Society*, 12 (3), 291-312.
- Coupland, N. (2003). Sociolinguistic authenticities. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7 (4): 417-31.
- Coupland, N. and Jaworski, A. (2004). Sociolinguistic perspectives on metalanguage: Reflexivity, evaluation and ideology. In A. Jaworski, N. Coupland and D. Galasiński (Eds), *Metalanguage: Social and ideological perspectives* (pp. 15-52). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Croteau, M. (2009). Réactions divergentes chez les Innus. *La Presse*, 4 July 2009, p. A16.
- Dam-Jensen, H. and Korning Zethsen, K. (2008) Translator awareness of semantic prosodies. *Target*, 20 (2), 201-221.
- da Silva, E., McLaughlin, M. and Richards, M. (2007). Bilingualism and the globalized new economy: The commodification of language and identity. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism: A social approach* (pp. 183-206). New York: Palgrave.
- David, M. (2009). La résignation tranquille. *Le Devoir*, 30 June 2009, p. A3.
- Davies, M. (2009). Word frequency in context: Alternative architectures for examining related words, register variation and historical change. In D. Archer (Ed.), *What's in a word list?* (pp. 53-68). Farnham/Burlington: Ashgate.
- De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M. and Wodak, R. (1999). The discursive construction of national identities. *Discourse & Society*, 10 (2), 149-173.
- Delaney, G. (2009). New Canadians sworn in. *The Chronicle-Herald*, 17 June 2009, p. A12.
- Delveroudi, R. and Moschonas, S. A. (2003). Le purisme de la langue et la langue du purism. *Philologie im Netz*, 24, 1-23.
- De Mer, E. (2008). *Les différences de traitement des journalistes Canadiens anglais et Québécois francophones: Le cas de la mission militaire canadienne en Afghanistan*.

## References

- Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Ottawa. Retrieved from <http://www.crej.ca/demer.pdf>.
- Denley, R. (2009). When numbers drop, enlist some francophoneys; The Ontario government is using dubious tactics to boost its francophone minority problem. *The Ottawa Citizen*, 21 June 2009, p. A3.
- Desbiens, C. (2004). Producing North and South: A political geography of hydro development in Québec. *Canadian Geographer*, 48 (2), 101-118.
- de Tracy, A. L. C. Destutt. (1826–7) *Elemens d'ideologie*. A. Wahlen: Brussels.
- DiFrancesco, D. A. and Young, N. (2010). Seeing climate change: The visual construction of global warming in Canadian national print media. *Cultural Geographies*, 18 (4), 517-536.
- DiGiacomo, S. M. (1999). Language ideological debates in an Olympic city: Barcelona 1992-1996. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language ideological debates* (pp. 105-142). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dolbec, M. (2009). Le Clézio à la défense de La Romaine. *Le Devoir*, 2 July 2009, p. A4.
- Dubuc, P. (2009). La victoire des maîtres chanteurs. *Le Devoir*, 22 June 2009, p. A7.
- Dufour, C. (2008). *Les Québécois et l'anglais: Le retour du mouton*. Mariville: Les Éditeurs réunis.
- Duchêne, A. and Heller, M. (Eds) (2007). *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages*. London: Continuum.
- Duranti, A. (2009). *Linguistic anthropology: A reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Eagleton, T. (2007). *Ideology. An introduction*. New and updated edition. London: Verso.
- Eckert, P. (2000). *Language Variation as Social Practice: The Linguistic Construction of Identity in Belten High*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Eckert, P. (2008). Variation and the indexical field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12 (4), 453-476.
- Edwards, J. (2009). *Language and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## References

- Eissenstat, H. (2005). Metaphors of race and discourse of nation: Racial theory and state nationalism in the first decades of the Turkish Republic. In R. Spickard (Ed.), *Race and nation: Ethnic systems in the modern world* (pp. 239-256). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Elkin, F. (1975). Communications media and identity formation in Canada. In B. D. Singer (Ed.), *Communications in Canadian society*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. (pp. 229-243). Vancouver: Copp Clark Publishing.
- Eloy, Jean-Michel. (1998). Légitimité et légitisme linguistique: Questions théoriques et pratiques d'idéologie linguistique. *Revue québécoise de linguistique*, 26 (2), 43-54.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Essex: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1998). Political discourse in the media: An analytical framework. In A. Bell and P. Garrett (Eds), *Approaches to media discourse* (pp. 142-162). Oxford: Blackwell
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis. The critical study of language*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. London: Pearson.
- Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction*. (pp. 258-284). London: Sage.
- Fee, M. (2007). Introduction to the first edition. In M. Fee and J. McAlpine (Eds), *Guide to Canadian English usage*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. (pp.x-xvii). Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Ferenczy, M. (2009). Broader opportunities. *Ottawa Citizen*, 3 July 2009, p. A9.
- Fletcher, F. J. (1998). Media and political identity: Canada and Quebec in the era of globalization. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 23 (3). Retrieved from <http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/1049/955>
- Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the text: A post-structuralist reader* (pp. 51-78). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Foucault, M. (2006 [1972]). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Oxon: Gallimard.
- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. London: Routledge.



## References

- Fowler, R. (2003 [1996]). On critical linguistics. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard and M. Coulthard (Eds), *Readings in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 3-14). London: Routledge.
- Fox, J. E. and Miller-Idriss, C. (2008). Everyday nationhood. *Ethnicities*, 8 (4), 536-576.
- Fralic, S. (2009). O Canada, our home and disparate land. *Vancouver Sun*, 30 June 2009, p. A1.
- Francard, M. (1998). La légitimité linguistique passe-t-elle par la reconnaissance d'une variété "nationale"? Le cas de la communauté française de Wallonie-Bruxelles. *Revue québécoise de linguistique*, 26 (2), 13-23.
- Frank, J. (1990). You call that a rhetorical question? Forms and functions of rhetorical questions in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 723-738.
- Fraser, G. (2003). Organisons-nous d'abord. In S. Langlois and J. L. Roy (Eds), *Briser les solitudes: Les francophonies canadiennes et québécoise* (pp. 123-127). Québec: Nota bene.
- Fraser, G. (2006). *Sorry, I don't speak French. Confronting the Canadian crisis that won't go away*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Fraser, G. (2007). *The role of the media in bridging the French-English divide: Remarks to the Ottawa chapter of the Canadian Association of Journalists*. Ottawa, January 24, 2007. Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages. Retrieved from [http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/html/speeches\\_discours\\_24012007\\_e.php](http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/html/speeches_discours_24012007_e.php).
- Freake, R., Gentil, G. and Sheyholislami, J. (2011). A bilingual corpus-assisted discourse study of the construction of nationhood and belonging in Quebec. *Discourse & Society*, 22 (2), 21-47.
- Freeden, M. (2003). *Ideology. A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Futurebrand. (2010). *2010 Country brand index: Executive summary*. Retrieved from: [http://www.futurebrand.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CBI\\_BBC\\_2010\\_execsummary.pdf](http://www.futurebrand.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CBI_BBC_2010_execsummary.pdf).
- Gaboury, P. (2009). Rapport du comité des langues officielles. Les universités doivent former plus de diplômés bilingues. *Le Droit*, 25 June 2009, p. 10.
- Gabrielatos, C. (2007). Selecting query terms to build a specialised corpus from a restricted-access database. *ICAME Journal*, 31, 5-43.

## References

- Gabrielatos, C. and Marchi, A. (2011). *Keyness: Matching metrics to definitions*. In: Theoretical-methodological challenges in corpus approaches to discourse studies - and some ways of addressing them. University of Portsmouth. Available: <http://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/51449/>.
- Gagnon, C. (2006). Language plurality as power struggle, or: Translating politics in Canada. *Target*, 18 (1): 69-90.
- Gagnon, S. (2003). La construction discursive du concept de la souveraineté dans les médias canadiens lors du referendum de 1995. *Revue québécoise de linguistique*, 32 (2): 97-116.
- Gal, S. (1998). Multiplicity and contention among language ideologies: A commentary. In B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard and P. V. Kroskrity (Eds), *Language ideologies. Practice and theory* (pp. 317-332). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gal, S. and Irvine, J. T. (1995). The boundaries of languages and disciplines: How ideologies construct difference. *Social Research*, 62 (4), 967-1001.
- Gardner, R. C. and Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13 (4), 266-273.
- Garrett, P. and Bell, A. (1998). Media and discourse: A critical overview. In A. Bell and P. Garrett (Eds), *Approaches to media discourse*, (pp. 1-20). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Garvin, P. (1993). A conceptual framework for the study of language standardization. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 100/101, 37-54.
- Gee, J. P. (2008). *Social linguistics and literacies. Ideology in discourses*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. London: Routledge.
- Gentil, G., Bigras, J., and O'Connor, M. (2009). Le maintien du français chez les fonctionnaires fédéraux: Impact d'un programme de formation linguistique. *Canadian Modern Language Review/Revue canadienne des langues modernes*, 65 (5), 841-867.
- Gentil, G., Bigras, J., and O'Connor, M. (2011). Achieving bilingualism in the Canadian federal workplace: Does language training matter? In B. Apfelbaum and B. Meyer (Eds), *Multilingualism at work: From policies to practices in public, medical and business settings* (pp. 81-104). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

## References

- Ghosh, R. (2004). Public education and multicultural policy in Canada: The special case of Quebec. *International Review of Education*, 50 (5-6), 543-566.
- Giampapa, F. (2001). Hyphenated identities: Italian-Canadian youth and the negotiation of ethnic identities in Toronto. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5 (3), 279-315.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Goffman, E. (1976). Replies and responses. *Language in Society*, 5, 257-313.
- Goodwin, C. & Duranti, A. (1992). Rethinking context: An introduction. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds), *Rethinking context* (pp. 1-42). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. (Q. Hoare and G. Nowell, Ed., trans.). New York: International Publishers.
- Greaves, C. (2009). *ConcGram 1.0. A phraseological search engine*. Available from <http://www.edict.com.hk/pub/concgram/>.
- Greenberg, J. and Hier, S. (2001). Crisis, mobilization and collective problematization: "Illegal" Chinese migrants and the Canadian news media. *Journalism Studies*, 2 (4): 563-583.
- Grescoe, T. (2001). *Sacre blues: An unsentimental journey through Quebec*. Toronto: Macfarlane, Walter & Ross.
- Gries, S. T. (2008). Dispersions and adjusted frequencies in corpora. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 13 (4), 403-437.
- Gumperz, J. (2001). Interactional sociolinguistics. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, and H. E. Hamilton (Eds), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 213-228). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Halford, P. W., van den Hoven, A., Romanow, W. I., and Soderlund, W.C. (1983). A media tale of two cities: Quebec referendum coverage in Montreal and Toronto. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 9 (4), 1-31.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Matthiessen, C. (2004) *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.

## References

- Haque, E. (2012). *Multiculturalism within a bilingual framework: language, race, and belonging in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Harding, R. (2006). Historical representations of Aboriginal people in the Canadian news media. *Discourse & Society*, 17 (2), 205-35.
- Harré, R. (2001). The discursive turn in social psychology. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen and H. E. Hamilton (Eds), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 688-706). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Harris, R. and Rampton, B. (2003). Introduction. In R. Harris and B. Rampton (Eds), *The language, ethnicity and race reader* (pp. 1-14). London: Routledge.
- Havrankova, J. (2009). Apprendre le français, un privilège. *Le Devoir*, 22 June 2009, p.A6.
- Hawkes, D. (2003). *Ideology*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. New York: Routledge.
- Hayday, M. (2005) *Bilingual today, united tomorrow: Official languages in education and Canadian federalism*. Montreal/Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Hayday, M. (2009) Variety show as national identity: CBC television and Dominion Day Celebrations, 1958-1980. In G. Allen and D. J. Robinson (Eds), *Communicating in Canada's past: Essays in media history* (pp. 168-192). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hayday, M. (2010) Fireworks, folk-dancing and fostering a national identity: The politics of Canada Day. *The Canadian Historical Review*, 91 (2), 287-314.
- Heller, M. (1995). Language choice, social institution, and symbolic domination. *Language in Society*, 24 (3), 373-405.
- Heller, M. (1999a). Heated language in a cold climate. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language ideological debates* (pp. 143-170). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heller, M. (1999b). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. London: Longman.
- Heller, M. (1999c). Alternative ideologies of la francophonie. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 3 (3), 336-359.
- Heller, M. (2002). *Éléments d'une sociolinguistique critique*. Paris: Didier.

## References

- Heller, M. (2003a). Actors and discourses in the construction of hegemony. *Pragmatics*, 13 (1), 11-31.
- Heller, M. (2003b). Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7 (4), 473-492.
- Heller, M. (2003c). *Crosswords: Language, education and ethnicity in French Ontario*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heller, M. (2007). The future of 'bilingualism'. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Bilingualism: A social approach* (pp. 340-345). New York: Palgrave.
- Heller, M. (2011). *Paths to post-nationalism. A critical ethnography of language and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heller, M. and Duchêne, A. (2007). Discourses of endangerment: Sociolinguistics, globalization and social order. In A. Duchêne and M. Heller (Eds), *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages* (pp. 1-13). London: Continuum.
- Heller, M. and Labrie, N. (2003). Langue, pouvoir et identité: Une étude de cas, une approche théorique, une méthodologie. In M. Heller and N. Labrie (Eds), *Discours et identités: La francité canadienne entre modernités et mondialisation* (pp. 9-39). Rennes: Proximités: Editions Modulaires Européennes (E.M.E).
- Hill, J. (1995a). Junk Spanish, covert racism, and the (leaky) boundary between public and private spheres. *Pragmatics*, 5 (2), 197-212.
- Hill, J. (1995b). Mock Spanish: A site for the indexical reproduction of racism in American English. *Language and culture symposium, Binghamton University, New York*. Available: <http://language-culture.binghamton.edu/symposia/2/part1/index.html>
- Hillmer, N. Chapnick, A. (2007). Introduction: An abundance of nationalisms. In N. Hillmer and A. Chapnick (Eds), *Canadas of the mind: The making and unmaking of Canadian nationalisms in the twentieth century* (pp. 3-13). Montreal/Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Hoey, M. (2006). Language as choice: What is chosen? In G. Thompson and S. Hunston (Eds), *System and corpus: Exploring connections* (pp. 37-54). London: Equinox.

## References

- Hoey, M. (2007). Lexical priming and literary creativity. In M. Hoey, M. Mahlberg, M. Stubbs and W. Teubert (Eds), *Text, discourse and corpora: Theory and Analysis* (pp. 7-30). London: Continuum.
- Hoey, M. (2011). Lexical priming and translation. In A. Kruger, K. Wallmach and J. Munday (Eds), *Corpus-based translation studies: Research and applications* (pp. 153-168). London: Continuum.
- Horner, K. (2007). Global challenges to nationalist ideologies: Language and education in the Luxembourg press. In S. Johnson and A. Ensslin (Eds), *Language in the media: Representations, identities, ideologies* (pp. 130-148). London: Continuum.
- Horrocks, D. (2009). Landmark decision; Bill 104 ruling to shape future of English schools. *The Gazette*, 17 June 2009, p. A21.
- Hunston, S. (2007). Semantic prosody revisited. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 12 (2), 249-268.
- Hunston, S. and Thompson, G. (2006). System and corpus: Two traditions with a common ground. In G. Thompson and S. Hunston (Eds), *System and corpus: Exploring connections* (pp. 1-14). London: Equinox.
- Howlett, K. (2009). French schools will be available to more students. *The Globe and Mail*, 17 June 2009, p. A12.
- Hymes, D. (1997 [1972]). The scope of sociolinguistics. In N. Coupland and A. Jaworski (Eds), *Sociolinguistics: A reader and coursebook*. Macmillan.
- Igartua, J. E. (2006). *The other quiet revolution: National identities in English Canada, 1945-71*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Ignatieff, M. (1994). *Blood and belonging: Journeys into the new nationalism*. London: Vintage.
- Ignatieff, M. (2000). *The rights revolution*. Toronto: House of Anasi Press Limited.
- Ignatieff, M. (2009). *True patriot love: Four generations in search of Canada*. London: Penguin.
- Influence Communication (2009a). *2009 Report. Canadian news review*. Retrieved from <http://www.influencecommunication.com/en/bilan-ca-2009.html>.

## References

- Influence Communication (2009b). *Bilan 2009. État de la nouvelle*. Retrieved from <http://www.influencecommunication.com/en/bilan-qc-2009.html>.
- Innis, H. R. (1973) *Bilingualism and Biculturalism. An abridged version of the Royal Commission Report*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Innis, H. (1993). Conclusion from The Fur Trade in Canada. In D. Taras, B. Rasporich, and E. Mandel (Eds.), *A Passion for Identity* (pp. 18-9). Scarborough: Nelson Canada.
- Irvine, J. T. (1998). Ideologies of honorific language. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard and P. V. Kroskrity (Eds), *Language ideologies. Practice and theory* (pp. 51-67). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jaffe, A. (1999). Locating power: Corsican translators and their critics. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language ideological debates* (pp. 39-66). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jaffe, A. (2007a). Corsican on the airwaves: Media discourse in a context of minority language shift. In S. Johnson and A. Ensslin (Eds.), *Language in the media: Representations, identities, ideologies* (pp. 149-172). London: Continuum.
- Jaffe, A. (2007b). Discourses of endangerment: Contexts and consequences of essentializing discourses. In M. Heller and A. Duchêne (Eds), *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages* (pp. 57-75). London: Continuum.
- Jaspers, J. and Verschueren, J. (2011). Multilingual structures and agencies. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1157-1160.
- Jaworski, A., Coupland, N. and Galasiński, D. (Eds) (2004a). *Metalanguage: Social and ideological perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jaworski, A. Coupland, N. and Galasiński, D. (2004b). Metalanguage: Why now? In A. Jaworski, N. Coupland and D. Galasiński (Eds), *Metalanguage: Social and ideological perspectives* (pp. 3-10). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jaworski, A., Thurlow, C., Lawson, S. and Ylanne-McEwen, V. (2003). The uses and representations of local languages in tourist destinations: A view from British TV holiday programmes. *Language Awareness*, 12 (1), 5-29.
- Jedwab, J. (2011). Langue – Le français en déclin, vraiment ? *Le Devoir*, 21 October 2011. Available: <http://www.ledevoir.com/societe/actualites-en-societe/334086/langue-le-francais-en-declin-vraiment>.

## References

- Jedwab, J. and Landry, R. (Eds) (2011). *Life after forty/ Après quarante ans: Official languages policy in Canada/ Les politiques de langue officielle au Canada*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Jensen, J. (2000). Pluralist modernity in Quebec: From nationality to citizenship. In M. Venne (Ed.), *Vive Quebec!: New thinking and new approaches to the Quebec nation* [Trans.: R. Chodos and L. Blair] (pp. 113-118). Toronto: James Lorimer & Company Ltd., Publishers.
- Johansson, S. (2007). *Seeing through multilingual corpora: On the use of corpora in contrastive studies*. Amsterdam: The Netherlands.
- Johnson, S. and Ensslin, A. (2006). Language in the news: Some reflections on keyword analysis using WordSmith Tools and the BNC. *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics, 11*, 96-109.
- Johnson, S. and Ensslin, A. (2007). Language in the media: Theory and practice. In S. Johnson and A. Ensslin (Eds), *Language in the media: Representations, identities, ideologies* (pp. 3-23). London: Continuum.
- Kariel, Herbert G. and Rosenvall, Lynn A. (1983). Cultural affinity displayed in Canadian daily newspapers. *Journalism Quarterly, 60* (3), 431-36.
- Karim, K. H. (1993). Construction, deconstructions, and reconstructions: Competing Canadian discourses on ethnocultural terminology. *Canadian Journal of Communication, 18* (2). Retrieved from <http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/viewArticle/744/650>.
- Karim, K. H. (2008). Press, public sphere, and pluralism: Multiculturalism debates in Canadian English-language newspapers. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 40* (1), 57-78.
- Kasuya, K. (2001). Discourses of linguistic dominance: A historical consideration of French language ideology. *International Review of Education, 47* (3-4), 235-251.
- Kelly-Holmes, H. and Milani, T. M. (2011). Thematising multilingualism in the media. *Journal of Language and Politics, 10* (4), 467-489.
- Kemppanen, H. (2004). Keywords and ideology in translated history texts: A corpus-based analysis. *Across Languages and Cultures, 5* (1), 89-106.



## References

- Kilgarriff, A. (2009). Simple maths for keywords. *Proceedings of the corpus linguistics conference 2009, University of Liverpool, UK*. Retrieved from <http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/publications/CL2009/>.
- King, R. and Wicks, J. (2009). "Aren't we proud of our language?" Authenticity, commodification, and the Nissan Bonavista television commercial. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 37 (3): 262-283.
- Kirk, J. M. (2009). Word frequency use or misuse? In D. Archer (Ed.), *What's in a word list?* (pp. 17-34). Farnham/Burlington: Ashgate.
- Korning Zethsen, K. (2004). Latin-based terms. True or false friends? *Target*, 16 (1), 125-142.
- Kuhn, J. and Lick, E. (2009). Advertising to Canada's official language groups: A comparative critical discourse analysis. *Semiotica*, 176 (1/4): 165-176.
- Kulyk, V. (2010). Ideologies of language use in post-Soviet Ukrainian media. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 201 (1), 79-104.
- Kuo, S. and Nakamura, M. (2005). Translation or transformation? A case study of language and ideology in the Taiwanese press. *Discourse & Society*, 16 (3), 393-417.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (1998). *Finding our way: Rethinking ethnocultural relations in Canada*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (2004). Marketing Canadian pluralism in the international arena. *International Journal*, 59 (4), 829-52.
- Labelle, M. and Salée, D. (2001). Immigrant and minority representations of citizenship in Quebec. In T. A. Aleinikoff and D. Klusmeyer (Eds), *Citizenship today* (pp. 278-315). Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Lakoff, R. T. (2001). *The language war*. Berkeley/L.A.: University of California Press.
- Landry, R. (2011). Loi sur les langues officielles et démographie: Comment les droits linguistiques peuvent-ils influencer la vitalité d'une minorité? In J. Jedwab and R. Landry (Eds), *Life after forty/ Après quarante ans: Official languages policy in*

## References

- Canada/ *Les politiques de langue officielle au Canada* (pp. 53-72). Kingston: McGill-Kingston University Press.
- Landry, N. and Lang, N. (2001). *Histoire de l'Acadie*. Quebec: Septentrion.
- La Presse Canadienne (2012). La SRC serait trop centrée sur le Québec. *Le Devoir*, 15 October 2012. Available: [http://www.ledevoir.com/societe/medias/361421/la-src-serait-trop-centree-sur-le-quebec?utm\\_source=infolettre-2012-10-15](http://www.ledevoir.com/societe/medias/361421/la-src-serait-trop-centree-sur-le-quebec?utm_source=infolettre-2012-10-15).
- Laroche, A. (2009). Insulting words. *National Post*, 26 June 2009, p. A17.
- Laurier, M. D. (2005). La maîtrise du Français dans la formation des immigrants adultes. In A. Stefanescu and Pierre Georgeault (Eds), *Le Français au Québec: Nouveaux défis* (pp. 569-588). Quebec: Conseil supérieur de la langue française.
- Laviosa, S. (1997). How comparable can 'comparable corpora' be? *Target*, 9 (2), 289-319.
- Lawrence, G. (2009). De l'évanescence à l'efferevescence. *Le Devoir*, 20 June 2009, p.D1.
- Le Bouthillier, C. (2009). Le Grand Caraquet – suite. *L'Acadie Nouvelle*, 25 June 2009, p. 13.
- Lee, D. Y. W. (2008). Corpora and discourse analysis: New ways of doing old things. In V. K. Bhatia, J. Flowerdew & R. H. Jones (Eds), *Advances in discourse studies* (pp. 86-99). London & New York: Routledge.
- Lefebvre, J. M. (2009). La fête de qui? *Le Devoir*, 20 June 2009, p. C4.
- Leitner, G. (1997). The sociolinguistics of communication media. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 187-204). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Le Page, R. B. and Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Létourneau, J. (2002). Langue et identité au Québec aujourd'hui. Enjeux, défis, possibilités. *Globe: Revue internationale d'études québécoises*, 5 (2), 79-110.
- Lévesque, R. (1997). *René Lévesque: Mot à mot*. (Citations colligées par Rémi Maillard). Montreal: Les Éditions internationaux Alain Stanké.
- Levine, M. V. (1997). *La reconquête de Montréal*. (Trans. M. Poirier). Montreal: VLB Éditeur.
- Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (1996). Cross-linguistic and language-specific aspects of semantic prosody. *Language Sciences*, 18 (1-2), 153-178.

## References

- Lilles, J. (2000) The myth of Canadian English. *English Today*, 16 (2), 3-10.
- Lisée, J. F. (2007). *Nous*. Montreal: Boréal.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2005). Globalisation and national communities of communication. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 29 (2), 109-133.
- Lockerbie, I. (2005). The debate on l'aménagement du français in Québec. In I. Lockerbie, I. Molnaro, K. Larose and L. Oakes (Eds), *French as the common language in Québec: History, debates and positions* (pp. 15-65). Québec: Éditions nota bene.
- Lodge, R. A. (1993). *French, from dialect to standard*. London: Routledge.
- Louw, B. (1993). Irony in the text or insincerity in the writer? The diagnostic potential of semantic prosodies. In M. Baker, G. Francis and E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds), *Text and technology: In honour of John Sinclair*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lüdi, G. (1992). French as a pluricentric language. In M. Clyne (ed.) *Pluricentric languages: Differing norms in different nations* (pp. 149-78). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lussier, M. A. (2009a). De père en flic. *La Presse*, 4 July 2009, p. Cinema 2.
- Lussier, M. A. (2009b). L'appartement de Marc-André. *La Presse*, 5 June 2009, Arts et spectacles, p. 5.
- Machin, D. and van Leeuwen, T. (2007). *Global media discourse: a critical introduction*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Mackey, E. (2001). *The house of difference: Cultural politics and national identity in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- MacLennan, H. (1945). *Two solitudes*. Kingston/Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- MacMillan, C. M. (1998) *The practice of language rights in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Manca, E. (2008). From phraseology to culture: Qualifying adjectives in the language of tourism. In U. Römer and R. Schulze (Eds), *Patterns, meaningful units and specialized discourses* (pp. 368-385). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Marissal, V. (2009). Le Canada qu'on aime. *La Presse*, 27 June 2009, Vacances-Voyages, p. 9.

## References

- Martel, M.(1997) *Le deuil d'un pays imaginé. Rêves, luttés et dérouté du Canada français*. Ottawa: Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa.
- Martel, M. (1998). *French Canada: An account of its creation and break-up, 1850-1967*. Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association.
- Martin, J. R. (2004). Grammatical structure: What do we mean? In C. Coffin, A. Hewings and K. O'Halloran (Eds), *Applying English grammar: Functional and corpus approaches* (pp. 57-76). London: Arnold Publishers.
- Martin, P. (2007a). Malentendu ou supercherie? *La Presse*, 12 January 2007.
- Martin, P. (2007b). Quebec, through the looking glass. *The Star*, 8 January 2007.
- Mautner, G. (2009). Corpora and critical discourse analysis. In P. Baker (Ed.), *Contemporary corpus linguistics* (pp. 32-46). London: Continuum.
- May, S. (2008). *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language*. New York: Routledge.
- Mazerolle, B. (2009). The quintessential Canadian. *Moncton Times & Transcript*, 25 June, 2009, p. A1.
- McAndrew, M. (2003). Immigration and diversity: Some policy issues confronting the Quebec school system. *Policy Options* (pp. 59-62). October 2003.
- McAndrew, M. (2010). The Muslim community and education in Quebec: Controversies and mutual adaptation. *International Journal of Migration & Integration*, 11 (1), 41-58.
- McCrone, D. and McPherson, G. (Eds). (2009). *National days: Constructing and mobilising national identity*. Houndsmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- McDevitt, M. (2009). For all the world to see. *The Record*, 16 June 2009, p. 6.
- McEney, T. and A. Salama. 2011. 'De/Victimizing Christian Copts in/outside contemporary Egypt: A critical corpus-based study'. Paper presented at the *International Corpus Linguistics Conference*, Birmingham, UK.
- McEney, T. and Xiao, R. (2007). Parallel and comparable corpora: What is happening? In G.Anderman and M. Rogers (Eds), *Incorporating corpora: The linguist and the translator* (pp. 18-31). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

## References

- McRoberts, K. (1991). *English Canada and Quebec: Avoiding the issue*. Unpublished text. Available:  
[http://www.broadbandreports.com/r0/download/1610408~bc87067ede526673a341f43162712fc7/rl\\_mcroberts.pdf](http://www.broadbandreports.com/r0/download/1610408~bc87067ede526673a341f43162712fc7/rl_mcroberts.pdf).
- McRoberts, K. (1997). *Misconceiving Canada: The struggle for national unity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meney, L. (2010). *Main basse sur la langue: Ideologie et interventionnisme linguistique au Québec*. Montréal: Liber.
- Meurice, P. (2009). Pauvres touristes. *La Presse*, 7 July 2009, p. A13.
- Milani, T. (2007a). A language ideology in print: The case of Sweden. In S. Johnson and A. Ensslin (Eds), *Language in the media: Representations, identities, ideologies* (pp. 111-129). London: Continuum.
- Milani, T. (2007b). Voices of endangerment: A language ideological debate on the Swedish language. In M. Heller and A. Duchêne (Eds), *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages* (pp. 169-196). London: Continuum.
- Milani, T. M. and Johnson, S. (2008). CDA and language ideology: Towards a reflexive approach to discourse data. In: Ingo H. Warnke and Juergen Spitzmuller (eds), *Methoden der Diskurslinguistik Sprachwissenschaftliche Zugaenge zur transtextuellen Ebene*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 361-384.
- Milizia, D. and Spinzi, C. (2008). The 'terroridiom' principle between spoken and written discourse. In U. Römer and R. Schulze (Eds), *Patterns, meaningful units and specialized discourses* (pp. 322–350). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Milroy, J. (2001). Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 5/4, 530-555.
- Milroy, L. and Gordon, M. (2003). *Sociolinguistics: Method of interpretation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Moïse, C. (2007). Protecting French: The view from France. In M. Heller and A. Duchêne (Eds), *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages* (pp. 216-241). London: Continuum.

## References

- Molinaro, I. (2005). Context and integration: The allophone communities in Québec. In I. Lockerbie, I. Molnaro, K. Larose and L. Oakes (Eds), *French as the common language in Québec: History, debates and positions* (pp. 67-116). Québec: Éditions Nota bene.
- Moore, D. (2009). Threat to whom? *The Gazette*, 17 June 2009, p. a20.
- Morley, J. (2009). Introduction: A description of *CorDis*. In J. Morley and P. Bayley (Eds), *Corpus-assisted discourse studies on the Iraq conflict: Wording the war* (pp. 1-12). New York: Routledge.
- Morley, J. and Bayley, P. (Eds) (2009). *Corpus-assisted discourse studies on the Iraq conflict*. New York: Routledge.
- Morley, J. and Partington, A. (2009). A few *Frequently Asked Questions* about semantic – or evaluative – prosody. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 14 (2): 139-158.
- Morris, M. A. (Ed.) (2010). *Canadian language policies in comparative perspective*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Morson, G. and Emerson, C. (1990). *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a prosaics*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Munday, J. (2011). Looming large: A cross-linguistic analysis of semantic prosodies in comparable reference corpora. In A. Kruger and K. Wallmach (Eds), *Corpus-based translation studies: Research and applications* (pp. 169-186). Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Newspaper Audience Databank Inc. (2011). *2011 Study*. Available: [http://www.nadbank.com/en/system/files/2011OverviewofResults%28EN%29\\_0.pdf](http://www.nadbank.com/en/system/files/2011OverviewofResults%28EN%29_0.pdf).
- Nelson, M. (2006). Semantic associations in Business English: A corpus-based analysis. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25, 217-234.
- Nesbitt-Larking, P. W. (2007). *Politics, society, and the media*. New York: Broadview Press.
- Newman, J. and Columbus, G. (2010). *The ICE-Canada corpus. Version 1*. Retrieved from <http://ice-corpora.net/ice/download.htm>.
- Nolen, S. (2009). India's gay community fights for 'dignity'. *The Globe and Mail*, 19 June 2009, p. A16.
- Nurse, A. (2003). A profile of Canadian regionalism. In K. G. Pyke and W. C. Soderlund (Eds), *Profiles of Canada* (pp. 35-61). Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press.

## References

- Oakes, L. (2001). *Language and national identity: Comparing France and Sweden*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Oakes, L. (2005). French as the “common public language” in Quebec. In I. Lockerbie, I. Molinaro, K. Larose and L. Oakes (Eds), *French as the common language of Québec: History, debates and positions* (pp. 153-194). Quebec: Éditions nota bene.
- Oakes, L. (2007). Whose French? Language attitudes, linguistic insecurity and standardisation in Quebec. In M. Howard (Ed.), *Language issues in Canada* (pp. 64-85). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Oakes, L. (2010). Lambs to the slaughter? Young francophones and the role of English in Quebec today. *Multilingua*, 29, 265-288.
- Oakes, L. and Warren, J. (2007). *Language, citizenship and identity in Quebec*. Basingstoke, England and New York: Palgrave Macmillian.
- Ochs, E. (1992). Indexing gender. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds), *Rethinking context: Language as a social phenomenon* (pp. 335-358). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages. (2010a). *Beyond obligations: Annual report 2009-2010*. Volume II. Available:  
[http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/docs/e/ar\\_ra\\_2009\\_10\\_v2\\_e.pdf](http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/docs/e/ar_ra_2009_10_v2_e.pdf)
- Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages. (2010b). *Official languages at the heart of our identity. An overview of the Official Languages Act*. Retrieved from:  
[http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/docs/e/ola\\_llo\\_e.pdf](http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/docs/e/ola_llo_e.pdf).
- Orkin, M. (1971). *Speaking Canadian English*. London: Routledge.
- Owens, T. W. and Baker, P. M. (1984) Linguistic insecurity in Winnipeg: Validation of a Canadian index of linguistic insecurity. *Language in Society*, 13 (3), 337-350.
- Pacini-Ketchabaw, V. and de Almeida, A. E. (2006). Language discourses and ideologies at the heart of early childhood education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9 (3): 310-341.
- Pagé, M. (2005). La francisation des immigrants au Québec en 2005 et après. In A. Stefanescu and P. Georgeault (Eds), *Le Français au Québec: Nouveaux défis* (pp. 191-232). Quebec: Conseil supérieur de la langue française.

## References

- Pagé, M. and Georgeault, P. (Eds) (2006). *Le Français, langue de la diversité québécoise: Une réflexion pluridisciplinaire*. Montreal: Québec Amérique
- Paillé, M. (2011). Recul des francophones à Montréal. *Le Devoir*, 17 novembre 2011. Available: <http://www.ledevoir.com/politique/montreal/336500/lettres-recul-des-francophones-a-montreal>.
- Palmer, H. (1987 [1976]). Mosaic versus melting pot? Immigration and ethnicity in Canada and the United States. In E. Mandel and D. Taras (Eds), *A passion for identity. Introduction to Canadian studies* (pp. 82-96). Agincourt, Ontario: Methuen.
- Paquot, A. (1997). Anglicismes, identité nationale et dictionnaires au Québec. In M. Dvorak (Ed.), *Canada et bilinguisme* (pp. 83-90). Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes.
- Partington, A. (1998). *Patterns and meanings – Using corpora for English language research and teaching*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Partington, A. (2004). Corpora and discourse, a most congruous beast. In A. Partington, J. Morley and L. Haarman (Eds), *Corpora and Discourse* (pp. 11–20). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Partington, A. (2008). Teasing at the white house: A corpus-assisted study of face work in performing and responding to teases. *Text & Talk*, 28 (6), 771-792.
- Partington, A. (2009) Evaluating evaluation and some concluding thoughts on CADS. In J. Morley and P. Bayley (Eds), *Corpus-assisted discourse studies on the Iraq conflict: Wordings the war* (pp. 261-304). New York: Routledge.
- Patrick, D. (2007). Indigenous language endangerment and the unfinished business of nation states. In M. Heller and A. Duchêne (Eds), *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages* (pp. 35-56). London: Continuum.
- Pelletier, R. (2003). Un divorce consommé. In S. Langlois and J. L. Roy (Eds), *Briser les solitudes: Les francophonies canadiennes et québécoise* (pp. 31-42). Québec: Nota bene.
- Perraux, L. (2009). Receiving warm western responses but no local love, Quebec farmer says. *The Globe and Mail*, 30 June 2009, p. A7.
- Pettinicchio, D. (2012). Migration and ethnic nationalism: Anglophone exist and the ‘decolonisation’ of Québec. *Nations and Nationalism*, 18 (4), 719-743.



## References

- Philip, G. (2009). Arriving at equivalence: Making a case for comparable corpora in translation studies. In A. Beeby, P. Rodríguez Inés, and P. Sánchez-Gijón (Eds), *Corpus use and translating: Corpus use for learning to translate and learning corpus use to translate* (pp. 59-73). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Phillips, S. U. (1998). Language ideologies in institutions of power: A commentary. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard and P. V. Kroskrity (Eds), *Language ideologies. Practice and theory* (pp. 211-228). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. (1997). Realities and myths of linguistic imperialism. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 18 (3), 238-248.
- Pole, C. (2009). Galt reunion is back on at the Piggery. *The Record*, 23 June 2009, p. 8.
- Polèse, M. (2009). Le français écoperait. *La Presse*, 7 July, 2009, p. A35.
- Pöll, B. (2005). *Le français langue pluricentrique? Études sur la variation diatopique d'une langue standard*. Frankfurt am Main: Berlin.
- Preston, D. R. (2002). Language with an attitude. In J. K. Chambers, P. Trudgill & N. Schilling-Estes (Eds), *The handbook of language variation and change* (pp. 40-66). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Preston, D. R. (2004). Folk metalanguage. In A. Jaworski, N. Coupland & D. Galasiński (Eds), *Metalanguage: Social and ideological perspectives* (pp. 75-104). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Prime Minister of Canada. (2006a). Le PM declare que les Québécoises et les Québécois forment une nation au sein d'un Canada uni. Available : <http://www.pm.gc.ca/eng/media.asp?id=1415>
- Prime Minister of Canada. (2006b). PM declares that the Québécois form a nation within a united Canada. Available: <http://www.pm.gc.ca/eng/media.asp?id=1415>
- Pritchard, D. and Sauvageau, F. (1999). English and French and Generation X: The professional values of Canadian journalists. In H. Lazar and T. McIntosh (Eds), *How Canadians connect* (pp. 283-306). Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

## References

- Pritchard, D., Brewer, P. R. and Sauvageau, F. (2005). Changes in Canadian journalists' views about social and political roles of the news media: A panel study, 1996-2003. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 38 (2), 287-306.
- Privy Council Office (2003). *The next act: New momentum for Canada's linguistic duality*. Ottawa: Privy Council Office.
- Proulx, M. (2009). Une ville ne fait pas la province. *Le Soleil*, 25 June 2009, p. 27.
- Pujolar, J. (2007). The future of Catalan: Language endangerment and nationalist discourses in Catalonia. In M. Heller and A. Duchêne (Eds), *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages* (pp. 121-148). London: Continuum.
- Qian, Y. (2010). *Discursive construction around terrorism in the People's Daily (China) and The Sun (UK) before and after 9.11*. Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Raboy, M. (1991). Canadian broadcasting, Canadian nationhood: Two concepts, two solitudes and great expectations. *Electronic Journal of Communication*, 1 (2). Retrieved from <http://www.cios.org/EJCPUBLIC/001/2/00123.HTML>.
- Rabson, M. (2009). Canada too unilingual, city MP Glover laments. *Winnipeg Free Press*, 22 June 2009, p. A8.
- Ravindran, M. (2009). How to speed immigrants' entry into the workforce. *Vancouver Sun*, 30 June 2009, p. A10.
- Rayson, P. (2008). From key words to key semantic domains. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 13 (4), 519-549.
- Rea, J. M. (2006). *Ideologies of language: Authority, consensus and commonsense in Canadian talk about usage*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Simon Fraser University. Retrieved from: [Summit.sfu.ca/system/files/iritems1/2863/etd2355.pdf](http://Summit.sfu.ca/system/files/iritems1/2863/etd2355.pdf)
- Reisigl, M. and Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse-historical approach. In M. Meyer, and R. Wodak (Eds), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 87-121). London and Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Remysen, W. (2004). L'insecurité linguistique des francophones ontariens et néo-brunswickois. In S. Langlois and J. Létourneau (Eds), *Aspects de la nouvelle francophonie canadienne*. Saint-Nicolas: Presses de l'Université Laval.

## References

- Resnick, P. (1977). *The land of Cain: class and nationalism in English Canada, 1945-1975*. Vancouver: New Star Books.
- Resnick, P. (1994). *Thinking English Canada*. Toronto: Stoddart.
- Resnick, P. (1995). English Canada: The nation that dares not speak its name. In K. McRoberts (Ed.), *Beyond Quebec: Taking stock of Canada* (pp. 81-92). Montreal/Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Resnick, P. (2005). *The European roots of Canadian identity*. Plymouth: Broadview Press.
- Retzlaff, S. and Gänzle, S. (2008). Constructing the European Union in Canadian news. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*, 2 (2), 67-89.
- Ricento, T. (2003). The discursive construction of Americanism. *Discourse & Society*, 14 (5), 611-637.
- Ricento, T. (2005). Problems with the 'language-as-resource' discourse in the promotion of heritage languages in the U.S.A. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9 (3), 348-368.
- Ricento, T. (2006). Americanization, language ideologies, and the construction of European identities. In C. Mar-Molinero and P. Stevenson, *Language ideologies, policies, and practices: Language and the future of Europe* (pp. 44-57). Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Richardson, J. E. (2007). *Analysing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Rioux, C. (2009). Full bilingue. *Le Devoir*, 3 July 2009, p. A3.
- Robichaud, L. (2009). Brian Murphy et Yvon Godin appuient l'affichage bilingue à Dieppe. *L'Acadie Nouvelle*, 27 June 2009, p. 5.
- Robinson, G. (1998). *Constructing the Quebec referendum: French and English media voices*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Roy, F. (2009) Recent trends in research on the history of the press in Quebec: Towards a cultural history. In G. Allen and D. J. Robinson (Eds), *Communicating in Canada's Past: Essays in media history* (pp. 257-270). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

## References

- Roy, M. (2009). La courtepoinde de Le Clézio. *La Presse*, 3 July 2009, p. A15.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE (The Journal for the National Association for Bilingual Education)*, 8 (2), 15-34.
- Sarfati, S. (2009). Marie Laberge dans le Larousse. *La Presse*, 8 July 2009, Arts et spectacles, p. 6. Available: <http://www.cyberpresse.ca/arts/livres/200907/08/01-882260-marie-laberge-dans-le-larousse.php>.
- Saul, J. R. (1997). *Reflections of a Siamese twin: Canada at the end of the twentieth century*. London: Penguin.
- Sauvageau, F. (2001). Would the real journalists please stand up! In Jean-Paul Baillargeon (Ed.), *The handing down of culture, smaller societies, and globalization* (pp. 35-42). Toronto: Grubstreet Books.
- Schieffelin, B. B. and Doucet, R. C. (1998). The “real” Haitian creole: Ideology, metalinguistics, and orthographic choice. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard and P. V. Kroskrity (Eds), *Language ideologies. Practice and theory* (pp. 285-316). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scott, Marian. (2009a). French threatened in Montreal, poll finds. *National Post*, 22 June 2009, p. A6.
- Scott, Marian. (2009b). Quebecers split over threat to French in Montreal. *The Ottawa Citizen*, 22 June 2009, p. A5.
- Scott, Marian. (2009c). Telling gap between the two solitudes; Anglos, allophones dismiss concerns over language. *The Gazette*, 22 June 2009, p. A3.
- Scott, Marian. (2012). Census 2011: StatsCan does away with ‘francophone’, ‘anglophone’ and ‘allophone’. *The Gazette*, 26 October, 2012. Available: <http://www.montrealgazette.com/news/Census+2011+StatsCan+does+away+with+francophone/7439307/story.html>.
- Scott, Mike. (2004-5). *Oxford WordSmith Tools Help Manual*. Version 4.0. Oxford: Mike Scott/Oxford University Press.
- Scott, Mike. (2009). In search of a bad reference corpus. In D. Archer (Ed.), *What’s in a word list?* (pp. 79-92). Farnham/Burlington: Ashgate.

## References

- Séguin, R. (2012). Quebec plans 'robust reform' to halt decline of French in Montreal. *The Globe and Mail*, 24 October 2012. Available:  
<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/quebec-plans-robust-reform-to-halt-decline-of-french-in-montreal/article4647038/>
- Seymour, B. (2009). Des citoyens de Campbellton réclament une régie provincial bilingue. *L'Acadie nouvelle*, 23 June 2009, p. 4.
- Seymour, M. (1999) Les stratégies fédérales pour ethniciser le Québec. Available (accessed August 25, 2010):  
<http://www.vigile.net/spip.php?page=archives&u=http://archives.vigile.net/998/seymourethniciser.html>.
- Siegel, A. (1979). French and English broadcasting in Canada – A political evaluation. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 5 (3), 1-17.
- Silverstein, M. (1992). The uses and utility of ideology: Some reflections. *Pragmatics*, 2 (3), 311-323
- Silverstein, M. (1998). The uses and utility of ideology: A commentary. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard and P. V. Kroskrity (Eds), *Language ideologies. Practice and theory* (pp. 123-148). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication*, 23 (3-4), 193-229.
- Simon, S. (1992). The language of cultural difference: Figures of alterity in Canadian translation. In L. Venuti (Ed), *Rethinking translation: Discourse, subjectivity, ideology* (pp. 159-176). London: Routledge.
- Simpson, J. (2009). Why Canadians owe great thanks to Michaëlle Jean. *The Globe and Mail*, 1 July 2009, p. A11.
- Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, ideology and point of view*. London: Routledge.
- Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. (1996). The search for units of meaning. *Textus*, 9 (1),75-106.
- Singfield, M. (2009). You gotta have a dream. *The Sherbrooke Record*, 19 June 2009, p. 3.

## References

- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2006). Language policy and linguistic human rights. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy* (pp. 273-291). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Smith, A. D. (2001). *Nationalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Smith, J. (1998). Media policy, national identity, and citizenry in changing democratic societies: The case of Canada. In J. Smith (Ed.), *Media policy, national identity and citizenry in changing democratic societies: The case of Canada* (pp. 3-32). Durham, NC: Duke University.
- Smolicz, J. J. (1999). In M. Secombe and J. Zajda, J.(Eds), *J. J. Smolicz on education and culture*. Albert Park: James Nicholas Publishers Pty Ltd.
- Soderlund, W. C. and Hildebrandt, K. (2005a). *Canadian newspaper ownership in the era of convergence rediscovering social responsibility*. Edmonton, Alta.: University of Alberta Press.
- Soderlund, W. C. and Hildebrandt, K. (2005b). Chain ownership: Review and analysis of empirical studies. In W. C. Soderlund and K. Hildebrandt (Eds), *Canadian newspaper ownership in the era of convergence: Rediscovering social responsibility* (pp. 31-44). Edmonton, Alta.: University of Alberta Press.
- Soderlund, W. C. and Hildebrandt, K. (2005c). The relationship between the press and democratic politics. In K. Hildebrandt and W. C. Soderlund (Eds), *Canadian newspaper ownership in the era of convergence rediscovering social responsibility* (pp. 1-10). Edmonton, Alta.: University of Alberta Press.
- Soderlund, W. C. and Romanow, W. I. (2005). Failed attempts at regulation of newspaper ownership: The Davey committee and the Kent royal commission. In W. C. Soderlund and K. Hildebrandt (Eds), *Canadian newspaper ownership in the era of convergence rediscovering social responsibility* (pp. 11-30). Edmonton, Alta.: University of Alberta Press.
- Soderlund, W. C., Lee, M. F., and Gecelovsky, P. (2002). Trends in Canadian newspaper coverage of international news, 1988-2000: Editors' assessments. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 27, 73-87.
- Soroka, S. N. (2002). *Agenda-setting dynamics in Canada*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

## References

- Spitulnik, D. (1998). Mediating unity and diversity: The production of language ideologies in Zambian broadcasting. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard and P. V. Kroskrity (Eds), *Language ideologies. Practice and theory* (pp. 163-188). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Squires, L. (2010). Enregistering internet language. *Language in Society*, 39 (4), 457-492.
- Stark, A. (1992). English-Canadian opposition to Quebec nationalism. In R. Kent Weaver (Ed.), *The Collapse of Canada?* (pp. 123-157). Washington: The Brookings Institution.
- Statistics Canada (2006). *Population projections by aboriginal identity in Canada: 2006-2031*. Available: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/91-552-x/91-552-x2011001-eng.pdf>
- Statistics Canada. (2012). *Canada at a glance*. Available: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/12-581-x/12-581-x2012000-eng.pdf>
- Stewart, D. (2010). *Semantic prosody: A critical evaluation*. London: Routledge.
- St-Jacques, S. (2009). Les artistes et la politique. Entrer en scène en sortant du placard. *La Presse*, 29 June 2009, p. A19.
- Stubbs, M. (1996). *Text and corpus analysis: Computer-assisted studies of language and culture*. Oxford, UK and Cambridge, USA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Stubbs, M. (1997). Whorf's children: Critical comments on critical discourse analysis (CDA). In A. Ryan and A. Wray (Eds), *Evolving models of language: Papers from the annual meeting of the british association for applied linguistics held at the university of Wales, Swansea, September 1996* (pp. 100-116). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Stubbs, M. (2001) *Words and phrases: Corpus studies of lexical semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stubbs, M. (2003). Computer-assisted text and corpus analysis: Lexical cohesion and communicative competence. In D. Schriften, D. Tannen and H. E. Hamilton (Eds), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 305-320). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Stubbs, M. (2006). Corpus analysis: The state of the art and three types of unanswered questions. In G. Thompson and S. Hunston (Eds), *System and corpus: Exploring connections* (pp. 15-36). London: Equinox.

## References

- Stubbs, M. (2007a). An example of frequent English phraseology: Distributions, structures and functions. In R. Facchinetti (Ed.), *Corpus linguistics: 25 years on* (pp. 89-105). New York: Rodopi BV.
- Stubbs, M. (2007b). On texts, corpora and models of language. In M. Hoey, M. Mahlberg, M. Stubbs and W. Teubert (Eds), *Text, Discourse and Corpora: Theory and Analysis* (pp. 127-162). London: Continuum.
- Stubbs, M. (2010). Three concepts of keywords. In M. Bondi and M. Scott (Eds), *Keyness in texts* (pp. 21-42). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.
- Tagliamonte, S. A. (2006). "So cool, right?": Canadian English entering the 21<sup>st</sup> century. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 51 (2/3), 309-331.
- Taras, D. (1993). The mass media and political crisis: Reporting Canada's constitutional struggles. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 18 (2): 131-48.
- Taylor, Charles. (1993). *Reconciling the solitudes: Essays on Canadian federalism and nationalism*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press.
- Taylor, Charlotte. (2008). What is corpus linguistics? What the data says. *ICAME*, 32, 179-200.
- Taylor, Charlotte. (2009). Interacting with conflicting goals: Framework and impoliteness in hostile cross-examination. In J. Morley and P. Bayley (Eds), *Corpus-assisted discourse studies on the Iraq conflict: Wording the war* (pp. 208-233). New York: Routledge.
- Taylor, Charlotte. (Forthcoming, 2013). Searching for similarity using corpus-assisted discourse studies. *Corpora*, 8 (2).
- Teubert, W. (2007). *Natural and human rights, work and property* in the discourse of Catholic social doctrine. In M. Hoey, M. Mahlberg, M. Stubbs and W. Teubert (Eds), *Text, discourse and corpora: Theory and analysis* (pp. 89-126). London: Continuum.
- Thompson, G. and Hunston, S. (2000). Evaluation: An introduction. In S. Hunston and G. Thompson (Eds), *Evaluation in text. Authorial stance and the construction of discourse* (pp. 1-27). Oxford: Oxford University Press.



## References

- Thompson, G. and Hunston, S. (Eds) (2006). *System and corpus: Exploring connections*. London: Equinox.
- Thurlow, C. (2007). New-media discourse and the technologization of young people. In S. Johnson and A. Ensslin (Eds), *Language in the media: Representations, identities, ideologies* (pp. 213-233). London: Continuum.
- Tognini-Bonelli, E. (1996). *Corpus theory and practice*. TWC Publishers.
- Tognini-Bonelli, E. (2001). *Corpus linguistics at work*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Trudeau, P. E. (1968). *Federalism and the French Canadians*. Toronto: Macmillan.
- Trudgill, P. (2006). Dialect mixture versus monogenesis in colonial varieties: The inevitability of Canadian English? *The Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 51 (2/3), 265-286.
- Turcot, G. (2009). Premier concert de l'artiste en Outaouais. *Le Droit*, 30 June 2009, Arts and Spectacles, p. 22.
- Uzelac, G. (2010). National ceremonies: The pursuit of authenticity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33 (10), 1718 – 1736.
- Valpy, M. (2009). The emperor and the tennis pro. *The Globe and Mail*, 27 June 2009, p. A1.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1991). *Racism and the press*. London: Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998a) *Ideology. A multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998b). Opinions and ideologies in the press. In A. Bell and P. Garrett (Eds), *Approaches to media discourse* (pp. 21-63). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (Eds), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 95-120). London: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2003). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen and H. E. Hamilton (Eds), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 11 (2), 115-140.

## References

- Van Leeuwen, T. (2003 [1996]). The representation of social actors. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard and M. Coulthard (Eds), *Readings in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 32-70). London: Routledge.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2004). Metalanguage in social life. In A. Jaworski, N. Coupland and D. Galasiński (Eds), *Metalanguage: Social and ideological perspectives* (pp. 107-130). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Venne, M. (2003). Québécois et minorités francophones. Pour une alliance lucide entre nationalistes. In S. Langlois and J. L. Roy (Eds), *Briser les solitudes: Les francophonies canadiennes et québécoises* (pp. 43-62). Québec: Nota bene.
- Vessey, R. (forthcoming). Too much French? Not enough French? The Vancouver Olympics and a very Canadian language ideological debate. *Multilingua*.
- Vigneault, A. (2009). Fête nationale: Guy A. Lepage dénonce les « cous bleus ». *La Presse*, 18 June 2009, Arts et spectacles, p. 5.
- Vigor, J. C. (2009). Cet art qu'est la composition florale. *Le Devoir*, 20 June 2009, p. D6.
- Vipond, M. (2008). One network or two? French-language programming on the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission, 1932-36. *The Canadian Historical Review*, 89 (3), 319-343.
- Vipond, M. (2012). *The mass media in Canada*. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- Vipond, R. C. (1996). Citizenship and the Charter of Rights: The two side of Pierre Trudeau. *International Journal of Canadian Studies*, 14, 179-192.
- Voyageur, C. (2003). In from the cold: Aboriginal media in Canada. In D. Taras, F. Pannekoek, and M. Bakardijeva (Eds), *How Canadians communicate* (pp. 165-185). Calgary: University of Calgary Press.
- Wai, V. (2009). Discrimination and Asian actresses. *National Post*, 18 June 2009, p. A21.
- Watts, R. J. (1999). The ideology of dialect in Switzerland. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language ideological debates* (pp. 67-104). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Weaver, R. K. (1992). Political institutions and Canada's constitutional crisis. In R. Kent Weaver (Ed.), *The Collapse of Canada?* (pp. 7-76). Washington: The Brookings Institution.

## References

- Webber, J. (1994). *Reimagining Canada: Language, culture, community, and the Canadian constitution*. Montreal/Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Weber, E. (1976). *Peasants into Frenchmen: The modernization of rural France, 1870-1914*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Whitsitt, S. (2005). A critique of the concept of semantic prosody. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 10 (3), 283-305.
- Widdis, R. W. (1997). Borders, borderlands and Canadian identity: A Canadian perspective. *International Journal of Canadian Studies*, 15, 49-66.
- Wiley, T. G. (2000). Continuity and change in the function of language ideologies in the United States. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, politics, and language policies: Focus on English* (pp. 67-86). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Williams, R. (1973). Base and superstructure in Marxist cultural theory. *New Left Review*, 82, 1-14. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.newleftreview.org/?getpdf=NLR08101&pdflang=en>.
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Winseck, D. (2002). Netscapes of power: convergence, consolidation and power in the Canadian mediascape. *Media, Culture and Society*, 24: 795-819.
- Winter, E. (2007). Neither 'America' nor 'Quebec': Constructing the Canadian multicultural nation. *Nations and Nationalism*, 13 (3), 481-503.
- Wodak, R. (2001a). The discourse-historical approach. In M. Meyer and R. Wodak (Eds), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 63-94). London and Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Wodak, R. (2001b). What CDA is about - a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In M. Meyer and R. Wodak (Eds), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1-13). London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wodak, R. (2007). Language and ideology – language in ideology. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 6 (1), 1-5.
- Wodak, R. (2008). Introduction: Discourse studies – Important concepts and terms. In R. Wodak and M. Kryzanowsky (Eds), *Qualitative discourse analysis in the social sciences* (pp. 1-29). Houndsmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

## References

- Wodak, R., De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M. and Liebhart, K. (2009). *The discursive construction of national identity* (A. Hirsch, R. Mitten Trans.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Woolard, K. A. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard and P. V. Kroskrity (Eds), *Language ideologies. Practice and Theory* (pp. 3-50). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Xiao, R. and McEnery, T. (2006). Collocation, semantic prosody, and near synonymy: A cross-linguistic perspective. *Applied Linguistics*, 27 (1), 103-129.
- Yavorska, G. (2010). The impact of ideologies on the standardization of modern Ukrainian. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 201, 163-197.
- Young, D. (2001). Céline Dion, national unity and the English-language press in Canada. *Media, Culture & Society*, 23: 647-663.
- Young, N. and Dugas, E. (2011). Representations of climate change in Canadian national print media: The banalization of global warming. *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue canadienne de sociologie*, 48 (1), 1-22.
- Young, N. and Dugas, E. (2012). Comparing climate change coverage in Canadian English- and French-language print media: Environmental values, media cultures, and the narration of global warming. *Canadian Journal of Sociology/ Cahiers canadiens de sociologie*, 37 (1), 25-54.
- York, G. (2009). Sterilized, stigmatized. *The Globe and Mail*, 15 July 2009, p. A7.
- Zhang, W. (2009). Semantic prosody and ESL/EFL vocabulary pedagogy. *TESL Canada Journal/Revue TESL du Canada*, 26 (2), 1-12.

# APPENDICES

**Appendix 1: Anonymous. (2009g). Vigilance essential for French. *Toronto Star*, Jul 1, 2009. pg. A.17**

Raising young children in Toronto in the early eighties, we hooked them on Passe-Partout, Tele-Quebec's popular preschool program, and restricted television access to the length of the half-hour daily episodes.

The only language spoken at home was French, and both kids were home-schooled to read in their mother tongue long before they could decipher a word of English. That was part and parcel of bulletproofing our kids for the inevitable day when they ventured into the largely English-speaking Ontario world.

A few years later, a move to Ottawa, a city where French has a greater presence, brought some relaxation to the parental rules, and we mostly let down our guard when Montreal became our home a decade after that.

Mostly, but not completely. In the age of video games and the Internet, raising children who are as competent as they should be in French is a challenge, even in Canada's French-speaking metropolis.

Rationing English in favour of French paid off. Our adult sons switch effortlessly from one language to the other, and they have to think twice when they are asked whether the movie they are watching or the book they are reading is in French or English.

In most regions of Canada, English-speaking parents have to work at ensuring their children acquire and maintain second-language skills in French, but it is a rare francophone who, having set out to master English, has not been up to the task.

## Appendices

Indeed, English is generally so pervasive that francophone families often have to guard their kids against “franglais,” a mix of both languages that does not stand its speakers in good stead on either side of the language divide.

A recent poll found that 90 per cent of francophone Quebecers worry about the status of the French language in Montreal. The opposite would have been a surprise. The notion that vigilance is essential if French is to continue to be a vibrant presence in North America has been bred in the bone of successive francophone generations. It is also borne out by the demographic realities.

In many ways, Montreal is a linguistic success story. Home to the highest proportion of trilingual Canadians, its daily life is far more bilingual than Ottawa’s, the capital of a country that purports to have two official languages.

Almost half of Montrealers speak a language other than French at home and the number is growing. But while the power of attraction of English ensures that it is the common language of multicultural Toronto, French would hardly be as dominant as it is in Montreal without some legislative assistance. Over the past three decades, the obligation for newcomers to the province to have their children educated in the French school system has ensured they no longer massively bypass French on the way to adopting English as their sole default official language.

The federal Official Languages Act has also turned proficiency in French into a professional asset rather than a cultural pursuit. Over that same period, concern over the shrinking place of French in an increasingly English-speaking wired universe had spread to the whole of the Francophonie. The attraction of English has increased while the influence of many other languages has decreased.

As the debate over the future of the planet’s linguistic diversity has become global, the limits of local legislative solutions have become obvious. That is why even as Quebecers fret over the place of French in the Montreal of tomorrow, most do not want to reopen the Pandora’s box of the language laws. Have a good Canada Day!

**Appendix 2: Bélair-Cirino, M. (2009). Le français à Montréal: 90 % des francophones sont inquiets. *Le Devoir*, 22 juin 2009, p. A1**

Près de 90 % des Québécois francophones estiment que la langue française est menacée à Montréal. Une opinion partagée par moins d'un anglophone ou allophone sur quatre, révèle un sondage Web Léger Marketing-Association d'études canadiennes-Quebec Community Groups Network dévoilé à l'avant-veille de la Fête nationale. Le sondage met en lumière un fossé important entre les perceptions des Québécois d'expression française et ceux d'expression anglaise sur la vitalité de la langue de Tremblay sur l'île de Montréal.

« On voit qu'il y a une quasi-unanimité auprès des francophones [...] qui pensent que la langue française est menacée à Montréal, ce qui n'est pas le cas chez les non-francophones », fait remarquer le directeur de l'Association d'études canadiennes (AEC), Jack Jedwab.

L'étude du démographe Marc Termote sur les perspectives démo-linguistiques du Québec et de la région de Montréal, qui soulignait à grands traits que les personnes qui s'expriment en français à la maison deviendront minoritaires dans la métropole d'ici à 2021, et l'offensive de l'Office québécois de la langue française ont eu un impact indubitable sur l'opinion publique, pense M. Jedwab. « Cela a été un tournant », affirme-t-il.

« Les non-francophones ne voient pas la situation de la même manière. Dans leur esprit, le français progresse à travers la province [parce que la proportion de] non-francophones qui apprennent le français comme langue seconde [croît] », ajoute-t-il.

Un peu moins de 54 % de la population montréalaise parle français à la maison, dévoilait le recensement de 2006 de Statistique Canada.

Le gouvernement de Jean Charest « donne le sentiment à l'ensemble de la population québécoise qu'il n'est pas véritablement prêt à agir. Il y a un sentiment d'inaction, et ça inquiète beaucoup les Québécois », explique Alain G. Gagnon, directeur du Centre de recherche interdisciplinaire sur la diversité au Québec (CRIDAQ).

La mollesse du gouvernement du Québec dans l'épanouissement de la langue française au Québec, selon M. Gagnon, est semblable à la situation qui prévaut à Ottawa. L'échec du Bloc

## Appendices

québécois à faire adopter une politique linguistique qui s'appliquerait aux institutions fédérales sur le territoire du Québec, la mise en veilleuse du programme de contestation judiciaire par le gouvernement de Stephen Harper, les compressions en culture ou son refus de suppléer aux revenus publicitaires insuffisants à Radio-Canada: « Ce sont des facteurs qui s'additionnent et qui peuvent conduire les francophones du Québec à un sentiment d'une plus grande insécurité ou d'un plus grand inconfort par rapport à la communauté anglophone majoritaire hors Québec », souligne Alain G. Gagnon. « Il y a un sentiment peut-être d'inquiétude, mais que 90 % des Québécois pensent véritablement que le français soit véritablement menacé, ça m'apparaît un peu élevé », ajoute-t-il.

« Assurément qu'il y a une intention derrière ce sondage-là qui est de faire ressortir un sentiment que les Québécois sont encore insécures concernant la présence de leurs concitoyens », affirme Alain G. Gagnon.

Par ailleurs, quelque 60 % des Québécois d'expression française estiment que les anglophones du Québec comprennent mal la société québécoise, selon le sondage Web Léger Marketing-Association d'études canadiennes-Quebec Community Groups Network. Un point de vue que partagent 20 % des anglophones et allophones questionnés. « Probablement parce que [les anglophones] ne comprennent pas à quel point la langue française est menacée », suppose Jack Jedwab. Bien que les francophones disent dans une très forte majorité nouer des relations avec des anglophones, ils ne sont pas moins méfiants au sujet de la situation de la langue française au Québec, selon lui.

Les anglophones se comportent comme s'ils étaient une majorité au Québec, dans l'esprit de plus de 65 % des francophones - qui estiment néanmoins former la majorité - contre 20 % des anglophones et allophones. « Les anglophones ont le sentiment d'être minoritaires vis-à-vis de la situation de la langue française. Les francophones, eux, ont l'air de croire que les anglophones ne comprennent pas la situation de la langue française », fait savoir M. Jedwab.

Les « peuples fondateurs » du Québec

La question du sondage: « êtes-vous [d'accord] avec l'énoncé suivant: Les anglophones sont un peuple fondateur de la société québécoise? », a fait sourciller Alain G. Gagnon. « On vient



## Appendices

complètement chambarder la lecture historique des rapports Québec-Canada », lance-t-il. Malgré tout, les anglophones constituent « un peuple fondateur du Québec », selon deux répondants québécois francophones sur cinq. Une opinion partagée par 80 % des Québécois non francophones. « Il y a quelque chose de particulier dans ce sondage-là qui m'échappe. On va sans doute pouvoir en débattre [aujourd'hui] », a conclu Alain G. Gagnon.

D'autre part, la société québécoise est menacée par l'arrivée d'immigrants non chrétiens, croient 40 % des répondants au sondage, francophones, anglophones et allophones confondus.

Les immigrants - de confession chrétienne ou non - représentent une menace pour la langue française au Québec, pensent 57 % des francophones, et à peine 13 % des anglophones et allophones. Les Québécois francophones souhaitent qu'un plus grand nombre de personnes qui résident au Québec fassent l'apprentissage de la langue française, souligne Alain G. Gagnon. Il note néanmoins plusieurs progrès « appréciables et significatifs ». La jeune génération accepte de plus en plus de travailler, d'échanger en français et d'accepter le français comme langue commune notamment.

Par ailleurs, quelque 60 % des Québécois dont la langue maternelle est le français estiment que « les immigrants du Québec devraient abandonner leurs coutumes et traditions, et être davantage comme la majorité des Québécois », selon le sondage. Un point de vue que partagent seulement 30 % des Québécois dont la langue maternelle est différente du français.

Ce sondage Web Léger Marketing a été effectué du 11 au 14 mai auprès de 1000 personnes au Québec. La marge d'erreur est de 3,9 %, 19 fois sur 20. Il servira à lancer les discussions d'un déjeuner-causerie auquel participeront l'AEC (Jack Jedwab), Le Devoir (Bernard Descôteaux), The Gazette (David Johnston), le CRIDAQ (Alain G. Gagnon) et le Quebec Community Groups Network (QCGN).

**Appendix 3: Ferenczy, M. (2009). Broader opportunities. The *Ottawa Citizen*, 3 Jul 2009, p. A9**

Canadian Parents for French (Ontario) supports expanded admission guidelines to access French-language schools.

All students should have opportunities to become proficient and literate in both official languages. Opening the door to newcomers to retain and/or develop their French through the French-language school boards is positive and inclusive.

Our organization of predominantly non-French-speaking parents encourages initiatives to improve access to education in French.

It is unclear to us in Randall Denley's column whose "official stance" it is that "French Immersion is good enough for the anglos."

The highest demand for French immersion enrolment comes from parents in diverse ethnic communities and new Canadians, in the past enrolled by default in English program schools due to a lack of information at immigration entry points and community school systems.

Ontario has unprecedented growth in French language school and French immersion program enrolments and it remains the responsibility of school boards, whether English or French, to meet parent demand for increased choice in educational opportunities for their children.

**Appendix 4: Howlett, K. (2009). French schools will be available to more students. *The Globe and Mail*, 17 Jun 2009, p. A.12**

More parents will be eligible to send their children to French schools in Ontario under new admission rules to be unveiled today.

Education Minister Kathleen Wynne will unveil the new rules at école secondaire étienne-Brûlé, a Toronto high school currently restricted to children with one parent who is either a native francophone Ontarian or whose first language is French. The intent of the new rules is to open up the province's 422 elementary and secondary French-language schools to more students, Michelle Despault, a spokeswoman for Ms. Wynne said yesterday.

The announcement comes just as the government is under siege over cuts to French immersion programs. Two separate groups of parents are calling for French immersion classes to be reinstated in their neighbourhoods. One group has said they would set up co-op French classes in their own homes, rather than see their children travel by school bus to French immersion classes outside their neighbourhood.

Ms. Despault said today's announcement is unrelated to the cancellation of two of the six French immersion senior kindergarten classes at Withrow Avenue and Jackman Avenue Junior Public Schools for the coming school year. "This is not about French immersion," she said.

Because Canada is officially bilingual in English and French, parents in Ontario who learned French as their first language have a constitutional right to have their children educated in publicly funded French schools. In the current school year, just under 92,000 students were enrolled in public and Roman Catholic French schools in Ontario, up slightly from just over 90,000 in 2003/04. There were about two million students enrolled in the province's English-language schools this year.

The idea behind the French schools is that the children, many of whom also speak the language at home, are not just taught in French in the classroom but are totally immersed in the French culture. French is the only language spoken in the classroom as well as the playground and the cafeteria.

**Appendix 5: Havrankova, J. (2009). Apprendre le français, un privilège. *Le Devoir*, lundi 22 juin, 2009, p. a6.**

Le gouvernement du Québec veut favoriser la venue des immigrants dans les secteurs d'emploi où il existe une pénurie. La question se pose: cette augmentation se fera-t-elle au prix d'une diminution des exigences en français? La plupart du temps, on présente l'apprentissage du français comme une contrainte et une corvée ingrate. Pourtant, la connaissance du français ouvre la porte non seulement sur la culture québécoise, déjà riche, mais aussi sur l'immense culture francophone mondiale.

Le français est une langue plutôt difficile? Comparée à l'anglais, sans doute, mais j'ai connu des expatriés qui ont appris des langues bien plus rébarbatives et plus limitées géographiquement, comme le suédois ou le néerlandais. Pour promouvoir l'apprentissage du français par les immigrants, le gouvernement devra envisager plusieurs stratégies: rendre les cours du français accessibles, jumeler les immigrants francophones et allophones, s'assurer par des examens que l'immigrant progresse dans ces connaissances du français, allouer un temps raisonnable pour acquérir la maîtrise du français, organiser des concours de productions orales et écrites en français pour les allophones, etc. Ces efforts devront être soutenus par un environnement linguistique où l'on évite des anglicismes et des barbarismes divers, qui enlaidissent la langue d'Anne Hébert. Je me sens privilégiée de vivre en français et je voudrais que d'autres immigrants éprouvent la fierté et la joie d'utiliser cette belle langue.

**Appendix 6: Meurice, P. (2009). Pauvres touristes. *La Presse*, 7 juillet, 2009, p. a13**

Il y a une quinzaine de jours, j'ai emmené un couple allemand à la Maison Saint-Gabriel. J'y étais déjà allé; tout y est bien organisé et bien présenté.

À part l'allemand, mon amie parle français, anglais, portugais et espagnol. Son mari parle anglais et espagnol, mais pas français. Nous avons donc demandé la visite guidée en anglais. Quelle triste expérience! Nous avons bien vite dû demander à la guide de parler français: son anglais était pratiquement inintelligible. Mon amie allemande a dû traduire le français pour son mari. Mais ce qui a le plus surpris mes amis et m'a indigné, c'est que lorsque nous avons demandé à la guide de parler français, elle a poussé un soupir de soulagement et nous a dit naïvement: "Oui, mon anglais n'est pas très bon: j'ai rarement l'occasion de pratiquer!" Comment? À Montréal? C'est à se demander si ceux qui luttent contre l'anglais n'ont pas tellement bien réussi que nous passons maintenant pour des troglodytes!

**Appendix 7: Ravindran, M. (2009). How to speed immigrants' entry into the workforce. *The Vancouver Sun*, Jun 30, 2009. pg. A.10**

Non-English-speaking immigrants arriving with families face a significant dilemma: seek low-paying work that will provide only hand-to-mouth wages or attend English classes and generate little-to-no income. What would any parent do in this situation?

Government programs such as English Language Services for Adults do facilitate economic and cultural integration into Canadian society, but I believe more pragmatic solutions need to be implemented.

Free language services come with waiting lists that force newcomers to wait months before gaining entry to classes. So the more funding these government programs receive, the less time newcomers will have to wait before being able to participate in the workforce and achieve those high-paying jobs.

Secondly, given the economic downturn, job-focused English classes ought to be provided at no cost to newcomers. Finally, day care should be available at subsidized rates for families and women who would otherwise forgo language classes and prolong their isolation in a new city.

**Appendix 8: Rioux, C. (2009). Full bilingue. *Le Devoir*, 3 juillet 2009, p. a3**

Qui se souvient du beau geste qu'avait fait le président Jacques Chirac il y a quelques années? L'affaire avait eu un certain retentissement au Québec. Dans une conférence de l'Union européenne où le grand patron français Ernest-Antoine Seillière s'exprimait en anglais, Jacques Chirac s'était levé et avait claqué la porte. C'était pour lui une question de principe: les représentants français devaient s'exprimer en français dans les grands forums internationaux.

Nombreux étaient les Québécois qui avaient applaudi. Ils se réjouissaient que la France se tienne debout et défende la place du français parmi les grandes langues internationales. Tout n'était donc pas perdu dans cette France dont nous sommes par ailleurs si prompts, nous Québécois, à dénoncer le snobisme anglophile. « On ne va pas fonder le monde de demain sur une seule langue et donc sur une seule culture, ce serait une régression dramatique », avait déclaré le président. Ces mots étaient du miel à nos oreilles.

C'était le 24 mars 2006, il y a trois ans à peine. On a pourtant l'impression que cela fait des siècles.

La semaine dernière, ce n'est pas un grand patron français qui est venu parler anglais à Bruxelles, mais bien le premier ministre du Québec lui-même. De passage dans la capitale européenne pour une conférence internationale sur l'environnement, Jean Charest a prononcé un discours dans une langue exotique qui n'est parlée que dans certains quartiers d'Ottawa: le bilingue. L'allocution était pour moitié écrite en anglais et chaque paragraphe en français était inévitablement suivi d'un paragraphe en anglais. Au diable la nette prédominance du français inscrite dans la loi 101. On croyait entendre un fonctionnaire canadien appliquant avec zèle la politique officielle de bilinguisme du gouvernement fédéral. De mémoire de correspondant, on n'avait jamais vu un premier ministre québécois se faire ainsi le porte-étendard du bilinguisme intégral.

Qu'on me comprenne bien. Il ne s'agit pas de reprocher au premier ministre du Québec de parler anglais, et anglais seulement, chaque fois que cela est nécessaire. À l'étranger, Jean Charest prononce souvent des discours en anglais devant des gens d'affaires ou des représentants politiques. Le premier ministre a toutes les raisons de le faire chaque fois que

## Appendices

son auditoire ne comprend pas le français. Mais quelle raison avait-il d'agir ainsi dans une ville francophone comme Bruxelles, alors que l'auditoire était largement francophone (comme le prouvait son discours bilingue), que la traduction simultanée était disponible et que la plupart des conférenciers s'exprimaient en français?

Vendredi dernier, la majorité de la centaine de participants réunis au Crown Plaza comprenait parfaitement le français. Bruxelles compte une proportion plus grande de résidents francophones (plus de 80 %) que Montréal et même les employés des organisations internationales peuvent difficilement y vivre sans finir par parler français. De plus, un service de traduction simultanée était disponible.

En fait, le seul conférencier à s'exprimer en anglais, avec Jean Charest, fut le premier ministre du Manitoba Gary Doer. Tous les autres n'ont parlé qu'en français. Ce fut le cas notamment de la représentante de l'Assemblée des régions d'Europe, Michèle Sabban. Contrairement à Jean Charest qui représente une province dont l'unique langue officielle est le français, Mme Sabban représentait pourtant 270 régions européennes réparties dans 33 pays où l'on parle plus d'une trentaine de langues.

Le plus surprenant restait pourtant à venir. Le représentant de la Catalogne devait en effet nous offrir une belle leçon. Le ministre catalan de l'Environnement, Francesc Baltasar i Albesa, avait choisi de parler, non pas en catalan ou en espagnol (les deux langues officielles de la Catalogne), et encore moins en anglais, mais en français. Faudra-t-il dorénavant compter sur les Catalans, plus que sur le Québec, pour défendre le français dans les forums internationaux?

La prochaine fois que Jean Charest passera par Bruxelles, il ne devra pas se surprendre si les organisateurs ont supprimé la traduction simultanée. Si le Québec ne présente pas un visage essentiellement français dans les organisations internationales chaque fois qu'il le peut, on se demande bien qui le fera à sa place. Pourquoi la Francophonie continuerait-elle, par exemple, à dépenser des millions pour former des fonctionnaires francophones dans l'Union européenne et à l'ONU? Faudra-t-il dorénavant compter sur les Catalans... ou sur les Grecs?



## Appendices

On apprenait en effet cette semaine que la chanteuse Nana Mouskouri était montée aux barricades lors de l'inauguration du musée qui vient d'être construit au pied de l'Acropole. En constatant l'absence de présentation en français, elle a aussitôt claqué la porte. Belle leçon d'humilité.

**Appendix 9: Scott, Marian. (2009). “Telling gap between the two solitudes; Anglos, allophones dismiss concerns over language”. *The Gazette*, 22 June 2009, p. A3.**

Is French threatened in Montreal? Depends whom you ask.

French-speaking Quebecers are almost unanimous that it is, while English-speakers and immigrants overwhelmingly dismiss the concern.

That is the main finding of a poll by Leger Marketing for the Association for Canadian Studies and the Quebec Community Groups Network.

“There is a gigantic gap between francophones and non-francophones on whether they think French is threatened,” said Jack Jedwab, the association’s executive director.

While the survival of French in Montreal has been a perennial concern, Jedwab said he has never seen such unanimity among francophones on the topic.

“This creates a high level of insecurity among francophones in Montreal,” he said.

Eighty-seven per cent of francophones agreed with the statement: “The French language is threatened in Montreal,” while only 24 per cent of non-francophones did so.

A 2008 survey found 79 per cent of francophones worried about the future of French in the city.

Quebecers have long been suspicious of “the cosmopolitan metropolis ... represented in the collective imagination as a threat to French-Canadian survival,” *La Presse* columnist Lysiane Gagnon wrote last month.

That concern has intensified as allophones - residents whose mother tongue is neither French nor English - have increased.

The proportion of francophones on the island of Montreal dropped to just below 50 per cent in the 2006 census, from 53 per cent in 2001.

## Appendices

Allophones on the island grew to 33 per cent of the population in 2006 from 29 per cent in 2001, while anglophones remained steady at 18 per cent.

In the greater Montreal area, francophones dropped to 66 per cent of the population in 2006 from 68 per cent in 2001 while anglophones held steady at 12.5 per cent.

Allophones in greater Montreal grew to 22 per cent of the population in 2006 from 19 per cent in 2001.

Despite last week's brouhaha over a move to exclude two anglo bands from a Fete nationale concert tomorrow - a decision later overturned - relative language peace has reigned in recent years.

But the conflicting perceptions of the status of French reveals that fault lines remain between language groups, Jedwab said. He called for dialogue between Montrealers to promote understanding between language groups. "People will have to sit down and explain to each other why they disagree," he said.

Jedwab predicted sensitivity over French's future in Montreal is here to stay.

"Whatever the future holds in the ongoing language debate, the issue of French being threatened in Montreal will be evoked the most frequently," he said.

The Leger Marketing survey of 1,003 Quebecers was conducted by online questionnaire May 13-16. Results are considered accurate within 3.9 percentage points, 19 times out of 20.