UC Berkeley
Dissertations, Department of Linguistics

Title
Language, Ethnicity and Politics in Quebec

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5zz7b8j6

Author
Heller, Monica

Publication Date
1982

Language, Ethnicity and Politics in Quebec

By

Monica Sara Heller

A.B. (Swarthmore College) 1976
M.A. (University of California) 1978

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Linguistics

in the

GRADUATE DIVISION

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Approved: ...*Charles J. Fillmore*... 8 Sept 82
  co-Chairman   Date
  .... 9 Sept 82
  co-Chairman
  ...*Robin T. Lakoff*... 13 Sept 82

DOCTORAL DEGREE CONFERRED
DECEMBER 4, 1982

To my parents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tables

Acknowledgements

This dissertation is the outcome of several years of fieldwork and analysis. During that time I have been fortunate to have received much help and support. I would like to take the opportunity here to thank the following friends, colleagues and organizations:

The administration and employees of Harper's Brewery, who allowed me and my research assistants to carry out this project under the most pleasant of conditions, and without whose interest and collaboration there would have been no study.

The Service de la recherche sociolinguistique of l'Office de la Langue Française in Montreal, where I was first encouraged to formulate and submit this project. I would specifically like to thank Denise Daoust-Blais, André Martin and Pierre Laporte for their extensive efforts on behalf of this project, and the personal interest they took in it. I am also grateful to others at the Office who are too numerous to mention here by name.

My research assistants, Laurette Lévy, Luc Ostiguy and Jean-Paul Bartholomot, whose contribution has been most valuable, especially in the areas of analysis of technical terminology and the ethnographic description of certain sectors of the brewery.

The Ministère des Affaires Culturelles of the Government of Quebec, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, grants from which enabled me to carry out this project.

Hannah Kaltman, who participated in the early stages of the project, in the formulation of techniques for the analysis of conversations.

Douglas Campbell, Nicole Domingue, Sarah Freeman, Stephen O. Murray, Mary Catherine O'Connor, Amparo Tuson and Elissa Warantz, all of whom have provided insightful critiques of earlier drafts.

Irving and Anita Fochs Heller, to whom I am grateful for their quiet unflagging support, and for all the ways in which they have taken part in my work.

Timothy Kaiser, who can never be adequately thanked for the help and encouragement he provided every step of the way. His involvement in every detail of this study, from the most ridiculous to the most sublime, has been invaluable.

Finally, my dissertation committee, Charles J. Fillmore, John J. Gumperz and Robin T. Lakoff, whom I wish to thank for hours of discussion, helpful criticism and moral support. I especially want to thank John Gumperz, who throughout my graduate career has truly been my mentor, and with whom it has been a privilege to work.

.   .

Preface

All names in the text (except my own) have been changed. The name of the brewery is also fictitious. In the text I have used the original English form of the brewery's name, although now, of course, in accordance with Bill 101, the brewery is officially <u>La</u> <u>Brasserie</u> <u>Harper</u>.

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.0 Language, ethnicity and politics in everyday life in Quebec

1.0.1 Background

Quebec society has been characterized by ethnic divisions for all of its history since 1759, when the British conquered what was then the French colony of New France. These divisions have sometimes led to open conflict, and at other times they have been accepted as part of community life, but they have in any case persisted through periods of fundamental social change and political upheaval. Language has always played a central role in the maintenance of ethnic divisions in the province, whether the role was one of a badge of identity used in political mobilization, or one of a criterion of inclusion that acted to restrict members of other groups from access to participation in activities and social networks over which members of the in-group do have control. Language was (and is) used to identify people as either French or English. On the basis of that identification people would either be accepted or rejected as friends, spouses, job candidates, or anything else involving long-term relations to which duties, rights and obligations are attached.

Social, economic and political changes in Quebec, and in areas affecting Quebec, have produced the current situation, where the

relative status of ethnic groups, as well as their internal organization, are in a state of rapid change. This study is concerned primarily with the relationship between the French and the English, the two most powerful groups in the province, and with the role of the languages they speak in that relationship. It is concerned with the way in which language is used to define criteria of access to ethnic groups and to the roles and resources they control.

This is a case study. In order to grasp the various different ways in which language plays a role in social life, it was decided to focus on one social domain which, for historical reasons, is particularly pertinent to interethnic relations to-day. That domain is private enterprise. There are other important domains, notably those of education and public settings, but private enterprise is one where interethnic face-to-face interaction takes place regularly, and which at the same time is in itself a valuable resource over which the French and English now struggle for control. The fundamental questions posed by this study are these: In what way does the verbal behaviour of individuals in social interaction reveal processes of change in the meaning of social, especially ethnic, relations in Quebec? Further, what is the relationship of this micro-level of language use to the macro-level processes of social, economic and political change?

1.0.2 Language and ethnicity

Language and ethnicity interact in several ways. Ethnicity acts to constrain participation in social networks and social situations;

members of ethnic groups feel they have a shared background, and the fact that they share with others in the group certain values, styles of life and ways of behaving goes a long way towards reinforcing this notion. Further, they are tied together into social networks by the rights and obligations they bear to one another as group members. Thus, on the one hand, they share overt assumptions about social life: about what is going on and about who people are. Some of this feeling of sharedness might be explicit; some of it, however, arises from the good feeling that one gets when one has had a pleasant and fruitful interaction with another person. That implicit, covert feeling of sharedness is achieved because the interactants are playing the same game by the same rules. Certain aspects of those situations and roles may symbolize group identity and become emblems of that identity, especially when there is contact with other groups whose ways of being are different. Language, because it is a distinctive characteristic of a group, can become such an emblem, and can be used consciously to define and to re-define social reality, to make claims on participation in interactions and to negotiate the behaviour and goals appropriate to those interactions.

On the other hand, as a result of the contact between group members, shared assumptions about roles and about situations may come to be conventionally signalled through behaviour which is eventually no longer subject to conscious manipulation. In speech communities, that is, communities defined by communicative networks made up of ties between people who talk to each other (Gumperz 1972), ways of behaving become characterized by culturally-constituted conventions. As members

of such communities, people learn to express meanings in culturally conventionalized ways, to use taken-for-granted ways of saying things.

Ethnicity, by helping to define speech communities, contributes to the constitution of subconscious conventions of behaviour specific to the groups. The specific forms of speech may themselves acquire social significance as emblems or stereotypes (Labov 1966) of group identity. Language can be both an emblem of ethnic identity (on the level of language choice as well as on the level of specific forms of speech) and a culturally-conventionalized way of behaving in which assumptions and expectations about interactions are implicitly conveyed.

These two aspects of the relationship between language and ethnicity can be reflected in two levels of the manipulation of language in social interaction which I will refer to as language choice and language use. In language choice what is most salient is the fact of speaking in one language as opposed to any other; in language use the choice of code has been made, and what is salient is the manipulation of conventionally-defined ways of saying things. Put into other terms, in a contact setting there are two levels of language use: one is that of choosing from a set of alternate codes which can possibly (although with greater or lesser degrees of likelihood) be used in an interaction; the other is that of choosing from among sets of alternates within a code (Gumperz 1972). These two ways of looking at verbal behaviour correspond to a distinction maintained in contact settings between inter-group and intra-group interaction.

Choices on these two levels provide indications of the sets of assumptions and expectations speakers bring to an interaction, based on their previous experience of behaviour in social interaction. They are used to establish, through interaction, the frame of reference (Goffman 1974): the set of assumptions and expectations the interlocutors share for the purposes of the interaction. Among other things, they serve to indicate social relationships based on shared or unshared group membership.

In Quebec, the change in the basis of livelihood of ethnic groups has altered the networks of communication that characterized those groups, and has therefore altered the fundamental sets of assumptions and expectations underlying behaviour in everyday life. In order to discover what has happened to language use and language choice in Quebec, it was necessary to undertake an ethnographic study which would reveal the directions of change in the experience people were having of social interaction. Ethnography not only permits an analysis of the crucial encounters of daily life in the institutional or organizational context in which the encounters take place, of the networks and situations in which people participate, but it also reveals the ways in which processes of inclusion, exclusion and interaction work, and the ways in which they change. Furthermore, ethnography reveals the values and beliefs people bring to an interaction. The analysis of behaviour, in this case verbal behaviour, in situated interactions (Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz 1982) provides a means of linking the systematic expression of assumptions and expectations (through emblems and through subconscious conventions) to the outcome of encounters; further, it

provides a means of relating the outcome to future possibilities of access to encounters.

The significance of language choice or language use in an interaction can only be understood in terms of the assumptions and expectations which the participants bring to it. These assumptions and expectations concern the type of encounter (e.g., whether it is a chat, an argument, an evaluation, an interview), the behaviour appropriate to it (e.g., joking, questioning, arguing, silence, explicit presentation of information) and the goal or outcome. That is, they concern what the participants think is going on, how they think they should act given what they think their roles are in the encounter, and given what they think they are trying to accomplish in the exchange. Ethnography provides information about what these assumptions and expectations are likely to be, given the setting and the participants, as well as an idea about how they will be expressed. The actual behaviour in the interaction, as well as the short and long-term outcomes of the interaction, can then be evaluated in the light of this ethnographic information.

A case study seemed necessary, since the methodology involves detailed examination of behaviour in face-to-face interaction in its social context, data which can only be collected from a limited set of people if the researcher is to make any use of them in his or her lifetime. Since this is a case study the conclusions arrived at can only be applied to the rest of the community with caution. However, within the domain of private enterprise the research site chosen (a

large brewery in Montreal) presented a number of characteristics which indicate that it is well-connected with both the francophone and anglophone communities, and is thus a reasonable place in which to look at interethnic relations in Montreal, the most ethnically heterogeneous community in Quebec, and once the financial centre of Canada. Harper's brewery is one of a Canada-wide chain, and a subsidiary of a larger company with diversified holdings in Canada, the United States, and New Zealand. It has a varied clientele and a widespread network of contacts all over Montreal: although wine has gained in popularity recently, and some people drink less beer than others, Montrealers on the whole do drink a lot of beer, and there is a market for it in all neighbourhoods and among all sorts of people. The brewery's labour force is recruited from many different sources, both private and public. Changes in the company's demography, language policy, structure and mode of functioning can be seen to be related to changes in economic, social and political processes affecting not only Montreal, but the wider network of which it is a part. And finally, its restricted physical site made the occurrence of face-to-face interaction more frequent than might have been in a company with sectors scattered all over the city of Montreal and its suburbs.

So the site had all the right elements for a study of interethnic relations in private enterprise, and of the role of language and communication in those relations. I would like now to re-examine some of _my_ assumptions concerning the relationship of language use to processes of group formation, namely: (1) emblems and conventions; (2) the effect of language use on interaction: evaluation and access to

participation in encounters; and (3) the effect of change on behaviour and on interactive processes.

1.1 Emblems and conventions and their relation to ethnic processes

The first question concerns ethnicity; there has been much debate in the past over the nature of ethnicity and over the extent to which the concept can be applied to all types of society. Although it has been maintained that ethnicity can be reduced to an agglomeration of factors or of features (Naroll 1964) it seems more useful for our purposes to approach ethnicity from within the community than from without. That is, it is not necessary to posit territorial separation or distinctive features to be able to talk about ethnic groups. Rather, an ethnic group can be seen as made up of networks of people who share overt culture, and, as a result of regular contact with each other, covert culture as well: they share both emblems of identity and conventions of behaviour. Further, the social organization of an ethnic group entails that its members participate in networks and situations in which non-members may not participate. As well, ethnic group members are bound by right and obligation more tightly to in-group than to out-group members and those rights and obligations may be enacted in daily life in social interaction. Ethnicity may be seen as a form of social organization with concomitant effects on the shared values, beliefs and conventions of its members, and on the processes by which individuals get included, excluded and evaluated as members.

Both Max Weber (1946) and, later, Frederik Barth (1969) discuss ethnic groups as "status groups" (Weber 1946:191) or communities defined by shared notions of what Weber calls "honour" (1946:187), but which can equally well be discussed in terms of shared definitions of reality, shared values and shared interests. From this point of view, ethnicity appears to be an organizing principle for social groups which becomes salient under conditions of contact with other groups, and co-existence with them under what Barth (1969:12) refers to as the same ecological circumstances. That is, a group's overt beliefs, the values attached to upholding those beliefs, and the identity derived from successfully doing so, become important in and of themselves when they are in opposition or contrast to another group with which there is significant contact. It is in this notion of "us" versus "them" that ethnicity resides. There is a notion of a cultural commonality (Hechter n.d.) which is reinforced by daily experience of sharedness with in-group members, and non-sharedness with "others".

The actual manifestations of ethnicity and of interethnic contact may differ from place to place and over time; one of the goals of this study is to discover what ethnicity is for the French and the English in Quebec, and in what ways that is changing as a result of a change in sources of livelihood for each group. Further, it is important to look at the ways in which economic stability in the community affects the relative importance of ethnic and class divisions. That is, it is important to look at the relationship between those changes and differences in styles of life, in the overt and covert forms of culture that are constituted and given meaning in daily life.

There are three major aspects of ethnic groups which should be discussed here: the first has to do with the organization of ethnic groups on the basis of making a living (its economic, social and political organization); the second has to do with their relative success in preserving a degree of stability in the constitution of culture and identity; and the third has to do with the consequences of any changes in a hitherto stable system.

The manifestation of ethnicity as status has implications for the social organization of an ethnic group: a group's shared interests and values are upheld by being acted out in social life. That is, there are roles which members of the group may appropriately enact in given social situations which put social values into play in the life of the community. The enactment of values serves in turn to organize social life, although as Hechter (n.d.) has pointed out, social organization based on shared culture is only one form of organization, which may overlap in varying degrees with organization on the basis of the means of production or of units of consumption. These last two forms of organization constitute class, rather than ethnic, structures. Nonetheless, a characteristic of ethnic groups is the high proportion of interactions with other group members in certain culturally meaningful situations, of which work is an example. Indeed, it is often the case that one finds in a society what Hechter (n.d.:4) has called a "cultural division of labour"; that is, a certain degree of occupational specialization on the basis of ethnic divisions. That specialization may be related to the fact that individual members of a group learn to define success in terms they learn as members of a culture. The

activities they engage in and the goals they pursue often involve not only successful modification of the natural environment, but also of the social environment; success is often dependent upon the help and cooperation of others, and one of the things an individual has to know how to do is how to enlist the help of others in pursuit of a goal. Just as this can be accomplished on the level of individuals, so may groups be mobilized in the pursuit of interest.

The use of language in the enactment of social ties contributes to the conventional expression of beliefs, values, rights and obligations, and to the manipulation of the basic set of assumptions in order to accomplish personal and/or social goals through conversation. On the one hand, then, values are constituted through social interaction, and are also learned in that manner; on the other hand, values and ways of expressing them (of enacting them) which are previously learned become the basis for further action, and the point of departure for subsequent interactions.

In stable situations certain roles may become conventionally associated with the enactment of certain values. Further, that enactment may itself become conventional, that is, the values and meanings of the interaction may be expressed through conventional means.

These conventions can be of several orders. One order is that which Barth has called "diacritical" and which has been referred to here as "emblematic" (DeVos 1975), and which concerns the establishment of certain relatively stable and visible features of life as signs of

identity. Aspects of costume and ritual may become emblems, as may aspects of the linguistic system used by group members. Emblems may change without the group disappearing; they do not, in themselves, define the group. Rather, they are used as emblems of identity and as signs indicating the social values around which the group is organized. Questions that must be asked about emblems, then, are: When and how are they brought into play in social interaction? In what respect can the emblematic and conventional aspects of language interact in conversation? How do emblems and social values interact, especially as social values change?

In interaction the use of language as an emblem is most noticeable in the choice of a code or stereotyped alternate in an interaction where that choice is not normally expected. A switch from an expected to an unexpected variant expresses meanings associated with interactions to which the unexpected variant _is_ appropriate, or expresses meanings related to the discrepancy between the present interaction and the other one; this act of referring to another frame has been called "metaphorical code-switching" (Blom and Gumperz 1972:425) and serves to call into play the assumptions and expectations appropriate to that other frame. Where there is no conventionally understood frame of reference, use of a socially significant alternate calls into question the definition of the rights and obligations of interlocutors as members of ethnic groups; this latter situation characterizes many interactions in Montreal (both inter-ethnic and intra-ethnic), as it would any situation of change, and will be explored in detail in later chapters. It is probably most helpful, however, to discuss first the emblematic

and conventional use of language in stable situations.

Irvine (1974) provides an example of the emblematic and conventional use of language in the enactment of role relationships. In Senegal, among the Wolof, language use in obligatory greeting rituals re-affirms the relative status of interlocutors. Lower-status interlocutors deferentially initiate the routine in high-pitched, loud and rapid speech, and higher-status interlocutors reply quietly, slowly and at low pitch. Of course, the conventions can be manipulated for the purpose of laying claims to roles and statuses which one properly does not have, but which are useful for the accomplishment of conversational, i.e. personal and social, ends. For example, prolonged stalling on the part of the conventionally designated initiator may succeed in forcing the higher-status participant to initiate the routine, so strong is the force of convention that the ritual take place. This has the effect of being a claim on the part of the staller for higher status, and may have as a consequence either the initiation of conflict over the appropriateness of this claim, or the neutralization of status differences if the claim is successful. It is also worth noting that these claims, and negotiations over them, are possible only because the interpretation of the convention is built on the basis of the shared notion of the obligatoriness of the whole interaction. To ignore that obligatoriness would amount to a denial of membership in the group. But only if ignoring becomes a widespread phenomenon could it be interpreted as a denial of group values rather than a denial of group membership.

The display of emblems initially establishes whether or not the interlocutors are in fact appropriate participants in an interaction, and whether or not as a result they share frames of reference, or share assumptions and expectations about the interaction and how to behave in it. The degree to which they are successful in accomplishing their interactive goals is dependent to a large extent on the degree to which they share conventions of expressing interaction related and discourse related meanings (Gumperz 1977; Gumperz and Roberts 1978). Beyond access to participation, then, lie first the negotiation of shared frame of reference (what is the activity the participants are engaged in? what are the respective roles of the interlocutors in the interaction?), and second, the expression of communicative content, of an argument or a point. The degree to which people are seen to be cooperative communicative partners who make sense when they talk is a function, at least in part, of the way in which they express things, and that way is culturally constituted and learned; it governs conventions of role-taking in conversation (turn-taking, interruption, hesitation, opening, closing, agreement or disagreement), and the coherence of an argument or a point. Failure to be seen to be making sense or to be acting as a good conversational partner can have drastic consequences for the outcome of a conversation, and, in the long run, for the life chances of an individual.

Schegloff (1972) provides an example of this from conventionalized greeting routines, in which failure to act out the routine as it is conventionally structured forestalls any possibility of continuing the conversation until the routine has successfully been accomplished.

Anyone who repeatedly failed to go through the routine properly would be seen either as a foreigner, or, if judged as a member of the in-group, as difficult or even crazy. People are, then, judged on the basis of their verbal behaviour: they are categorized as in-group or as out-group members, and evaluated accordingly.

The establishment of the "facts" of the context to an encounter can be seen as a process of negotiation. It is possible to characterize conversational negotiation as consisting of three stages: first, do the interactants have a legitimate claim to participation in the interaction? Second, if so, are they in-group members or out-group members; that is, can they be expected to share conventions of behaviour? (Or, more precisely, which, if any, conventions can they be expected to share, since different conventions may characterize inter-group and intra-group conversation.) If no conventions are shared, what conventions can be established for the purposes of the interaction that will permit the goals of the interlocutors to be accomplished, and who gets to define those conventions? Third, given shared conventions, do the interlocutors communicate what they want to communicate, that is, do they consider the interaction to have been successful?

Thus emblems and conventions can be used to make claims on roles, and can also be used as criteria of evaluation of group members' performance of roles. Their use calls into play the shared framework of social definitions and values, of assumptions about roles and role relations, and of expectations about one's own behaviour and that of

others (Gumperz 1977; Tannen 1979). Emblems and conventions, are not, of course, the only means of calling frameworks into play, but they do contribute to the definition of aspects of behaviour from which other strategies of conveying social information may be created.

This framework of shared assumptions and expectations acts as a means of organizing behaviour within the group, and of maintaining what Barth (1969:15) has called a boundary between groups. The term "boundary" perhaps conveys unnecessary connotations of clear-cut lines, of distinct categories of "us" and "them". While there are most certainly cases of fairly stable configurations of separate groups linked only by a specialized buffer group whose role it is to be the liaison, it is probably most useful to see that configuration as an extreme at one end of a continuum of distinctiveness. The reason for this argument has to do with the process of boundary maintenance and the degree to which it is manipulable and otherwise subject to change.

This process has essentially to do with the restriction of access to participation in social situations; that is, to roles and resources controlled by the ethnic group. The degree to which access is restricted, and the bases and means of restriction, can vary according to social, economic, political and natural circumstances, many of which are beyond the direct control of members of the group. Changes in these variables can alter the degree to which group members can be successful in acting out their style of life, and therefore the degree to which it makes sense to continue their practices, including those practices directly related to processes of inclusion and exclusion. As a result

language can be more or less salient as an emblem, depending on the circumstances, and the importance of its conventional use may change over time as the contact situation changes.

Barth (1969:132-134) discusses the ways in which lack of success in acting out an identity can be manifested in the following terms: the first distinction to be made concerns that between circumstances which threaten an individual's ability to be a good member of a group, and those which threaten a group's collective ability to preserve its identity. An individual who is unable to appropriately and successfully enact the roles to which he or she may want to lay claim may be personally unable (i.e. may not have the intellectual or physical skills necessary to the accomplishment of deeds and behaviours which are socially valued), or may have, through some action or lack of action, so threatened the status order as to be ostracized. In an ethnic situation characterized by contact, the individual has the option of changing identity, of "passing" into the other group. This process may serve to stabilize both groups involved by eliminating deviant members from one group which has no means of dealing with them, and by providing a pool from which groups in need of new members can draw. Passing, of course, requires that individuals learn new ways of behaving in order to successfully manage the new social situations with which they will be confronted (Goffman 1959, 1963). On the other hand, some circumstantial changes are so drastic as to radically alter the basis on which the group exists. Thus, in a contact situation, destabilization can have effects ranging from the re-acculturation of individuals to the breakdown of ethnic social organization, and its re-organization along

one of several lines. Barth suggests three options: (1) group members may seek out an alternate basis on which to carry out their activities; (2) they may pass, or become absorbed individually or collectively into another group; or (3) they may re-organize, and therefore re-define their value system and structure of role relations. It will be my contention that the "seeking out of other fora" (or arenas, or spheres of activity) (Barth 1969:132) often entails re-organization, not only for one ethnic group, but for all the other groups with which it co-exists. However, this may be problematic, since in order to establish control of alternate fora people must be mobilized on the basis of their shared identity and values. When the new basis of existence entails new ways of life, that is, new roles and new values and beliefs, the old framework of social life is necessarily contradicted. A call for collective action in these movements is usually based on an appeal to traditional values and definitions of identity, which may be impossible to realize under the new circumstances. This is the case in Quebec; in later chapters I will discuss the particular sources of conflict in the domain of private enterprise. I will also discuss the consequences of this conflict for the enactment of roles in daily life and for the processes of boundary maintenance which restrict access to those roles.

Processes of boundary maintenance are influenced by the networks of role relations which allow people access to social situations in which their competence as members (or as potential members) can be evaluated. Here again, emblems may act as a basis for preliminary screening, by restricting access to social networks. While access to networks may be

accomplished by the successful use of emblems (whether ascribed or achieved), success in evaluative situations is dependent upon appropriate behaviour and successful use of language and other forms of communicative behaviour in the accomplishment of conversational ends.

Initial screenings, or gate-keeping encounters (Erickson 1976), are institutionalized, and are governed by conventions of behaviour and of criteria of evaluation shared by the gate-keepers, and, in a stable community, by the candidates. One of the arenas of change in Quebec concerns who is going to define those criteria, and whether or not criteria can be found which are acceptable to members of all groups. One domain directly affected is that of work, especially in private enterprise, where there is conflict over the requirements set by the government and by employers for present and prospective employees. There is conflict over whether or not an employer has a right to demand knowledge of a language of an employee, and whether the government has a right to define the limits of acceptable demands, whether there is any acceptable way of measuring that knowledge. That is, change has affected first the criteria by which people may claim legitimate access to participation in networks and situations (e.g., jobs and job interviews), and the criteria are still under negotiation. Further, change has affected definitions of appropriate behaviour, and the sources of those definitions (e.g., what language to speak in an interview or at work, and whether the government or the individual should decide). However, it remains clear that the manipulation of emblems and the use of language is intimately related to the definition of situations and of roles, and therefore to the organization of ethnic

groups, to their overt values and beliefs, and to the covert ways of behaving which form part of the interactive processes which make up members' daily lives.

1.2 The effect of language use on interaction: access to participation and evaluation

This way of looking at processes of inclusion and exclusion of (potential) members into and from ethnic groups is based on Gumperz' (1972) discussion of speech communities as defined by shared norms governing the permissible set of alternates (of possible ways of saying things) in a speech event, or interaction in a given social situation. That is, one of the conventional ways of accomplishing social ends and defining interactional roles and role relations is found in verbal behaviour; social values and other forms of social information are conventionally communicated through the selection of certain forms of language, through the manipulation of socially significant aspects of the verbal repertoire accessible to members of the speech community. Social significance is negotiated in conversation, and is therefore culturally learned. It is negotiated on the basis of what the participants assume and expect about the world, about their roles in it, and about the purpose of the interaction, its outcome and how to achieve it.

This process of negotiation can also be seen as part of the process of entering social networks and social situations. To the extent that participants are able to establish a shared framework of assumptions and expectations, they are able to jointly accomplish the social goals of

their interaction, and to mutually define their roles and role
relations. These relations are durable in a stable community, and allow
for the conventionalization of behaviour and of appropriate interaction.
They may eventually become institutionalized, thus contributing further
to the conventionalization (sharedness) of expectations.

The institutionalization of social networks and of procedures of
evaluating group members has the consequence of contributing, then, not
only to the conventionalization of interaction, but also to the
definition of the social situations of which the interactions are a
part. In small, stable communities, especially, certain behaviours are
expected of certain types of people in certain places, at certain times:
the Wolof greeting ritual (Irvine 1974) is an example of this, as are
the oratorical behaviour of men in Malagasy villages (Keenan 1974), the
hospitality ritual among the Pathan (Barth 1969), and, closer to home,
the behaviour of such people as judges, politicians, doctors and news
announcers acting in their professional capacities in Western society.

However, modern urban industrial society places constraints on the
conventionalization of expectations and of social relations that are not
felt in smaller communities where members regularly interact on a
face-to-face basis (Cook-Gumperz 1981). The bureaucratization of
industrial society has created a situation where evaluation of
candidates in gate-keeping encounters is performed by individuals whom
the candidates have never seen before, and may never see again. This is
further guaranteed by the geographical mobility now associated with this
type of economy. Mobility also entails that members of very different

kinds of groups will be brought together, face-to-face, in gate-keeping encounters the purpose of which is to control access to the kinds of goods and services our society has to offer: jobs, training (education), health care services, legal services, publicity. Members of different groups are also brought into contact in the less formally institutionalized encounters which often form the evidential basis for subsequent judgement of a more structured nature; an example of this might be the daily contacts at work that are used as evidence for judgements about an individual's performance that affect the individual's opportunities for promotion. The problem is compounded in a city like Montreal where social change has propelled people into spheres of activity their families and friends had never known before.

There are potential consequences for the outcome of such bureaucratic interactions that run contrary to the ideology of equality prevalent in democratic societies where claims to participation in situations must be made on the basis of merit. Criteria for evaluation are of necessity defined by the group controlling access to roles and resources (the historical reasons for a group's dominance differ from case to case). In a plural urban industrial society it cannot be assumed that candidates for evaluation will, due to a background shared with the evaluators, share also with them an understanding of the criteria for evaluation and knowledge of the conventional behaviour appropriate to the interactions in which they are being evaluated. That is, there is the possibility of conflict arising from the discrepancy either between different sets of values _and_ different ways of behaving, or between shared values that are expressed differently in behaviour.

As a result, it is not possible to determine at the outset whether or not assumptions and expectations concerning criteria of evaluation are in fact shared. So gate-keeping procedures in plural industrial societies are confronted with three levels of screening: the first has to do with establishing the legitimacy of the petitioner's presence, the second has to do with the degree to which the participants agree about what is going on, and the third has to do with acquiring the information necessary to accomplish the goals of the interaction. The same set of hurdles can be said to pertain to any interaction.

In a society where class and ethnic barriers (as well as other forms of social separation) effectively preserve a separation of social networks and therefore of cultural conventions, there is little chance that members of different groups will have access to knowledge of the conventions of the other groups. Gate-keepers, evaluators, come to interactions with no knowledge of the means by which to interpret the behaviour of candidates; similarly, candidates may not know how to "read" the gate-keeper, let alone present himself or herself in a manner intelligible to the evaluator. Masked by the ideology of equality, there is a structure of self-perpetuating inequality, as those who have no access to the cultural knowledge of the dominant group fail according to the criteria set by that group, in the first sets of encounters that control access to all subsequent opportunities in main-stream society.

As far as Quebec is concerned, ethnic separation perpetuated the cultural differences which have contributed to what has been called the "two solitudes" (Maclennan 1945); the only links between French and

English took the form of individuals who passed, or others who took the role of buffer or of liaison, and who had access to knowledge of appropriate behaviour for the restricted circumstances in which interethnic interaction was necessary. This was not a problem as long as the two groups maintained separate spheres of activity (or rather, it was only a problem for the limited number of people who might have wanted to pass but couldn't). However, industrialization and bureaucratization started off a series of processes leading to a situation more like the one described above, but now, unlike the past, with the French rather than the English as the dominant group. The details of this historical process and its consequences for present-day Quebec society will be discussed in Chapter 2. The point for our present purposes is this: in order to better understand relations between ethnic groups in urban industrial society we must understand that people are evaluated not only in terms of measurable criteria (such as whether or not they have a high-school education, or know how to keep books or operate heavy machinery), but also in terms of culturally-defined criteria that interfere with the entire evaluation process. In addition to the overt, explicit criteria there are implicit criteria related to one's presentation of self as a plausible candidate, as one who shares the same assumptions and expectations as the evaluator, as communicated largely through the use of emblems, and more subtly, through subconscious conventions of behaviour. These criteria are not usually subject to conscious awareness or manipulation, and may lead to the stereotyping that is one conventional form of dealing with interethnic interaction. However, due to the recentness of the change in relations of dominance, many conventions are unclear, so that bases of evaluation

are ambiguous (both for the evaluator and the one evaluated).

As stated above, the way in which these criteria interfere with the evaluation process can take two forms: the first has to do with the definitions of the situation (assumptions about role relations and interactional goal); the second has to do with the conventions of behaviour that affect the relative possibilities of establishing the shared framework of assumptions and expectations in the first place. That is, cultural conventions about roles and role relations and about the interaction as a whole can differ so radically as to prevent the establishment of a shared frame of reference within which interaction would be possible. But even where that absence of agreement is not necessarily the case, differing conventions of behaviour may interfere with the communication of social information necessary to the negotiation of shared frames. Conventions of behaviour (whether verbal or non-verbal) can signal expectations of one sort for one group of people, while for another the same behaviour can signal either nothing at all (i.e., be uninterpretable) or else be conventionally interpreted quite differently (i.e., lead to misunderstanding). This has to do with what Gumperz (1977) has called "conversational inference", that is, the process whereby participants in an interaction interpret the behaviour of their interlocutors, whereby they come to understand not only what the speaker intends in terms of straight exchanges of information, but also in terms of what he or she expects of the role relations and of the interactional goal. Conversational inference is, then, the process by which interlocutors can negotiate shared frames of reference, and in terms of that shared frame can accomplish the social goal that they set

out to accomplish in the interaction. It is a process which depends on the multi-level, and often ambiguous, presentation of information through behaviour; it depends on the establishment of coherent relationships between different kinds of information which are simultaneously encoded in different forms and channels of behaviour.

Research has shown that contextual information (information about what the participants think is going on) is conveyed not only at the level of social identity and social activity in the larger sense, but also at the level of discourse structure and interlocutor cooperation, through the many different levels of linguistic, paralinguistic and non-verbal behaviour (Birdwhistell 1972; Chafe 1974; Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz 1982; Erickson 1976a,b; Gumperz 1977; Gumperz and Roberts 1978; Kempton 1977; Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974). The fact that many channels are open simultaneously provides for potential ambiguity which may or may not be exploited by participants. One factor influencing the outcome of interethnic interaction in Montreal is precisely the extent to which participants focus on one or another level of contextual information. That which determines whether or not participants know at which level to focus and/or share the same ideas about what aspects of context are relevant is the extent to which interaction between groups has led to the establishment of conventions governing communicative behaviour. It is particularly important to be aware of whether the two (or more) groups in contact share behavioural conventions for all domains of social activity or only for those situations in which they interact. Given the sort of organizational separation which characterizes multi-ethnic communities, the latter case

is more likely to occur than the former.

Confining ourselves to a consideration of verbal behaviour alone, it is clear that language is used to convey (among other things) contextual information. That contextual information (and the language conveying it) is multi-level: it contains references to the social definition of the situation and to the roles and role relations enacted in it, and it contains references to the discourse itself, to its role in the social interaction. One variable to attend to, then, is the degree to which the information conveyed at all levels is congruent, and to which the participants attend to the same levels and interpret similarly where there is incongruence in the information being conveyed.

1.3 The effect of change on language use and on interactive processes

In a period of change in a contact situation two levels of change occur: the first level is related to the shift in relations between groups, and consists of altered assumptions and expectations about inter-group interaction, about the roles members of different groups may play, their relationship to each other, and, finally, about the behaviour appropriate to the changing situation. All this is a result, of course, of changes in the ways in which access and control of social situations is ascribed on the basis of group membership, and therefore has implications for changes in social definitions of situations (and therefore of group boundaries), and of group membership and social identity. This entails the second kind of change, which refers to

changes in the basis of social identity, and therefore in the behaviour appropriate to the newly re-defined situations as well as in the behaviour expected from the members of the re-defined groups in their new social roles. These two kinds of change influence each other and are mutually reinforcing (or weakening, in the case of failure to fulfill new expectations).

These re-definitions must be understood in terms of the ethnic group as a unit, and in terms of the identities and behaviour of members as members of this group. The first implications of this kind of change are for intra-ethnic interaction, and the second implications are for interethnic interaction. When assumptions are shared, of course, the interpretation of stylistic information in conversation is not problematic, and forms part of the re-affirmation of social identity. Otherwise, when frames are not shared, such a frame must be negotiated in conversation (Heller 1982). This latter form of interaction constitutes interaction on the level of social significance and must take place in order for conventions to be established. In other words, the establishment of role relations is intimately connected to the ability to convey stylistic or expressive meaning.

This study is a look at these two levels of change. It begins with an examination of the historical origins of the social, economic and political changes that altered the bases of ethnic group organization and group identity in Quebec. It discusses the way in which language acquired political and social significance as an emblem of group membership and as a symbol around which to organize political

mobilization, and it discusses its use as a tool in the evaluation of group members in order to control access to social situations and to social roles. It focusses on the impact of these changes on the social domain of private enterprise, and specifically on the brewery which was the research site chosen as an example of this domain. It examines the relationship between these changes and the conventions of behaviour that constitute social organization and social relations. Finally, it explores what happens to those conventions in times of change, and the ways in which language is used to re-define frames of reference and therefore to re-define social situations, social roles and social identity.

This re-definition leads to a re-constitution of conventions of behaviour along new group lines. It can therefore lead to new conventions of conveying stylistic information, and new conventions of conveying social information, in interethnic and in intra-ethnic interaction. Since in a period of change the frames on which conventions are based must be re-negotiated, a collapsing of social and stylistic significance can often be observed, sometimes accompanied by the conversational repair work (Polanyi 1978; Jefferson 1973) necessary to the avoidance of misunderstanding. Put in other terms, the lack of knowledge of shared frames results in an uncertainty as to the frame to which a speaker intended to refer, an uncertainty reinforced by the inherent ambiguity in the communication. In this case of change the social and stylistic frames are sometimes congruent and sometimes not; further, a speaker's purpose may be to greater or lesser degrees social. Part of the analysis here will concern the circumstances under which

social and stylistic information converge or diverge, and the conversational and social consequences of the degree of congruence of these two different aspects of frame of reference.

1.4 The fieldwork

The fieldwork at Harper's brewery on which this study is based was carried out by myself and three research assistants (two men and one woman) in two parts, the first being a period from August 1979 to December 1979, and the second taking place in July 1980. The first part was devoted to the following activities:

(1) A one-month period of observation, interviewing and examination of company and provincial government documents pertaining to the company's history, structure and functioning, to its language profile and policies, and to its negotiations with the provincial government over those language policies and their implementation. The initial questions were: What types of change have occurred in the brewery (technological, demographic, structural, etc)? What is the brewery's official picture of itself? What is its structure? What are its goals? What are its policies? Who works here? What do they do? What language(s) do they speak, read and write? And we began to ask: What is daily life at the brewery like?

2) The second stage was most centrally directed at this last question, and consisted of a period of participant observation which differed in length for each one of us. I worked as a helper in the

Quality Control Laboratories for three months, from September to November. Two of my research assistants worked briefly (for about two weeks) on the delivery trucks, and the third for a month as secretary to the manager of the warehouse. In October and November my research assistants returned to observation, interviewing and examination of documents (especially of those forms which are used in the daily functioning of the brewery) in the sector of the company which had come to interest us the most: Production.

3) The third period of the study was devoted to final interviews with people occupying certain key posts or pertinent statuses (for example, anglophones who were unable to be promoted because of insufficient knowledge of French, or young francophones who were particularly active in implementing the shift from English to French technical terminology), and to the administration of a questionnaire to a small but representative sample of employees which was designed to discover patterns of language choice, communication networks, and attitudes towards language use and language policy. The anglophones were somewhat overrepresented in this sample in order to get some generalizable information about this group. In this period I also began to make tape-recordings of natural conversation in two of the three laboratory divisions in which I worked; these recordings cover both talk at work and during coffee breaks.

The final part of the fieldwork took place in July, 1980. I returned alone to the brewery, and concentrated my work on the Production sector. I spent several weeks with employees at all

hierarchical levels, spending the day with them, in some cases interviewing them informally, and making tape-recordings of the natural conversation which took place in their workplaces over the course of the day.

The tape-recordings, along with conversational data noted in field notes from situations where tape-recording was impossible, and along with notes on written forms of language use, serve as the primary data which are analyzed here in their social context. For this reason they are presented at the end of the study, so that the reader may look at them having already come to understand something about the significance of language use and of language choice in the brewery, as in the larger community in which it is found.

A word of caution -- because of the highly sensitive nature of sociolinguistic fieldwork in Quebec, the intensive ethnic categorization process applied to all newcomers and the fact that this study was funded by the provincial and federal governments, it is certainly fair to say that we were not able to be neutral observers. On the other hand, the necessity most people felt to discuss language, ethnicity and politics with us is in itself highly indicative, pointing to the importance of those issues in daily life in Quebec.

1.5 Outline of the study

The presentation is organized, then, to provide first the historical and ethnographic background with reference to which the role

of language is discussed. Chapter 2 contains the historical background of French-English contact, and shows how the social domains over which each group has had control have changed. There are two primary foci: one is the effect of social change on private enterprise and the position of francophones and of anglophones in that domain, and the other is change in the role and significance of language choice and language use in Quebec social life. Finally, the implications of social change for language use in private enterprise will be outlined.

Chapter 3 is a short description of the linguistic repertoire of Montreal -- a discussion of socially significant features and of the social groups which use them. These features may be markers (in Labov's sense as a reflection of group membership of which those members are unaware [1972:180]) or they may be stereotypes (to which social values are consciously attached [Labov 1972:150]).

Chapter 4 is specifically concerned with the brewery which is the focus of this study. The 200 year history of Harper's is intimately tied to that of Quebec, and especially to that of Montreal. While the period up to the Second World War is not without relevance, the period following the War is much more pertinent to the present situation. For that reason the chapter will treat the social and economic changes which have occurred since the mid 1950s, and their effects on the demography of the work force in the brewery, on its hiring , firing and promotion policies, and on its language policies. The chapter also contains a synchronic ethnographic description of the brewery, including communication networks, both external and internal, spoken and written;

the organization of the brewery, both functional and hierarchical; and the physical lay-out and its relationship to communication networks. It discusses the various social situations which make up daily life in the brewery, and the communicative needs (for spoken and written French and/or English) of the various groups of employees in terms of the situations in which they participate.

Chapter 5 concerns the actual use of language in certain key situations in the brewery, and the way in which that use is influenced by and influences changes in interethnic relations, ethnic boundaries, and the access of members of ethnic groups to jobs and to decision-making situations in the workplace.

In Chapter 5 two major patterns of language use are discussed. The first pattern consists of language choices -- when and how English and French are used in interaction. The second pattern consists of choices between linguistic variants within French, variants which can be described as either Quebec French or standard (European) French. In both cases the purpose is to discover what the social meaning and value of alternates is and how that may be changing.

In most studies of linguistic vriation inferences regarding the social value of alternates are made on the basis of statistical correlations between the occurrence of alternates in the sample and the (generally ordinal) social and stylistic factors which form the sample's context. Due to the nature of the samples in this study, however, such quantification is inappropriate. Since we are dealing with a range of

activity types, only some of which may correspond to hierarchical stratification, and since for each participant we are focussing on only a limited set of the activities he or she may participate in, the samples are not comparable across the board. Further, since we can assume a certain degree of variability in Quebec French (on the basis of the studies of Montreal French carried out by D. Sankoff, G. Sankoff, Cedergren and others; see Chapter 3) it is not clear that variability per se will be at all significant. Rather, it will be important to discover whether the French spoken at Harper's includes Quebec French or European French features at all, again, assuming a certain degree of variability (the extent of which unfortunately would not provide significant information here). Two aspects of the occurrence of these features will, however, be considered significant: (a) in the restricted number of situations which can be hierarchically stratified, categorical occurrence vs. non-categorical occurrence of a variant which occurs elsewhere will be considered an indication of a tendency towards social stratification, especially if in other cases: (b) the same person uses more than one variant in demonstrably different social interactions (e.g., in heated discussion with a colleague vs. answering the telephone, where personal as opposed to positional factors can be seen to be important).

Chapter 6 is an attempt to put it all together: to analyze the patterns of language use described in Chapter 5 in terms of the background assumptions which the participants bring to an interaction. These background assumptions are informed by what the participants know about their community and about their workplace, and also by what they

know about the social significance of language choice and of other aspects of the linguistic systems (codes) used in the community. Along with these background assumptions, patterns of language use are influenced by the intent to accomplish something in conversational interaction. Whether that intent is personal or social it has an effect on the relationship between individuals as individuals and between individuals as members of groups; the degree and kind of interpersonal contact forms the basis of formation of social networks, and therefore of formation of group boundaries and inter-group and intra-group relations. This chapter, then, ties together the level of language use in social interaction to the level of processes of group formation and group relations.

1.6 Social change

What we are witnessing in Montreal is a situation where change has altered the bases of groups' livelihoods, and therefore their contact with their environment. Background assumptions cannot be taken for granted for two reasons: first, change has brought French and English into contact in situations where previously they did not interact, such as the management level of private enterprise; second, change has created new situations with which neither the French nor the English have had any previous experience. Interaction in new situations under new conditions leads to uncertainty as to how to behave; interlocutors of different backgrounds have different expectations, and furthermore there is a lack of conventions regarding new situations. The extent to which interlocutors are successful in negotiating shared frames of

reference, as well as the content of these frames, are indications of the new definitions of social situations and social roles, and of the re-organization of ethnic groups internally as well as with respect to each other in the community.

This is, fundamentally, an exploration of the relationship between social (especially verbal) behaviour, social relations, social organization and the environment in which groups live and which they often consider their property. This is a dynamic relationship, a social process of creating and re-creating the world in which we live. In this study I have tried to examine the workings of that process in the verbal interaction of one small group of people, and to derive from an understanding of that process an understanding of their world, of the way in which it is changing, and of the way in which they themselves are contributing to the direction of change.

Chapter 2

Ethnic Relations and Language in Quebec 1760-1982

2.0 Introduction

This chapter concerns the history of the contact between French and English in Montreal, in the context of the political, economic and social processes that have affected their ways of life and the nature of their contact. In writing this I have been most concerned with the organizational bases of the two groups, and with the events and processes that have influenced their relative access to power and control of roles and resources in their communities. In the second section of this chapter I have outlined the impact of contact on patterns of language use, from language policy to patterns of diglossia and bilingualism. The purpose of both sections is to arrive at an idea of the extent to which contact produced acculturation (in either direction) and, further, to understand how and why language has come to be the major emblem around which the political mobilization of francophones has occurred. Finally, this chapter will set up a framework within which to understand the social and stylistic significance of aspects of language use in Quebec today.

2.1 A short history of ethnic relations in Quebec

Interethnic relations in Quebec today are influenced by patterns set up at the outset of contact between French and English in the area. That contact was itself affected by the state of affairs in Quebec from the start of colonization. The French first arrived in Quebec in the early sixteenth century, but permanent settlements were not established successfully until the beginning of the seventeenth century, when several sites (many of them Indian villages) were occupied up and down the St. Lawrence river, and in what are now the Maritime provinces on the Atlantic coast.

The colony of New France remained under French control until the British conquered it during the Seven Years' War (1756-1763). The social structure of New France was characterized by divisions between the rural landless peasants, the landowning seigneurs, the various ranks of the Catholic Church, the administrative elite, and the largely urban middle class of merchants and professionals. At the periphery of society and yet simultaneously its life-blood were the trappers and explorers and traders, some of whom became known as the <u>coureurs de bois</u> (the runners of the woods); the wealth of the society was built on the fur trade, wealth that the landless peasants saw little of. Their presence in New France was a product of a combination of factors: lack of opportunity in France (most of the settlers were from the poorer areas of northern and western France) and the need to legitimate a French presence in the New World. The Catholic Church played a central role in this legitimation; it is also of interest that the Church managed to gain such a strong hold on temporal power in New France at a time when, in Europe, it was beginning to lose this power to secular and

bureaucratic institutions.

The persistent effect of the structure of New French society on post-conquest Quebec was the entrenchment of Church control over all aspects of social life among the French; all institutions were Church institutions (except in politics, and even there the Church's influence was not always absent), and most domains of social life were influenced by Church organization. This tendency was actually strengthened by the British conquest, since one result of that conquest was the return to France of part of the French secular elite (officials, soldiers and some nobles), and the radical change in status of those land-owners, merchants and professionals who stayed behind, while the position of the clergy was left largely unchanged (Wade 1968:50). Eventually, with the Quebec Act of 1774, the British agreed to guarantee the continued existence of French institutions, especially of the Church. The British were primarily interested in the fur trade; aside from administration, the British were predominantly engaged in commercial activities more or less directly involving this trade: the investment of wealth produced by it, and the conduct of trade with other British colonies in North America and the Caribbean, and with the mother country. The Protestant British were town-dwellers: they were administrators, soldiers, merchants, bankers, and businessmen of varying other sorts. The remaining French were divided into three main groups: the higher clergy and landed seigneurs, the peasants (or habitants, i.e. inhabitants, as they called themselves) whose lives were largely controlled by this first group, and a small group of shop-keepers, entrepreneurs, and professionals (doctors, lawyers and notaries, for the most part). This

latter group often also included the lower ranks of the clergy, the parish priests. While the British from time to time thought to assimilate the French, it was soon recognized that it would be more useful to make an alliance with the controlling elite, in order to easily mobilize the whole group when necessary; in other words, to exploit the existing structure, and to insure its loyalty by granting rights to the elite to continue in its position of power (to collect tithes, own land, practice its religion, etc.)(MacNaught 1969).[1]

Thus from the very beginning of the co-existence of French and English in Quebec there was a separation of groups, a separation manifested in different social organization and separate control of social institutions. Their sources of livelihood differed: the French engaged in agriculture, small business, and in the service occupations of towns and of the fur trade, as well as in the Church; the British engaged in trade, commerce and administration. They differed in their sources of prestige or status: success in French culture meant success in the Church or in the professions, either of which necessitated access to and good performance in Church-run educational institutions; for the English, on the other hand, success meant success in business. The separation of social organization was re-inforced by geographical separation: the French occupied rural areas, and the English occupied the towns. This separation of communities would in any case imply a development of separate speech communities; the fact that the two groups spoke different languages did nothing to attenuate the distance between groups.

This basis in separation, maintained in part by the liaison role of the French elite, has persisted until very recently, despite having gone through some fundamental transformations in its manifestation in social organization. Indeed, while the recent transformations have been important, they seem to have reinforced the notion of separation, or at least, to have brought it to the fore as one of the central problems of modern Quebec society. Nevertheless, fundamental changes have occurred in the basis of separation and in the nature of French/English relations.

There were several sources of change over the course of the history of French/English contact. One source was the rise of struggles for democracy and independence, the most important of which for Canada was that in the thirteen British colonies to the south. Canada failed to join in the American Revolution for several reasons, including the fact that the commercial interests of the British traders were probably best served by the colonial regime (to join with the Americans would have been to admit them into competition, and to give up any claim to exclusive rights in the area to the west of Quebec). Another factor concerned the French, the interests of whose elite were guaranteed by the British, and would probably not have been by the Americans.

Canadian lack of interest in participating in the American Revolution, and the American failure to take Canada by force either in that war or in the War of 1812, contributed to the consolidation of Canada as a separate entity. The character of this territory also began to take on a rather conservative colour, partly in reaction to the

Americans; this was reinforced by the arrival in Canada of the United
Empire Loyalists, those Americans who had opposed independence.

This new political entity began also to change demographically and
politically after the arrival of the Loyalists. Quebec was divided into
two zones in 1791; Lower Canada included Montreal and all the territory
inhabited by the French, and within it the guarantees of the Quebec Act
were respected; Upper Canada lay to the west, and was an English
province. Upper Canada was dependent on Lower Canada for a path to the
sea for imports and exports, so the position of the Montreal English
merchants was consolidated. However the building of canals to the
Hudson seaway was later to strengthen the position of Upper Canada.
Various Upper Canadian attempts at union with Lower Canada were resisted
by French and English Lower Canada elites alike, especially after
continuing immigration from the British Isles contributed to a growing
demographic imbalance; Canada had started out a French province, but the
English, especially in Upper Canada, grew to equal and then outnumber
the French over the course of the nineteenth century. Added to this was
geographic expansion westward, an English expansion which engulfed the
French communities of the west; the English eventually not only
outnumbered the French but also controlled a vastly greater amount of
territory (Keyfitz 1960; Wade 1968; McNaught 1969). The continued
existence, until very recently, of French communities outside Quebec is
largely attributable to their isolation (Joy 1972).

Thus the context of the relationship between French and English was
continually being re-defined in terms of demography and in terms of

political and economic power. Still, the central theme of Canadian politics, which was established so early on in the separation and different development of Upper and Lower Canada, is one that is still being played out today, albeit against a different background. The three power groups, the English elites of Ontario and Quebec, and the French elite of Quebec, have at various times vied for power or shared it, according to the degree to which they held interests in common.

Another factor has contributed to the metamorphosis of French/English relations, although it did not alter the fundamental nature of those relations. Industrialization in the mid nineteenth century, combined with over-population in the countryside, resulted in an exodus of francophones from the country to the industrial areas, primarily to Montreal, and to the textile mills of southern Quebec and of New England. Still, it was not until the late nineteenth century that French immigration from the countryside to Montreal shifted the demographic proportions and made that city predominantly French (Keyfitz 1960:131). The fate the French Canadian emigrants met differed according to which region they went to: in the United States, as is well known, they were eventually assimilated, despite the persistence of some francophone communities in certain parts of New England (Joy 1972: 70-72); in Quebec, however, and especially in Montreal, they formed the bulk of the urban working class, providing the labour for new industries owned by the anglophones, but rarely coming to occupy management or ownership positions themselves. A case study of an industrialized town in Quebec immediately before the Second World War showed that 94% of the workers in the town's textile mills were French, less than 33% of the

foremen were French, and only one staff member at the management level
(a doctor) was French (Hughes 1943). Those francophones who did rise
were largely drawn from the francophone elite, and often achieved access
to those positions at the expense of becoming anglicized. Thus class
distinctions within the francophone community were superimposed on
ethnic relations. Put in other terms, the cultural division of labour
(Hechter n.d.) was mainly hierarchical, in that English occupations had
greater prestige than French occupations (as reflected partly through
income). Further, even the few members of the French population who
were in prestigious professional occupations were outranked by their
English counterparts in the same professions. The general population
often felt, for example, that the quality of medical care at anglophone
hospitals was superior to that at French hospitals. (It is difficult to
judge to what extent this opinion was founded; it is possible that the
different types of education, different role of medicine, different
sources of financial support and the differing degree of closeness to
centres of theoretical and technical innovation, most of which were in
the anglophone United States, did make a difference at least to the rate
of change and to the degree of technological sophistication in each of
the two groups of institutions.) This remained true by and large until
the Second World War: what we are seeing now is the upheaval of that
old order of things. Most notably, anglophone control over the domain
of private enterprise was a characteristic of Quebec society that only
recently has come under the influence of social change.

The particular lines of development of Canadian social and
political structure have simultaneously entrenched the separation of

francophones in the protection of their special interests, and made it difficult for them to protect or use those privileges without going through their own elite. Indeed, what those special interests often amounted to was a preservation of the interests of those French elites, through the preservation of their institutional power base.

However, the creation of legislative assemblies in 1791 provided the French in Quebec with a political instrument which could be used against the English elite. Both the French in Lower Canada and the English bourgeois in Upper Canada found that they were excluded from power by the cliques of English merchants who had the governor's ear and who were interested only in their own commercial success. The disaffection of the excluded groups, although originating in different problems and points of view, provided for a common cause which led directly to the Rebellion of 1837. It is important to note, however, that in each region the rebellion was manifested in different forms: in Quebec, it took the form primarily of French nationalism, and although its leadership was drawn from the bourgeois professional classes, it had a power base in the countryside among peasants and parish priests. The Legislative Assembly was an instrument designed to anglicize the French or to increase the power of the English Quebecers, but became a means of mobilizing the French in the pursuit of their own interests. In this sense, at least, the French leaders of the rebellion are the spiritual ancestors of the present government in Quebec (Clift and Arnopoulos 1979).

However, the results of the rebellion were mixed; on the one hand, it led to increased democratization, but on the other, it led to the union of Upper and Lower Canada in 1840, thereby swamping the French in an English sea. The particularly Canadian tensions of federalism have in many ways not changed since then with its built-in conflict and the necessity for compromise in east/west, French/English, and federal/provincial relations. Tensions have also often been exacerbated by an underlying belief in Anglo-Saxon "racial" superiority, and in the benefit to the French of assimilation to the Anglo-Saxon way of life.

Processes of reform, encouraged by developments in Britain, and strengthened by the opposition of the middle class to the old commercial elite, combined in various ways to undermine not only the political, but also the economic, power base of that elite. The position of the Montreal English was particularly threatened by British failure to protect its commercial interests in London; further, the building of railways and canals from the Great Lakes to the Hudson shook their former supremacy as controllers of the only path of trade from the interior to Europe and the Caribbean. Here, in the mid nineteenth century, began the modern version of the struggle for control over Canada's natural resources and the trade routes which make them profitable, a struggle which is central to ethnic relations.

The English were, in the end, able to adapt to the change in the economic order of things, and used the railway, just as they had used the seaway, as a means of acquiring wealth and power. Similarly, they began to use the government of the new confederation (first of the Union

of the Canadas, and later of the Confederation after independence in 1867) just as they had used their former colonial governors. The federal government became more the preserve of the English than the French, while the reverse was true of the provincial assembly in Quebec, despite the presence in the federal government of those members of the educated francophone group who felt that French interests could be furthered by collaboration with the other power groups in the country.

This essential balance was maintained throughout the gradual process of westward expansion, democratization, and, finally, in 1867, independence and confederation. The British North America Act, which codified the terms under which Canada was to have its independence, effectively brought under English control access to financial and federal bureaucratic institutions (Guindon 1978). Added to these processes was that of immigration, which at about the time of confederation began to change in character. Waves of immigration from areas other than the British Isles started to change the demographic composition of the Canadian population. Most importantly for our purposes, these non-British immigrants, including those who settled in Quebec, eventually assimilated to some degree to the anglophone population, although they were rarely able to break into the informal networks that held access to the real centres of power and decision-making.

In Quebec, most immigrants settled in Montreal, rather than in the countryside or in any of the other urban centres. They occupied neighbourhoods in the middle of the city, between the English western

half and the French East End. Many of them went into industrial or service occupations where they had contact with both anglophones and francophones; many of these first generations of immigrants were bilingual. However, it had been made clear to them that in order to get jobs English was necessary; the French they learned was the result, rather, of daily contacts in entry-level jobs. As the immigrants became upwardly mobile they tended to move west into predominantly English neighbourhoods; further, their children, in English schools, never really learned French at all. There are two principal reasons for the fact that immigrants preferred English schools to French. For the non-Catholics there was in fact no choice, since they were usually denied access to Catholic schools and most of the non-Catholic schools were English. The Irish presence resulted in the existence of English Catholic schools, however, so even Catholic immigrants could get access to English education, an education that was desirable, in fact necessary, to achieve upward mobility in North American society. Upward mobility came through access via education to the management level of the private sector, through industry and business, and that type of education and that level of the private sector were English. It has been noted that up until the 1960s English-speakers had far greater chances of upward mobility than had French-speakers, who were relatively less skilled and less educated, even if they were in the same industry (Porter 1965:96-97). English was the language of work, not only in Quebec but in all of North America; this was to become increasingly important after World War II, when increased communications led to greater geographical mobility. English was also the language of education for immigrants, and therefore of opportunity. It is not

altogether surprising, then, that the immigrants should have chosen to learn English as a means of getting access to the primary sources of wealth on this continent.

The English, then, recruited members largely by means of immigration, first from the newly independent United States, then from the British Isles, and then from other parts of Europe and from Asia and Africa. Those whose mother tongue was not English learned English, and so did their children. The French, on the other hand, did not recruit; rather, they increased their population by means of one of the highest birth rates in the world, certainly the highest in North America; this has been called "la revanche des berceaux" -- the revenge of the cradles. A drastic drop in that birth rate, coupled with an increase in the rate of immigration, were among the consequences of the socio-economic changes that began with the Second World War, and which played a dramatic role in the collective "prise de conscience" that took place in Quebec in the early 1960s (Lachapelle and Henripin 1980).

In order to understand these changes it is necessary to understand two phenomena that fed off each other to produce the present situation. The first phenomenon has to do with the industrial economic boom of the post-war age and the communications boom that accompanied it. As a result of industrial expansion, the West, with its abundant natural resources, became an increasingly attractive source of wealth. Montreal and Toronto became involved in a struggle for control over these natural resources and the industries that exploit them, and eventually, by the 1960s, Toronto prevailed. The outcome was a shift in the centres of

decision-making to the west, closer to the natural sources of wealth. For the anglophone businessmen of Montreal, then, the west, or at least Toronto, became a more attractive place to be. Many companies acquired branches or subsidiaries in the West, often using experienced Montreal personnel in staffing those branches; many companies finally found it more reasonable to move their head offices out of Montreal, taking with them much of their management and office personnel, and leaving behind a stripped-down Montreal branch, itself often in need of staff. As Clift and Arnopoulos put it:

> "Déjà vers 1930, Toronto prenait le dessus sur Montréal
> comme centre financier, grâce à l'expansion industrielle
> du sud de l'Ontario... Un leadership faible et un manque
> d'initiative à Montréal donnèrent lieu à maintes
> occasions perdues, comme le développement de l'Abitibi
> qui fut laissé entre les mains de promoteurs de
> Toronto... Les élites financières et industrielles de
> Montréal devinrent tout simplement des intermédiaires
> entre les principaux centres de décision situés à Toronto
> et la main-d'oeuvre comme le marché québécois... La
> stagnation locale qui résulte du déplacement des centres
> d'activité économique pousse un nombre croissant de
> personnes à s'interroger sur la nature des liens qui
> unissent le Québec au reste du pays... La situation [des
> anglophones] devint peu à peu intenable. [Around 1930
> Toronto was already getting the upper hand over Montreal
> as a financial centre due to the industrial expansion of
> southern Ontario. Weak leadership and lack of initiative
> in Montreal led to many lost opportunities, such as the
> development of Abitibi [a region rich in lumber and
> minerals], which was left in the hands of promoters from
> Toronto... The financial and industrial elites of
> Montreal became simply intermediaries between the
> principal centres of decision-making in Toronto and the
> Montreal labour force and market... The local stagnation
> which resulted from the displacement of centres of
> economic activity led a growing number of people to
> question the nature of the ties between Quebec and the
> rest of the country... The situation [of the
> anglophones] little by little became
> untenable]."(1979:152-153)[2].

Some anglophones left in order to be in the centre of activity; others

retained their old positions of control in Montreal without the real economic power that made that position legitimate. As a result many Quebecers began to feel that there was no reason for the anglophones to have exclusive access to what were, after all, new kinds of positions in an increasingly regionalised network. The intermediaries were no longer necessary. Further, French Canadians ceased being able to seek low-level jobs outside Quebec, since those jobs were disappearing, or it was becoming uneconomical for employers to hire them; yet, at the same time those French Canadians were able, for the first time, to acquire the skills and education necessary to upward mobility within their own region.

The provincial government had become increasingly powerful, and in the 1950s began to struggle with the Church for control of social institutions and of policy. Further, in the 1960s the government made an effort to shift the balance of the Quebec industrial economy from one based on labour to one based on capital and technology. As a result, the previously necessary large working class was free to explore new avenues (Clift and Arnopoulos 1979:230), and were encouraged to do so by the increased democratization of the educational system and the addition to that system of many more institutions of higher education and of technical training. The decline in the power of the Church, the increase in prosperity, the establishment of universal access to education, all this began to broaden the horizons of the French, giving rise to a new sense of social mobility. Both creating and channelling this mobility was the increase in bureaucratization of the provincial government, as it acquired more power; through education and the civil

service there arose the beginnings of a new French middle class, a class which had previously scarcely existed. The same bureaucratization had the effect of placing under government control not only the French institutions previously run by the Catholic Church, but also those parallel English institutions controlled by the English business community. A major tie holding that financial elite to the community was thereby broken, possibly facilitating the departure to Toronto of the major English financial institutions (Clift and Arnopoulos 1979:135-136).

Along with rising expectations of what society had to offer, the francophones experienced a sudden drop in birth rate. Demographic studies reveal that while the francophone population was plummeting, the anglophone population was increasing, partly by recruiting immigrants, but also through "language transfers", the passing of individual francophones into the anglophone group, mainly through intermarriage. Added to the drop in birth rate and an increase in immigration was an increase in language transfers, as revealed in the Canadian census data of 1961 and 1971 (Government of Quebec 1972; Veltman 1976; Castonguay 1977; Lachapelle and Henripin 1980). The figures on language transfers showed that an ever-larger proportion of Quebec's population which counted French as its mother tongue reported that the language spoken at present at home and at work was English. In a parallel fashion, native speakers of French outside Quebec were rapidly adopting English as their working language in ever-increasing numbers (Lieberson 1971; Joy 1972; Arnopoulos 1982). There were thus three sources of change which led up to the period of francophone political mobilization in the 1960s: 1)

the drop in French birth rate; 2) the increase in non-francophone immigration, and the tendency of these immigrants to adopt English as their second language; and 3) the increase in assimilation of the French to the English. Further, these demographic studies reveal that a social stratification of ethnic groups by income, according not only to ethnic identification but also to language use (differentiating primarily monolingual anglophones and francophones from English/French bilinguals), placed monolingual francophones close to the bottom of the social scale, well below monolingual anglophone and bilingual immigrants. Further, bilingual francophones did far worse than bilingual or even monolingual anglophones. Finally, after World War II, anglophones began to leave Montreal for better economic opportunities in the West and in the United States, while francophones came to the city as industry became a more important source of livelihood and as educational opportunities became more available. As a result, Montreal has become increasingly French in the past forty years (Lachapelle and Henripin 1980:76-86), although French and English continued to inhabit different regions of the city, the English living in the west-central neighbourhoods, and the French in the east and around the periphery.

Gradually, the values of francophones changed to more nearly resemble anglophone and immigrant values; they began to measure success in the same way. But in terms of those values they were doing, as a group, very badly. The civil service, the one small avenue for francophone upward mobility, quickly became saturated; the new education system was producing more skilled and educated francophones than the economy, skewed to the entry of anglophones, could absorb. The French,

as a group, were starting to fall into disarray; no longer able to lead their lives in the traditional manner, they were also denied access on a collective basis to the social domains controlled by the anglophones. Demographic evidence showed not only a decline in birth rate but an increase in the rate of language transfer. Further, native speakers of French, especially the monolinguals, had much lower average incomes than almost any other group (Breton and Grant 1981:8). This situation goes a long way towards explaining language transfer (or passing). However, this was not an effective solution for the mass of Quebec francophones, who did not have access to English, and who therefore were faced with the classic Barthian dilemma: to permit the disintegration of their society and its eventual assimilation by the English, to give up their new aspirations, or to mobilize as a group and to gain access to fora where they would be able to control the means of livelihood themselves (Barth 1969:132-134). The direction taken, that of political mobilization, was made possible in part by the opening up of private enterprise and other social domains due to the departure of anglophones and to the increased strength of the power of the francophone-controlled provincial government. That government provided francophones with the instrument of mobilization; what was needed was a definition of an ideology around which to mobilize. As we shall see, language rapidly came to figure prominently in that ideology.

Mobilization began in the early 1950s with what was called "la revolution tranquille", the quiet revolution. The slogan of this "revolution" was "maîtres chez nous": masters in our own home. The stated goal was the mobilization of ethnic French Quebecers in the

pursuit of power and control over what they defined as their territory, the province of Quebec. Put in other terms, the mobilizers intended that the French not only gain access to all domains of social life in Quebec, but also that they dictate the terms and conditions of access for themselves and for everybody else. As with many other mobilizations of this sort, there were many levels at which disagreement could, and did, take place.

One level was that of frame of reference; the Québécois could mobilize on the basis of a claim of control over territory (i.e. resources) which they said was rightfully theirs. The legitimation of that claim was based on a historical argument of priority, and a social one of differentiation, as well as the political argument of democracy: by defining Quebec as the arena, they could prevail by weight of numbers translated into votes, a powerful argument given that the population was already ideologically committed to democracy. However, not everyone agreed that it was possible or right to define Quebec as the arena; rather, interest or ideology often dictated that Canada be taken as the frame of reference. Within the Canadian context, the French are a minority and therefore politically relatively helpless. This conflict of definition of arena continues today, with francophones tending to adopt the Quebec version and anglophones (including those within Quebec) that of Canada. This struggle is in fact only part of a general struggle between the provinces and the federal government over the division of power between them. At the same time, however, these definitions are being argued over and re-defined as part of the general process of change. It is important in this regard that the federal

government recognized the fact that the francophones lacked access to certain social domains, but chose to deal with the problem in a particularly ineffectual way: it adopted, on the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (Government of Canada 1968-1970), a policy of universal bilingualism, which provoked a vehement anti-French reaction in anglophone areas of the country where the need to use French was negligible or non-existent. As a result of the failure of the federal government to deal adequately with the problem, francophones turned to an even greater extent to the provincial government of Quebec as a means of accomplishing their goals.

Another level at which there has been and continues to be conflict is that of the definition of the terms and conditions of access to roles and resources in Quebec. This is essentially a process of re-definition of social identity, a process of social re-organization. On the one hand, there are those who see mobilization as working towards a takeover by new personnel (the French) of existing structures; on the other there are those who see this takeover as necessitating a change not necessarily in the resources , but in the social organization which controls access to them. This is manifested largely in differing political views of the new Quebec: is it to be a democratic or a socialist society? Is it to be pluralist or assimilationist? The question is fundamentally one of re-definition of social identity on the basis of social re-organization: what does it mean to be French? what sort of society do we, as French people, want to have?

The history of mobilization in Quebec is largely a political one, with culture and language used as emblems in the definition of political goals. The argument for French differentness, so necessary to any claim for privileged control over territory, was based on traditional values and definitions of social identity and social life. An historical claim to a homeland must be buttressed by a claim to cultural homogeneity. However, as has been pointed out above, one of the spurs to mobilization was the breakdown of various institutions and the disappearance of ways of life which had in the past been peculiarly Québécois. For this reason mobilization had to seize on the only really salient distinction left: language.

2.2 The language movement

2.2.0 Introduction

The language movement in Quebec can be discussed on two levels. The first is that of changes in the French and English languages themselves as they are spoken in Quebec. The second is that of the extension of the use of the French language into social situations where previously English was spoken. The two are in fact usually intertwined, since they are both facets of the legitimization of the French language and of its speakers. They are reflected in the changing patterns of diglossia and bilingualism, which reflect changes in the access people have to the codes used in the community. They are also reflected in changes in the ways in which those codes are used, in the linguistic forms considered appropriate for use in conversation (either interethnic

or intra-ethnic) at any level of code choice.[3]

2.2.1 Diglossia and bilingualism 1760-1960

It is important to discuss the extension of the use of the French language in terms of the historical development of diglossia and bilingualism from the beginning of ethnic contact in Quebec. The term diglossia is used to refer to a separation in the social sphere of the use of two or more codes, and bilingualism is used to refer to individuals' knowledge of both languages within a community. In Quebec, the primary division was, of course, between French and English, with separation in language use paralleling the separation of spheres of activity in which each of the two groups participated. In addition to the separation of social spheres arising from the cultural division of labour, geographical separation reinforced the strength of in-group ties and weakened inter-group relations.

In fact, in some respects one could also point to divisions within the francophone community, divisions that can also be characterized as diglossic (Ferguson 1964). While Ferguson's definition does contain many parameters, the central ones of separation of function and of differential prestige (as retained by Fishman 1967 and Gumperz 1968) do seem applicable here. One of the characteristics of the change Quebec is currently undergoing is a breakdown in the double lines of diglossia and bilingualism (English/French, standard French/Québécois) into different sorts of patterns for each line. That is, the changes in the English/French diglossic split take the form of changing patterns of

bilingualism and of language choice in various social domains. The changes in the standard French/Québécois split take the form of a breakdown of the split into a continuum and of the emergence of new sources of variation and conventionalization within the French spoken in Quebec (Martin 1981).

In the past, two varieties of French were used in the community, for different purposes and largely by different people. One of these varieties (which Ferguson would call the low variety [Ferguson 1964:430]) was the New World version of the northern and western dialects spoken by the original peasant immigrants from such regions of France as Normandy, Ile-de-France, Poitou and Picardy. While there is very little evidence of what was actually going on in the spoken language of New France (besides some written documents such as store accounts, orders, and other documents of everyday life, as well as eye-witness accounts of a general nature), it is thought that dialect differences were levelled by the mixing of groups in the New World (Dulong 1966). It is therefore possible to think in terms of a low variety, despite the difficulty of retrieving post-immigration persistence in dialect variations. This low variety was spoken (not, for the most part, written) by the <u>habitants</u> and some of the more humble bourgeois, and was used as the vehicle of communication in everyday life. Contrasting with this was the high variety of more standardized French, a written language stemming from the French of Paris which was in the process of being codified and diffused through use in a standardized, centralized, system of education and administration. In Quebec it was used and diffused by the Church and the educated elite,

some of whom were refugees from the French Revolution; this last group were in fact responsible for founding a number of francophone educational institutions (Wade 1968: 100-101, 1115). To the extent that French might have been used in transactions with the British rulers it would have been the high variety that was used, and it would, of course, have been the elite who would have been party to the interaction[4].

This elite appears to have become progressively disenchanted with the quality of the French spoken in Quebec. Beginning in the late 1800s, there appear manuals designed to correct Québécois usage (Dunn 1880; Tardivel 1880). Concern over the French language increased and was manifested in increasingly organized ways. It is noteworthy that neither in the past nor today have the English been bothered by similar effects on the English language by French, although it appears that just such an influence may be beginning to operate today (see Chapter 5). At any rate, this concern among the French led to the founding of the Société du parler français (Society for French Speech) in 1902. So from early on the most widely used form of French was a stigmatized form, and the feeling that Québécois was stigmatized was shared by both the upper class and the lower class who spoke it. This attitude seems to have persisted until recent years (Lambert 1972a), at least for some sub-groups (e.g., females, the middle class), although one interesting recent development has been the shift from standard French to a standardized form of Québécois as the preferred style (however, the "low" variety, sometimes called joual[5], is still stigmatized by most except those for whom it represents a form of covert prestige

[D'Anglejan and Tucker 1973; Trudgill 1972]).

The major concern of the Société was the preservation of good French in Quebec. This entailed not only the separation of "good" Canadianisms from "bad" anglicisms, but also the preservation of the language itself, which was already seen as threatened with being engulfed by English. The best manifestation of the first concern was the Glossaire du parler français au Canada (1930), which listed all terms used in Canadian French which were not borrowed from English (although borrowings from native Indian languages were allowed), and which were classified as regionalisms, especially where no equivalent item existed in European French, or where the Canadian term had its origin in a French dialectal form which had since been supplanted by a standard form in France. This sort of concern can be seen as a form of nationalism, since it defends the value not only of French as opposed to English, but of Canadian French as opposed to standard French.

What this concern for the quality of French indicates, moreover, is not only a diglossic split between levels or registers of French, but also a certain type of contact with English in the working class, which resulted in borrowings from English by French in certain lexical domains, or the word-for-word translation of items in these domains into French. It would appear that the greatest influence of English, certainly that which received the greatest amount of attention (Dulong 1966), was on the level of the lexicon, especially in those realms for which pre-Conquest French had provided no vocabulary (British common law, industry, business). It is worth repeating, however, that most of

these "anglicisms" were loan-translations or transphonologized loanwords, and thus can be said to have been integrated into the native system. Further, if more recent studies are at all pertinent to the past situation, lexical domains can be seen to contain not only these items drawn originally from French, but also a great many neologisms from French, some of which are in competition with the English loan (Heller 1979; Heller et al. 1982). The major influence of the loans on French may have been on the level of calqued phrases, (as opposed to single lexical items), for while such terms as mop, washboard, facterie (factory), or even délivrer un discours (deliver a speech) or entretenir des doutes (entertain doubts) (cited in Roy 1877) may not be French, they do not violate French grammatical rules, while such locutions as "j'objecte à ce qu'on législate en faveur de" [I object to that which they are legislating in favour of] (cited in Tardivel 1880) do impose English syntax on French discourse. However, this type of interference from English is rarely cited, so that it appears that the source of the problem for those active in the language movement was less the actual threat of assimilation than the recognition that activity and innovation and power were the preserve of the English. The source of loanwords was almost certainly the contact between French workers and English employers (and English technology) in the workplace; there were, then, a group of French bilinguals who learned English at work through limited contact with their anglophone superiors and probably also with some anglophone (usually Irish) workers. These "bilinguals" (it is hard to evaluate the extent to which they were fully bilingual) probably did not speak English outside the workplace, and those members of their families who did not work for the English probably never learned English at all.

Demographic evidence for the post-war period certainly indicates that this was the general picture of bilingualism in Montreal: bilingualism was a phenomenon characteristic of the individual life-cycle of certain francophones, who were monolingual in early childhood and late adulthood, and bilingual while at work and sometimes while at school (Lieberson 1972). Thus the francophone group had to learn English only when, as individuals, they entered domains controlled by the English, and used English texts at school or had to communicate with anglophones in the workplace. It is important to note, in this regard, that bilingualism in Montreal was stable only as long as francophone contact with English was limited not only to certain domains, but also within those domains. Joy (1972:15) points out that in this period "the burden of bilinguality (sic) was on the French Canadian workman rather than on the non-French foreman". By the 1960s, however, it was found that, in the workplace, bilingualism was characteristic of the middle range of the hierarchy, while the top of the scale was monolingual English and the bottom monolingual French (Government of Quebec 1972). This probably reveals an upward mobility of very limited extent, whereby French-Canadians came to predominate at the level of foreman. At any rate, it does seem to be the case that the concern over language that began in the late nineteenth century reflected the contact of French and English in the workplace in the unequal configuration that made the francophone bilingual and that exposed him to the, however limited, influence of English. Constraints on mobility and limited contact, however, indicate that the influence itself was probably limited; the problem, rather, was the inequality that bilingualism and borrowing revealed.

The second concern of the early period took the form of debates over the advantages and disadvantages of bilingualism. Bouthillier and Meynaud (1971) have pointed out that while the nationalist debates of this period (1902-1939) did indeed call for French language rights within Quebec, they did not threaten the structure of Canadian confederation or the language rights of anglophones in Quebec. Rather, they called for the right to use French in all social activities, including in dealings with the federal government, and for the strengthening of French culture through active concern for its language and its traditions. Bouthillier and Meynaud (1971:34-35) suggest, however, that the focus on purity and intrinsic value reveals the desperate nature of these language-revival efforts. The messianic form of many of the calls for action shows, they say:

> "la réaction d'un peuple (ou seulement d'une partie de ses élites) qui, réduit à la position d'une communauté dominée, essaie de s'évader de sa condition peu reluisante en se réfugiant dans des rêves de grandeur [the reaction of a people (or only of part of its elite) which, reduced to the position of a dominated community, tries to escape its less than shining condition by seeking refuge in dreams of grandeur] (Bouthillier and Meynaud 1971:34).

Nonetheless, certain aspects of the activism of this period before the Second World War can be seen to have laid the foundations for the language movement of the post-War period. Those aspects include: 1) a concern for the economic vitality of the francophone community as revealed in economic incentives for using their language; 2) a call for respect of francophone rights by the anglophone federal government; and 3) a concern for the quality of the French language as an index of the

strength of French social and cultural institutions. Finally, the elite character of the language movement and its expressions of French Canadian nationalism are both fundamental characteristics of later developments in the Quebec language movement.

The post-War period saw the emergence of several different lines of development. First, the increasing strength of the Quebec provincial government allowed it to win from the federal government increasing recognition of the rights of French Canadians in the federal bureaucracy and across Canada. Some of this was largely symbolic, including the use of French on federally-issued pay cheques. A more important aspect (from the point of view of francophone access to federal services and to jobs in the federal government) was the recognition that the federal government had to be equipped to provide services in French, and that its policy of requiring knowledge only of English from its employees was discriminatory. However, federal language policy, in keeping with the findings and recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (Government of Canada 1968-1970), promoted universal bilingualism within the federal bureaucracy and throughout Canada as a remedy for previous discriminatory practices. Unequal distribution of a real need for bilinguals doomed this policy to failure, since it was incapable of taking into account the special needs of different portions of the population. Areas of the country with no francophone population failed to see the purpose of using French, and felt that they were being forced to pay for mistakes made by other people in other parts of the country. Resentment thus began to build up in anglophone areas against the government and against Quebec. At the same time, the distribution

of ethnic francophones in the civil service, while reflecting the proportion of francophones in the population at large if taken over the whole of the civil service, was geographically restricted to Quebec, thereby giving the lie to the federal government's stated commitment to "universal bilingualism".

As far as Quebec was concerned the bilingualism policy changed matters very little, since it failed to take into account the fact that bilingualism is based on unequal distribution of people in social situations, and that therefore bilingualism would not rectify the basic unequal structure, rather it would fail to become a reality while leaving behind the same structural problems of differential control over social domains, as well as a lot of ill-will. Looked at more cynically, once Quebecers were committed to support a policy of "differentness" which legitimized their claim to autonomy, it was difficult for them to support an equalizing policy such as that of universal bilingualism.

The reaction in Quebec, therefore, was a realization that if anything was to be done, it was to be done at home. A split between radicals and conservatives, however, revealed a lack of consensus over goals and methods within the francophone community, as well as within the anglophone community within Quebec. The conservatives favoured use of the existing legal means in the attempt to take control of society on the behalf of the francophone population. The radicals felt that the attempt would have to entail (a) violent methods of acquiring political power and (b) a reorganization of society.

2.2.2 Language and politics 1960-1982

It is at this point, in the early 1960s, that the Front de Libération du Québec (FLQ: Quebec Liberation Front), was founded and began a terrorist campaign to call attention to its goal of the establishment of a socialist independent French Quebec. The FLQ was active from the early 1960s to 1970 when its kidnapping of the British Trade Commissioner and the francophone provincial Minister of Labour ended in the death of the latter, the invocation of the War Measures Act by the federal Prime Minister, and the break-up of a number of FLQ cells. The FLQ represents the furthest extreme of the radical group; many other radicals, while sharing the goal of a socialist independent French Quebec still preferred to pursue legal means, and these joined together to form the political parties which eventually coalesced into the Parti Québécois, which forms the present provincial government.

It is on the question, then, of the status and use of languages in Quebec that people differ, the political manifestations (separatism, federalism) being merely the means of making possible the social and economic goals symbolized by language rights and achieved through the exercise of those rights in daily life. It is a question of the extent to which it is necessary to create a monolingual state in order for the francophones to achieve power and control in Quebec, as well as one of the extent to which that achievement is itself desirable. The history of language-related legislation in Quebec in the 1960s and 1970s clearly reflects the struggle between the point of view which holds that the only realistic goal is monolingualism since bilingualism necessarily

implies inequality (and the strength of English in North America gives an indication of what the nature of that inequality in Quebec might be), and the point of view which holds that only freedom of choice is democratic, and that power can be shared among different groups.

The extension of the use of French was accomplished largely through a takeover by the francophone provincial government of the social institutions central to the organization of ethnic groups in Quebec. The government took control over much of the education system, for example. Up until the mid 1960s there existed in Quebec several parallel school systems. The public school system was under the control of two school boards, the Catholic and the Protestant, each of which had its form of support within the Catholic (and mainly French) and the Protestant (and mainly English) communities, although the administration of the Catholic school board was divided into French and English sectors. Added to this were various systems of private schools, Church-run <u>collèges</u> <u>classiques</u> modelled on the French system, English private schools modelled on the British and American systems, and various other parochial schools. Institutions of higher learning, including professional schools, were similarly divided along ethnic lines. In the 1960s the government moved to simultaneously standardize the school systems, open up access to higher education, and put the education system under tighter government control by making the institutions more dependent on government grants for financing, and less dependent on private or ecclesiastical sources of funds. Tighter government control meant, of course, a greater say in policy-making. At about the same time the government moved to take greater control over

hospitals, largely through the introduction of socialized medicine. Finally, the government began to take over the exploitation and development of various natural resources, the establishment of a provincial state-run hydro-electric company in 1963 being the most notable example of the way in which this was accomplished.

Several other events are worthy of note. At the beginning of the "Quiet Revolution", in 1961, the government established a Ministry of Cultural Affairs, and, under the direction of that Ministry, the Office de la Langue Française [Office of the French Language], whose role it was to be to "...veiller... à la correction et l'enrichissement de la langue parlée et écrite [to oversee the correction and enrichment of spoken and written language]" (Bill 9-10, Eliz. II, ch. 23, art. 14, 24 March 1961; cited in Bouthillier 1981:31). The government in this fashion set up the institutional means for the implementation of any language policy it might enact.

Further activity concentrated on the following salient domains: the official status of French and English in Quebec, the criteria of access to French and English schools, the recruitment of immigrants to the French and English ethnic groups, and the use of French and English in the workplace. The government at first resisted legislating in the area of language use, although both radicals and conservatives agreed on the need to encourage the study of French by anglophone students. The underlying notion among conservatives was that, while freedom of choice (of what language to speak and which kind of school to attend) should be guaranteed, French should be the dominant language in Quebec and all

inhabitants of the province should be able to speak it. This form of stating the position encountered violent opposition, not only on the part of non-francophones who were threatened by the notion of French dominance, but also on the part of francophones who felt that unless this position was bolstered by legal means of achieving that goal it was bound to fail. A proposed law encoding the conservative view (Bill 85, 1968) was defeated over just this problem, bJ. it did raise most clearly, and for the first time, the fundamentally different points of view of the francophone and non-francophone communities, as well as revealing a split in the francophone community itself. It also made clear the fact that the francophone and non-francophone groups each felt itself to be threatened by the other and in need of protection. However, the debate over Bill 85 led to the establishment, in 1968, of the Commission d'enquête sur la situation de la langue française et sur les droits linguistiques au Québec [Commission of inquiry into the situation of the French language and into language rights in Quebec], with the goal of collecting the information necessary to any further governmental action.

In 1969 the government passed a new law, Bill 63, designed to promote the French language. While according freedom of choice, it provided for the teaching of French to anglophones and immigrants. While accepting the presence of English in the workplace, it provided for the right of the francophone worker to use French in his or her place of work. It gave to the Office de la Langue Française the mission of working with private enterprise to make French the language of work. The major questions raised by this law were the extent to which

education, as opposed to the workplace, should be the primary focus of attention, and the extent to which the granting of freedom of choice might ultimately defeat the purpose of making French the dominant language in Quebec.

The findings of the Commission (referred to as the Gendron Commission after its director, Jean-Denis Gendron), published in 1972, made clear the disadvantaged position of francophones in the Quebec economy, and the disproportionately high use of English in a territory where the majority of the population were speakers of French. These findings led to a re-formulation of language policy under the new (Liberal) government, encoded and passed as Bill 22 in 1974.

One of the central points of Bill 22 was the re-definition of the status of languages in Quebec: the province passed from being officially bilingual to being officially monolingual French. As a consequence of that re-definition other measures became legitimate, including the institution of the primacy of French for official documents, announcements and public signs, and of the requirement of knowledge of the French language for public servants and for professionals. Language policy was to be implemented by the Régie (formerly the Office) de la Langue Française, in some cases supported by fairly coercive measures (including fines or the deprivation of government funds). The final important measure was the institution of strict criteria of access to English-language education.

It was probably this last measure that was the most controversial, since the regulations stated that only immigrant children who already spoke English could be admitted to English schools, and that their level of knowledge should be evaluated by tests drawn up by the government. This provision, however, failed to take into account intervening variables in the test-taking situation and therefore was seen as an unfair means of evaluation.

The evolution of language policy during this period reveals a negotiation over the goal of language policy (bilingualism? monolingualism?) and the means to achieve it (through education? through the workplace? through incentive methods? coercive methods?). However, Bill 22 and the reaction to it did seem to confirm the basic goal of monolingualism and the necessity of finding means to insure its use in certain domains and to extend its use into others. The major problem raised by Bill 22 was that of the re-definition of the role of non-francophones, especially of those non-francophones long established in the province (as opposed to recent or future immigrants).

The Liberal government which passed Bill 22 was defeated in 1976 by the Parti Québécois, the first time that party had ever won an election, and the first time any party other than the Liberals or the Union Nationale (a conservative party) had formed the provincial government for many years. The significance of the election was that the electorate was supporting the goal of establishing the legal and political means of achieving francophone dominance in Quebec, through the establishment of a monolingual territory where the collective rights

of the francophone majority predominated over the individual rights of any one Quebecer.

In August 1977 the Parti Québécois passed a law which was intended to define those collective rights and to institutionalize the means by which they might be exercised. This law, Bill 101 (also called the Charter of the French Language), sets out a detailed language policy which includes the assumptions behind the policy, its goals, and the means of policy implementation. Since it is the law which is at present in effect it is worth examining in detail some of its more important provisions.

Bill 101 clearly states the necessity of creating a monolingual state in Quebec. It unambiguously affirms French primacy, and strictly regulates access to various social domains on the basis of knowledge of the French language.

The primacy of the language is asserted through provisions for making the "face" of Quebec French; this is to be accomplished by two major means. The first is the conversion of place names to French, unless historical reasons justify the use of names from another language. This work is to be carried out by a newly-created Commission of Toponymy. The second means is the conversion of all public signs, including names of businesses, to French only. This latter provision has caused a great deal of protest among those who feel that it runs counter to the government's principle that "...on doit respecter les minorités, leurs langues, leurs cultures... [one must respect

minorities, their languages, their cultures...] (Charter of the French Language 1977: 19-30; cited in Breton and Grant 1981:21); again, the disagreement is over the issue of whether, for example, a sign posted in the window of a privately owned business is in the public domain where the collective rights of the French majority dominate, or whether it is in the private domain either of the individual or of the individual as a member of a cultural minority.

Bill 101 also undermines the sources of recruitment to the anglophone group by restricting access to English-language education on the following basis: only those children may be allowed to attend English-language schools whose parents (or one of whose parents) received English-language instruction in English in Quebec at the level of primary school, who were already enrolled in English-language schools in Quebec at the time Bill 101 was enacted, and/or whose elder siblings were already enrolled in English-language schools in Quebec at that time. Private schools were not subject to these provisions. While the primary targets of these provisions are non-Canadian immigrants, they also apply to other Canadians from outside Quebec. It is not known to what extent these articles have affected internal movement within Canada, especially since it appears that movement is becoming more regionally restricted in any case (as part of an overall regionalisation of the economy which has contributed to the rise of French nationalism in Quebec; Clift and Arnopoulos 1979).[6] Finally, the government has recently raised the possibility of totally reorganizing the school system on a secular geographical basis, a move which the anglophones feel will further undermine their access to control over education.

The law also requires that all professionals in Quebec demonstrate knowledge of the French language in order to be granted a license to practice. This competence in French is evaluated by tests drawn up and administered by the Office de la Langue Française (re-re-named and with extended powers). This provision has been the source of conflict between the francophone and non-francophone groups, since the francophone group considers it a necessary defense of its collective rights, on the grounds that if non-francophones were not forced to learn French in order to serve their francophone clientele they would not actually learn that language, due to widespread bilingualism among the francophone working population. The non-francophones consider this an intolerable infringement of personal rights, especially since the tests are not administered to graduates of francophone institutions. The issue is complicated by problems connected to the actual form of the tests and the method of their administration. Thus, for example, while most non-francophones accept the necessity of speaking French on the job, most feel that this entails an evaluation of their competence in job-related French; yet many aspects of the tests evaluate knowledge which is not clearly job-related. Further, the same standards of evaluation have been applied to highly educated professionals such as doctors and lawyers, who normally have great experience in test-taking, and nurses' aides and nursing assistants who have many fewer years of education and concomitantly fewer test-taking skills. This aspect of the tests is at present undergoing reform, although these reforms do not satisfy those who object either to the discriminatory application of the tests to only a certain portion of the population or to the very existence of such tests.

However, the major focus of Bill 101 was neither government nor specifically the professions, but rather the general domain of the language of work. The underlying assumption here is that it is necessary to provide economic incentives for the use of French, and that while education plays an important role in francisation, it is powerless to work fundamental changes unless it is clearly preparing students for the realities of the workplace. Indeed, experience elsewhere seems to confirm this hypothesis; for example, in Ireland, the teaching of Gaelic only at the level of primary school, with no provisions for its use in any other domain except the civil service, resulted in a massive lack of interest in the language since it was perceived as something appropriate only for children. The government thus failed in its goal of encouraging the widespread use of Gaelic (Macnamara 1971).

In order to make French the language of work, the government, through its policy agency, the Office de la Langue Française, set up the following stipulations:

1) the only language an employer can require of a candidate for employment, promotion or transfer is French, unless the employer can show that the conditions of a specific job entail knowledge also of a language other than French;

2) all written communication in a private or public enterprise must be in French only;

3) all organizations must prove to the government that they are

functioning in French in order to receive a "certificate of francisation" which constitutes, in essence, a license to do business in Quebec. This applies to business firms, whether privately owned or state owned, and to such institutions as hospitals.

This third provision is scaled according to the type and size of the organization, and involves a series of steps designed to ensure compliance and to take account of the specific circumstances of each company or organization. The first step (now generally accomplished) involves the setting up of a "francisation committee" composed of representatives of all levels and sectors of the organizational structure, whose role it would be to work out with representatives from the O.L.F. the details of the organization's francisation programme. The O.L.F. representatives are called "negotiators", and are usually assigned to several organizations within one economic or social domain (such as textiles, mining, food and drink, medicine, etc.). The first task of the committee is to complete a "linguistic analysis" of the organization, an analysis which is essentially a description of the organizational structure and of the main language of use of each of its employees in various different areas (reading, writing, speaking; advertising, in-house communication, communication with clients, suppliers, head office; with colleagues, superiors, subordinates; etc.). This description (to be completed by a certain deadline fixed by the O.L.F.) is then used as the basis for designing the francisation programme which the organization has to implement. Provisional certificates are issued upon receipt of the linguistic analysis; final certificates are to be issued only upon successful implementation of the

policy. Failure to meet deadlines is punishable by fines, and, ultimately, by deprivation of the certificate. There are a few important exceptions to these provisions, the most notable being tne exemption of head offices and scientific research institutes from compliance with the regulations of Bill 101 concerning francisation of business. (The above account is drawn in part from Daoust-Blais and Martin 1981 and Breton and Grant 1981:7-24.)

One of the most interesting aspects of language policy in Quebec is the increasing emphasis placed on language as opposed to ethnicity, and the ambiguities that result. The language basis of Bill 101 is defended as non-discriminatory since language is an achieved and not an ascribed characteristic. The stated goal of Bill 101 is francisation (the spread of the French language) rather than francophonisation (the spread of native speakers of French into social spheres from which they are absent). However, two consequences of this policy and of its method of implementation appear to have been unforeseen by the provincial government. The first, pointed out by Clift and Arnopoulos (1979: 235-245), is that while integration of immigrants into francophone society (one necessary consequence of Bill 101) eases the demographic pressure on the francophone community, that same integration must also entail a transformation

> of francophone society: "La possibilité que des
> immigrants intégrés de force à la société française
> puissent exercer une influence considérable sur celle-ci,
> n'effleura même pas l'esprit des sociologues et des
> hommes politiques qui présidèrent à la rédaction de cette
> loi [the possibility that immigrants, integrated by force
> into French society, might exert an influence on that
> society, did not even impinge on the consciousness of the

sociologists and politicians who presided over the
writing of that law]" (1979:236).

The second was that while on the surface it would appear that the law
does not discriminate since anyone can learn French, in fact the very
access to that language is unequally distributed in the community. In
some sense this consequence is the obverse of the first, since real
integration implies influence and change along with the acquisition of
the language, influence and change that are felt in both directions.
This is due to the fact that acquisition of a language allows one to
participate in new situations and to acquire new social relationships
which are modified in daily interactions. However, under present
circumstances, it would seem that the only real alternatives are either
assimilation or such limited bilingualism as to effectively prevent
non-francophones from competing successfully with francophones for jobs
and promotions. For example, it has been found that even those
non-francophone students enrolled in French immersion courses fail to
generalize their use of French to situations outside the classroom, and
this because of the conditions of contact (or rather, the lack of it) in
daily life.

While the language movement of the pre-War period often focussed on
language as a symbol of ethnic identity, and while that aspect was
certainly retained in the post-War period, another aspect of language
became, in this latter period, more pertinent: that of language as a
means of gaining access to power and control. By manipulating the
existing power base the French were able to make French not only
economically viable but economically necessary.

The French language became not only the symbol around which the francophone group could be mobilized, but also the means of doing so. The act of speaking French could be turned into an instrument of mobilization, as an exercise of the right to use French in a domain hitherto English. This had the effect of re-defining criteria of access to participation in situations, since knowledge of a language entails potential access to networks in which that language is used, thereby providing a criterion of inclusion to and exclusion from social situations and social relations. This criterion is fully acceptable in a society where the prevailing democratic ideology prohibits discrimination on the basis of ascribed characteristics, since language is something anybody can acquire. Of course, the acquisition of a language depends on access to it, so that breaks and gaps in communication networks (which are virtually assured in any sort of diverse society) tend to subtly perpetuate inequality by unequally distributing access to all the codes and variants used in the community (Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz 1982).

The results of French immersion courses seem to indicate that the continued separation of anglophone and francophone communities will only contribute to the alienation of anglophones from Quebec society, since they are unable to acquire the cultural knowledge necessary for success in everyday life among francophones, and since their power base, their source of re-definition, is in fact already outside the province. The anglophones, in order to retain their separateness within Quebec, will have to become something that they are not, something that as yet does not exist. Unless another power base can be found, it appears that the

hypothesis of the regionalization and monolingualization of Canada will

be confirmed. This hypothesis was stated most clearly by Clift and

Arnopoulos (1979) and Joy (1972):

> "...French Canada has finally raised its educational
> system to a level at which French-speaking candidates are
> available for most positions and it is to be expected
> that, even without legislation, French will gradually
> replace English as the language of work... With an
> entire continent open, how many [anglophones] will choose
> to make their future in the one small corner of that
> continent where their mother tongue constitutes an
> impediment to advancement?" (Joy 1972:139;133).

2.2.3 Some linguistic consequences of change in patterns of bilingualism and diglossia

From the point of view of English-French diglossia it appears that

the function of English is being restricted to use at home for the

anglophones and communication with anglophone areas outside Quebec for

both groups. To the extent that anglophones leave Quebec the second

function may remain as the only one. This is the pattern that seems to

be emerging at Harper's Brewery, which is not surprising given that the

evolution described here for the community as a whole is mirrored by the

history of the brewery. It also appears to be the case that

increasingly it is the anglophones, and no longer the francophones, who

become bilingual, although the conditions under which they do so are

different from those under which the French became bilingual in the

past. The French mainly learned English on the job; the English,

however, must learn French before entering the job market, and even

those who do so in order to get promotions in their present place of

work often do so as much through formal instruction as through

on-the-job communication. Certainly, unlike the French, their linguistic competence is often subject to formal evaluation in a test-taking situation.

The extension of the use of French, and the social mobility that accompanied it, has had important ramifications also for the other type of diglossia. In the 1960s and 1970s there was a sudden rise in the use of French in very visible social domains, notably literature, theatre, film and music. The use of French for "cultural" activities was, of course, part of the legitimation of French and part of the re-definition of French social identity, since the French that was used was not standard European French but rather the hitherto (and in some ways still) stigmatized Québécois variety: at this time the French elite spoke a more European variety of French, and the anglophones who learned French formally learned the European standard variety, refusing to learn the local variant partly because it was considered useless to do so, and partly because it would be degrading to learn what has been spoken of as a "workee" (sic) language. Thus class and code overlapped. It is important to note that many intellectuals had first turned to France as a means of legitimating French in Quebec (cf. Vallières 1969); however, they rapidly discovered that two hundred years of separation had caused Quebec and France to develop in quite different directions. Thus the way to re-define Quebec had to come from Quebec itself; hence there arose attempts to write about Quebec, about its history (cf. Bergeron 1974) and about its daily life (cf. Tremblay 1972), in its hitherto unwritten vernacular.

While completely reasonable as an attempt to legitimate a previously stigmatized variety, the use of Québécois in written language did raise all the problems of lack of standardization and therefore difficulty of comprehension that the direct transfer of spoken language to the printed page can entail. These difficulties were encountered not only within Quebec, but also between Quebecers and other francophones, thus rendering problematic ties which Quebec wanted to cultivate as a means of strengthening the position of French at home as well as of distancing Quebec from English Canada.

As the use of French was extended to more and more social domains, the necessity to legitimate the specifically Québécois variety lessened. In fact, this very extension may be contributing to the elaboration of new varieties of Québécois. One of these has been termed "franco-québécois" (Gendron 1974; Kemp 1979), or "néo-québécois" (Corbeil 1974), and can be characterized as an emerging standard between the still stigmatized Québécois vernacular and the European standard which is now rejected as too snobbish and too foreign to serve adequately as a vehicle for the speech of the new Quebec. This middle ground seems to consist of the adoption of certain Québécois lexical, syntactic and phonological features in a basically standard frame. These features, as well as linguistic features differentiating styles or varieties of French used in Quebec, and features revealing of the contact between English and French, will be discussed in the following chapter.

Thus the extension of the use of French has been accompanied by changing conventions not only of English/French language choice but also within variants of French. That extension was not only a gradual and unconscious process, as we have seen, but also an explicitly political one, with attendant effects on the social and stylistic significance of language choice and language use.

2.3 The social and stylistic significance of language choice and language use

As a result of the struggle for control over social spheres of activity, language choice and language use have acquired potential political significance. Since the conventional use of English or French, or of varieties of French, is generally associated with certain social groups, people who conventionally use one or the other of the several codes available in the community are assumed to be members of one of those groups. As such they are expected to have certain points of view regarding the social situation, and more specifically regarding the social change occurring in Montreal. The English are expected to be resistant to change; either resistant to any change, at one extreme, or, at the other, resistant to assimilation, and therefore to the use of French in domains which they consider to be English. The French are expected to be for the change; either total nationalists, at one extreme, or, at the other, for French dominance in the public domain as well as in the traditional French domains. Since the symbol of control over a domain, as well as the means of maintaining control, is the exclusive or dominant use of French or English in it, the act of opening one's mouth to talk can have political consequences. This is due to the

fact that one's choice of language can be interpreted as being a deliberate statement of intent that French or English should be the language used, not just for this particular personal interaction, but for all interactions in this sphere.

Within French, the register or variant of French used can reflect not only the social class of the speaker, but also the degree to which the speaker subscribes to a nationalist ideology. Of course, there are variants within English too, but since the issue in Quebec is over French versus English control, and over the type of French control, since it is the French, not the English, who were mobilized politically, variation in Quebec English is of considerably less political moment than variation in Quebec French. As francophone power becomes increasingly consolidated, it seems that those anglophones who have elected to remain in Quebec are forming increasingly well defined groups according to their reactions to change, including some explicitly political groups, a process which may be reflected in their use of English, and certainly in the degree to which they borrow from French.

In any case, it is clear that language choice and language use can have political significance, especially in those spheres of activity at the centre of change: the public domain and private enterprise. However, it is not clear that verbal behaviour need necessarily have that significance: there are people who have no particular political bias, and, further, there are people who are simply monolingual, and who therefore have no choice about what they speak.

One of the important features of the change in Quebec is that it has, in fact, allowed people to enter certain spheres to which they previously were denied access. Thus social change has not only altered the conventions of behaviour for those who were traditionally participants in these social situations, but it has also brought together people who previously would never have met, or, at least, would never have participated together in these particular situations. There are therefore two sources of uncertainty in these interactions, one stemming from a lack of knowledge concerning how to act in a new situation, and the other from a lack of conventions regarding the new roles of members of ethnolinguistic groups in this situation. The two, of course, overlap for the new participants, whose presence is often due to the political mobilization which opened doors to francophone participation in these heretofore English domains.

Thus the social significance of language choice is always close to the surface in any interethnic interaction (in which term should be included not only interactions in which members of different ethnolinguistic groups participate, but also those homogeneous interactions which take place in the presence of a member, or members, of the other group). The extent to which there is intent to convey political meaning through language choice (or code choice, to use the more general term) is something that has to be made clear in the interaction in order for participants to arrive at a shared framework which either allows them to interact or makes it evident that interaction is impossible. That shared framework must include an understanding of (a) the extent to which political opinion matters for

the purposes of the interaction; (b) the extent to which, if it does matter, that opinion is shared; and (c) which language it is appropriate to use given the answers to (a) and (b).

The outcome of these conversational negotiations can be seen to have an impact on the social identity of the participants as members of ethnolinguistic groups. On the one hand this outcome defines the behaviour appropriate to such members in such situations, and, on the other, it serves to indicate the extent to which the participants themselves subscribe to any such definition of their membership or of the behaviour expected of them or that they expect of others. Code choice can be used to influence the behaviour of others, to maintain, change or destroy conventions of behaviour, by doing the unexpected, the new, the old, or the inexplicable. This can be accomplished with or without the intent of the speakers; code choice can have social significance which may or may not be used deliberately by speakers to accomplish their personal and/or social goals in the interaction. The manifestation of this state of affairs underlying interaction in domains centrally related to the political mobilization of francophones will be discussed in the following chapters.

The other aspect of language use directly affected by social change in Quebec has to do with the stylistic, as opposed to the social, significance of code choice. This aspect of language use has to do with the use of a code, or codes, to convey stylistic meanings that are directly related to the interaction and to the relationship between the participants. These meanings range along such continua as

agreement/disagreement,   solidarity/distance,   and foregrounding/backgrounding (of information).

The use of code-switching by bilinguals to convey these stylistic meanings, especially in conversation amongst themselves (i.e. among bilinguals of the same mother tongue in the same community) has been well-documented (Gal 1979; Valdes 1981). It is possible to hypothesize that bilinguals use their two languages in points in discourse where monolinguals would use other conventional linguistic means of expressing the same thing, such as intonation, pitch, or tempo. The reason why bilinguals are able to do this derives from the social basis of the distribution of language use in the community: one aspect is directly linked to associations of language use with certain domains, so that, for example, one language is used at home, and is therefore felt to be the appropriate vehicle for talking about things that are associated with the home and (metaphorically extended to other domains), such as affection and intimacy. This kind of code-switching metaphorically extends social ties and social relations, with all the rights and duties associated with them, to domains where they are not in force, but where parts or aspects of them can be called into play in order for the participants to accomplish their interactional goals (Blom and Gumperz 1972). In other cases, it may be the mere fact of a switch that carries a certain stylistic force, so that the fact of saying something in another language, where one would not necessarily expect that to happen, has to be interpreted as having some stylistic function, or remain an inexplicable aberration on the part of the speaker. This stylistic significance is based on social significance, on social knowledge that

is shared by the speakers in an interaction. It is based, moreover, on some solidarity among speakers, on a shared identity, a shared relationship to the community in which these codes are used, and for this reason are rare in interethnic interaction. However, social change has its effect here as well, as the relationship between ethnolinguistic groups changes. The consequence is that there is an alteration in the social basis of stylistic significance and in the access to the codes which are used in conveying stylistic information.

In sum, the consequences of a social change affecting group boundaries include changes not only in the forms of language which carry social significance, but also in the way language is used in conversation to convey both social and stylistic meaning. As a result, not only is interethnic interaction affected, but so is intra-ethnic interaction. Finally, various different levels or aspects of the codes used are influenced, including their distribution in the community, the extent of influence of one code on another, and the use of linguistic forms in different types of interaction.

In Quebec, the shifting pattern of bilingualism has brought more anglophones into contact not only with the French language but also with native speakers of French, many more of whom, these days, are monolingual. This forms part of the background of change, the actual mechanism of which involves daily interaction in the new and chnaging circumstances brought about by macro-level processes.

The following chapter will deal with the linguistic characteristics of the codes used in Montreal today, and with the changing social and stylistic significance which certain features may acquire. The features will also be discussed in terms of what they reveal about the nature of ethnic contact and class stratification in the community.

Notes

1. In the relationship between French and English the truly native population of Indians and Inuit play only a minor role, to the extent that they allied themselves with one group or another. In the final analysis they were dominated by conquerors of both sorts, and were never able to play the French and English off against each other.

2. All translations not otherwise attributed are my own.

3. I am here assuming that it is possible to talk about code-switching for all levels of discourse, from entire conversations to single lexical items or even single morphemes or phonetic units, although the smaller the unit the greater the problem of distinguishing code-switching from borrowing or other sources of variation.

4. To my knowledge it has not been recorded what language was used in French/English interaction in the early history of their contact, but it seems entirely possible that French, or a mixture of French and English, was used.

5. The term "joual" for spoken Québécois derives from the supposed Québécois pronunciation of "cheval" (horse).

6. Further, the Government of Canada in 1941 ceased to indicate the language of individuals involved in internal migration (Joy 1972:45), although this can be reconstructed in some cases from information on mother tongue, language(s) used, place of birth, present place of residence and length of residence in that place.

Chapter 3

The Linguistic Repertoire of Montreal

3.0 Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the description of the codes used in Montreal as well as with their distribution in the community. There are two main oppositions which are important from the point of view of the social significance of language use: the first is the opposition between English and French, and the second is the opposition between varieties of French, most notably between what people usually call "québécois" and "français de France"; in this chapter, however, I will refer to these varieties as Quebec French (sometimes abbreviated QF) and European French (EF). European French, as a category, subsumes French as is spoken in Europe, including both the unwritten varieties and the standard, based on written language, whicn is recognized and sometimes used in Quebec. Since it is primarily the standard form which is present in Quebec (introduced largely through education), the term European French will be used here to refer to that form, unless the sources cited explicitly refer to other variants.

In the preceding chapter I have described the socio-historical basis of the geographical and social separation of English from French and of Quebec French from European French. It was this separation that

contributed to the preservation of each of these varieties or codes in Quebec. In this chapter I will discuss the effects of the particular configuration of contact on the codes themselves, with special regard to the social significance of choice of alternates. What this description provides, then, is both a reflection of the type and degree of contact between speakers of these codes, and a notion of the linguistic resources which may acquire social and stylistic significance in Quebec usage.

It should be made clear at the outset that the existing literature on the subject is incomplete. With respect to English/French contact, much of the existing literature (dating from the late 1800s through to the present day) is normative and prescriptive, devoted to lists of so-called anglicisms in Quebec French, and/or to a classification of types of anglicisms, and suggestions for substitutions by "correct" forms (cf. Dunn 1880; Tardivel 1880; Société du parler français 1930; and others cited in Dulong 1966 and Bouthillier and Meynaud 1972; cf. also Colpron 1970; Darbelnet 1976; Béguin 1977). Another group of authors has examined the effect of English on French in a more systematic fashion especially as regards the lexicon, but also with regard to syntax and phonology, usually investigating the origins of claimed anglicisms to see if they may in fact have arisen from dialect forms imported from seventeenth or eighteenth century France, or if they may represent internal changes paralleled in Quebec and in France (Connors 1972; Offroy 1975; Poirier 1978). Most of the data used by these authors are based on informant self-report, written materials (records, journals, newspapers, advertising) or television. The

attention devoted to the question of anglicisms is a reflection of the political importance of the issue of English dominance. It is therefore particularly interesting that the prevailing opinion today is that French-English contact has not in fact left deep impressions on the structure of Quebec French, although the lexicon has certainly been influenced. Still, this influence seems mainly to reflect lexical gaps in Quebec French in the face of technological innovations, although other kinds of calques and borrowings exist. Nonetheless, most of these are integrated in some way to the phonology and morphology of French.

The literature on the relationship between Quebec French and European French falls into three major categories. The first is that of historical dialectology, and focusses primarily on the lexicon (cf. Juneau and Straka 1975, and other works in the Trésor de la langue française au Québec at l'Université Laval at Québec). However, Juneau (1972) also provides an historical perspective on QF phonetics and phonology. The second major group is concerned with the synchronic comparison of certain features of each variant, notably phonetic, phonological and prosodic features (Gendron 1966; Boudreault 1968; Léon 1968). Guilbert (1976) also examines some features of syntax and lexicon. Another synchronic study examined differences and similarities in the language of 5-year-olds in Montreal and in Paris (Labelle 1976). The third category is in fact not concerned with comparison per se, but rather with the description of certain variable features of Quebec French; into this category falls most of the work done recently by sociolinguists in Montreal (cf. D. Sankoff 1978; Thibault 1979; G. Sankoff 1980; and D. Sankoff and Cedergren 1982 for a sampling of their

most recent work). Of a more strictly descriptive nature, the studies of Charbonneau (1957), Hull (1966) and Léon (1968) treat the phonetic, phonological and prosodic systems of Canadian French. There seems to be very little in the way of a global description of Quebec French, especially as compared to standard French. The variationist studies all focus on the co-variance of linguistic variables with a previously defined set of sociological variables. Finally, some researchers have described the distribution of English and of variants of French in the community (Chantefort 1976; Martin 1981). On the basis of these various sources it will be possible to discuss the relationship of Quebec French to European French, at least as regards the socially significant aspects of that relationship.

One other factor which should also be taken into account is the fact that in discussions of the relationship between Quebec French and European French a distinction must be made between spoken and written language. This distinction is all the more important in view of the fact that until the 1960s a large number of francophones in Quebec did not stay in school past seventh grade and thus had limited exposure to written language: about 70% of the eligible population in 1937, and even more prior to that (Kemp 1982:4). In the 1950s more children who started school stayed there longer ("70% of the initial cohort" in 1950 was still in seventh grade; Kemp 1982:5), but it is not clear what percentage of the eligible population is represented by that initial cohort. Corbeil (1976:16) estimates that in 1960 the average adult in Quebec had a fifth grade education. The problem is enhanced by the system of separate elite schools, especially for secondary and

post-secondary education, which trained a very influential but tiny
minority of francophones (Kemp estimates that prior to the Second World
War the elite consisted of no more than two to three percent of the
population; 1982:4). The importance of this system has lessened in the
past fifteen years, but still remains. Thus class divisions, reinforced
by the education system, are intimately involved in the evolution of
Quebec French and its relationship to the written standard.

I will first discuss the nature of the relationship between English
and French from the point of view of the influence they may or may not
have had upon each other. I will then discuss the socially significant
differences between Quebec French and European French.

3.1 Contact and influence: English and French

It is possible to deal rather rapidly with the influence of French
on English in Quebec. Not surprisingly, given the power relationships
between the two groups of speakers, that influence is minimal, confined
in the past to a few lexical items, and more recently (accompanying
shifts in the power balance) has extended to routines and some semantic
shifts. Poirier (1978:82) cites The Dictionary of Canadianisms on
Historical Principles (1967) as providing a list of words borrowed
mainly in the late 1800s and early 1900s, for flora, fauna and other
cultural artifacts peculiar to Quebec -- borrowings, in short, which
fill lexical gaps. Some of these terms are still in use, but most are
not, the objects and processes they refer to having disappeared from
modern life. A few of these types of borrowings have recently entered

the language, as has the increased use of French greeting and other
routines (see Chapter 5). Although largely undocumented, it appears
that some English forms may be undergoing extension or restriction of
reference under influence from French; an example that comes to mind is
the use of the adjective normal in a sense equivalent to the French
normal, whereas the French is probably more accurately translated into
English as natural; e.g. c'est normal qu'on parle français au travail =
it's normal/natural to speak French at work. Thus my sense is that any
influence of French on English is restricted to the lexicon, but that
the type of influence has shifted slightly not only from one set of
semantic fields to another but also to newly encompass routines and
extensions or restrictions of English forms. Much more work, however,
is needed to verify this.

Significantly, although the influence of English on French seems
more extensive in terms of degree, it does not seem very different in
terms of kind. That is, English has influenced French primarily in the
lexicon, a not surprising result of the introduction of new ways of life
primarily through the English business and industrial milieu. Within
this category of lexical influence may be included both borrowings and
loan translations.

A loan translation may be a fixed expression such as QF rencontrer
ses obligations (vs. EF faire face à ses obligations, English to meet
one's obligations; cf. Chantefort 1976:97), or may involve an extension
or restriction of a lexical item already existing in French, to
correspond to the English usage, e.g., QF apparaître in the sense of "to

appear on a page of text" (vs. EF _figurer_), or QF _information(s)_ used to cover both the EF senses of _information_ and _renseignements_ (English uses _information_ for both these senses) (Darbelnet 1976:88). Another category, which could be seen either as loan translations or as calques, involve changes in case relations, e.g. QF _manquer quelqu'un_ (_to miss someone_, vs. EF _manquer à quelqu'un_, literally _to be missing to someone_; Darbelnet 1976:88). I will return to the subject of calques below.

Borrowings may be more or less integrated into the phonology and morphology of French. It is, actually, difficult to find an example of a totally unintegrated loan; the only ones occurring in my data are _E.B.I._ [ibiaj], the currently used name in the brewery of the electronic bottle inspector, and _E.S.R._ [iɛsaɹ], which is the abbreviation of an estimate used in budget calculations. _Cuteis_ perhaps another example; but none of these cases violates the phonology of French even if the morphology is somewhat deviant. Integrated loans occur in most lexical categories: e.g. QF _bâdrer_ (to bother), QF _smatte_ (smart), QF _truck_ [tʀɔk] (Darbelnet 1976:88).

With regard to phonetics and phonology there is only one respect in which English might be said to have influenced French, and then only as possible tangential support for the preservation of a feature inherited from French: initial [h] in such forms as _haut_ (high), _hache_ (axe), _hareng_ (herring), _hardes_ (goods), _hors_ (out-) (as well as _dehors_, outside). Most of these forms (e.g. the first three listed here) were originally from German; the others may be explained historically

(Poirier 1978:73).

English seems to have played a similar tangential role in the preservation of archaic syntactic features, such as the use of à l'effet que to introduce a subordinate clause, in the sense of the English to the effect that (Offroy 1976:271). Offroy does cite one subordinating conjunction which may be an anglicism: alors que (in the sense of when) (1976:271). English may also play a role in supporting what appears to be a change internal to French, since it is paralleled in European French, that of not preposing prepositions in relative clauses, e.g. c'est le boss que je travaille pour (that's the boss I work for) vs. standard French: c'est le boss pour qui je travaille (Connors 1972:147-148; and Guiraud 1965 cited in Connors 1972:148). This seems to happen most often in sentences involving topicalization. Again, this is a relatively low-level change. Connors (1972) discusses the role of calquing in Canadian French, and comes to the conclusion that calquing affects Quebec French only at the superficial level of selection restrictions. Beyond the obvious effects on the lexicon (including formulas and routines), calquing introduces changes in case relations through the substitution of one preposition for another (e.g. il y a trop de monde sur la rue vs. il y a trop de monde dans la rue; there are too many people on/in the street), or through changing the transitivity of verbs (transitive to intransitive or vice versa), e.g. s'objecter à quelque chose vs. objecter quelque chose à quelqu'un; to object to something, literally, "to object one oneself to something" vs. "to object something to someone" (Connors 1972:145-159). Further, while violations of such structures as word order (e.g. N+Adj, as opposed to

English Adj+N) do occur, they are almost always treated as fixed forms, are judged unacceptable by native speakers more readily than the types mentioned above, and are unproductive.

It is thus clear that while English has had a clear effect on the lexicon of Quebec French, its effects elsewhere in the linguistic system of Quebec French are questionable. At most English has supported either the preservation of archaic and/or dialectal forms of French imported with the original settlers, or has supported changes internal to the system which are shared with European French. Further, even in the lexicon, most borrowed items are integrated to a high degree into the phonology and morphology of French.

Anglicization therefore seems to have more to do with changes in social life introduced by anglophones and which promote English-French contact, as well as being symbolized by an anglicized lexicon pertinent to the domain in question. The lexicon is a symbol of anglophone control over those domains, and is no less significant for not being a reflection of the loss of the French language, since it is a reflection of the disadvantaged social position of francophones in industrial Quebec. It is also significant, however, that other aspects of French have remained uninfluenced, since this reveals that francophone networks remain largely separate from those of anglophones.

3.2 Quebec French and European French

The question of linguistic differences between Quebec French and European French is essentially a question of nationalism, since Quebec French nationalism defines the need for a language distinct from either English or European French. Accompanying this issue, as previously mentioned, is that of spoken vs. written language. The distinction between spoken and written language is important because it has embodied in the past, and to an extent continues to embody, the distinction between the written-based European standard and the spoken, but not written, Quebec variant. This distinction corresponds to the old class distinction, so that standard French was always considered the more prestigious of the two. Further, the social value placed on each variant influences their use in different social situations and their use in conveying stylistic information within a situation (especially in the increasingly numerous cases where people master at least some aspects of both variants).

However, class distinctions have shifted due to more democratic access to education, so that the gap between the educated francophone elite and the poorly educated labour force is no longer as wide. There still exists a gap between the working class and the middle class, and between the middle class and the elite, but working class children tend at least to finish high school, though not to pursue higher education in the same numbers as do the children of the middle class. It is possible that this change is contributing to the development of a new Quebec standard, or at least to the lessening of variation.

In talking about differences between Quebec French and European French I will be constrained by the existing sources of information, which do not necessarily provide a complete picture of differences across class, age, sex, etc., but which do give enough information to be useful.

One factor to be considered is that of loanwords; in both cases English seems to be the primary source, at least since the Second World War. The differences are largely in degree, in terms of the numbers of loan-words, the numbers of semantic fields influenced, and the degree of integration of loan-words into the system. Some other low-level differences also exist, such as the differential assignment of gender to loan-words: for example, QF job is feminine, while EF job is masculine. Finally, QF and EF have different solutions to the problem of rendering English [θ] and [ð], which do not exist in either variant. EF pays attention to the frication, and substitutes [s] and [z]; QF approximates the place of articulation, and substitutes [t] and [d].

The lexicon of Quebec French differs from that of European French in other respects, which is not surprising given the lack of contact and different situations of the two. Some differences stem from dialectalisms which have disappeared in France, as well as from other archaic forms which were not necessarily only found in the dialects of north-western France. Chantefort (1976:94) gives the following examples: QF garrocher (which does not exist in EF) vs. EF lancer (to throw), QF dérangement (literally, in EF, the act of putting something out of place, or, figuratively, of bothering someone) vs. EF ennui (a

bother, a difficulty). Some lexical items are extensions of sense on the basis of archaic forms, e.g. supposément (supposedly), created on the basis of archaic supposé (supposed to) on analogy with censé/censément (supposed to/supposedly) with support from English supposedly (Offroy 1976:286). Other differences are the result of naming objects or activities non-existent in France, or not previously encountered there by the settlers. Examples of neologisms include épluchette (from éplucher, to peel), a feast or festival held at corn-harvest time, and therefore involving large-scale corn-husking activity, and poudrerie (from poudre, powder), fine, usually wind-blown, snow. Quebec French has borrowed some words from Amerindian languages, especially for flora and fauna, e.g. ouaouaron (bullfrog), and ouananiche (salmon). (All the above examples come from Guilbert 1976:46). In some cases technological innovations introduced after the separation of Quebec from France resulted in QF adopting an English word, and EF finding a term in the resources of its own lexicon, e.g. QF tèpe (tape) vs. EF ruban (an extension of the term for "ribbon").

Certain lexical items are considered particularly symbolic of national identity: QF char vs. EF auto, voiture (car), QF astheur (from à cette heure, literally "at this hour") vs. EF maintenant (now), QF fun vs. EF 0, EF gamine (young girl) vs. QF 0, QF ça fait que vs. EF donc, alors (so, therefore), QF correcte vs. EF d'accord (okay), and QF là (a discourse marker), as well as the whole range of swear words, which in QF are mainly based on religious objects, and which have undergone considerable changes since the nineteenth century (J. Thibault 1979:105-106), while in EF a major class of swear words is

based on excrement.

While syntactic differences between Quebec French and standard French exist, they are not numerous, and generally parallel development in spoken European French. Many could be classified as lexical differences, since they involve substitution of items performing the same syntactic function, e.g. QF subordinating conjunction à ce que vs. SF pour que (so that, in order for) (Offroy 1976:269). Other examples include QF discourse connective pis (SF puis, then) vs. EF et (=and), QF beaucoup (de) (many, much) vs. EF plein (de) (full) (=lots of), QF après+INF vs. EF en train de+INF (to be in the middle of doing something), QF juste or rien que (just, nothing but) vs. EF seulement (only, just) (Léon et al. 1968; Labelle 1976:66-67).

The kinds of processes that are occurring simultaneously in both variants include decreasing use of certain verb tenses (the past preterite and the subjunctive especially), the tendency for que, the relativizer for direct objects, to as used either as a general object relativizer as opposed to the subject form qui, or as an all-purpose relativizer, the tendency to replace the full future form with a compound future based on the present tense of the verb aller (to go)+INF, e.g. j'irai vs. je vais aller (I will go; literally, I go to go) (Guilbert 1976:46; Offroy 1976:276, 286). QF also has, however, a phonological variant of the first-person singular form of the periphrastic future: ama or ma, e.g., Ama aller dîner (vs. Je vais aller dîner; "I'm going to go have lunch").

However, there are certain differences which should be mentioned. Some of these are based on archaic and/or dialect forms, others are innovations. Among the archaic/dialect forms are:

1) The use of the question-particle tu [tsy]. European French forms interrogatives through subject-verb inversion or through the use of the interrogative phrase est-ce que (is it that; itself containing a subject-verb inversion) placed before the sentence. Spoken language also admits the use of rising intonation only as a marker of interrogation. For example:

EF	Tu vas à la banque.	You go to the bank.
EF	Vas-tu à la banque?	Go-you to the bank?
EF	Est-ce que tu vas à la banque?	Is it that you go to the bank?
EF	Tu vas à la banque?	You go to the bank?
QF	Tu vas-tu à la banque?	You go-Q to the bank?

The question particle is placed after the verb; after the auxiliary in compound tenses: T'es-tu allé à la banque? You did-Q go to the bank? The tu form is apparently descended from an archaic dialect form ti which has also been attested in Quebec (Brent 1971).

2) Negation. Sankoff and Vincent (1980) point out that while the negative particle ne has practically disappeared from both QF and EF, the process is far more advanced in QF (cf. also Daoust-Blais 1975; Ashby 1976). Still, as they show, ne is used productively in QF as a stylistic device, which corresponds to formal or careful usage; it is found most often in discussions about language itself, or about topics related to discipline and control. It is also correlated with other

markers of high-prestige style, such as the use of the conjunction <u>donc</u>

or <u>alors</u> (so, therefore) instead of the QF alternate <u>ça</u> <u>fait</u> <u>que</u>, and

the use of <u>elle</u> [εl], rather than the low-prestige alternate [a].

Interestingly, along with the loss of <u>ne</u>, there is a tendency to

use other negative particles with <u>pas</u>, as though they retain their

archaic positive sense (Offroy 1976:286; Nyrop 1930 cited in Sankoff and

Vincent 1980:295), e.g.:

Je n'ai/J'ai aucune idée vs. Je n'ai/J'ai pas aucune idée
(I have no idea)

This happens regularly with <u>aucun</u> (modern <u>not</u> <u>any</u>, archaic <u>any</u>) and <u>rien</u>

(modern <u>nothing</u>, archaic <u>anything</u>), and yet only occurs in the negative.

It also occurs with <u>personne</u> (nobody), e.g. Y a pas personne (there's

nobody there). While this is largely undocumented, this seems to happen

more rarely with <u>jamais</u> (ever/never), or with <u>plus</u> (<u>ne</u>... <u>plus</u> =no

more, no longer), although the negative sense of <u>plus</u> is kept distinct

from the now isomorphic comparative through presence or absence of

liaison, e.g.:

C'est plus anglais (it's more English) [seply(z)ãglε] or [seplΥsãglε]
C'est plus anglais (it's no longer English) [sepyãglε]
(Van Ameringen and Cedergren 1982:148).

Some innovations are paralleled in European French usage, but only

to some degree, and local factors intervene in the precise

characterization of the innovation. Two examples stand out:

1) the use of the interrogative <u>qu'est-ce</u> <u>que</u> (what; lit. what is it

that) in place of ce que (that which) in embedded questions and headless

relatives, e.g.:

On sait pas qu'osqui arrive. You don't know what's happening.
Plus tard, c'est nous autres qui fait qu'est-ce que l'autre va faire.
Later, it's we who do what the other one will do.
(Kemp 1979:53)[1]

While the same process may be occurring in European spoken French, it is

probable that qu'est-ce que is more widespread in Quebec usage (in

social, not syntactic contexts) since it serves as a Quebec nationalist

middle ground between the "too affected" European ce que, and the

stigmatized Quebec working class variant qu'osque [kɔskə] (Kemp 1982:8).

2) Shifts in the subject pronoun paradigm. One clear difference between

Quebec French and European French is that in Quebec the politeness

distinction between the second person singular pronouns tu and vous is

being lost, so that vous is reserved for its original plural sense

(Brown and Gilman 1960), and tu is used for almost all singular address

(Chantefort 1976:93). This is interesting in view of the fact that the

evolution of pronominal use generally involves exploitation of the

semantics of the system for purposes of conveying social meanings of

deference or power, of solidarity or distance, as well as metaphorical

extensions of those meanings (Brown and Gilman 1960; Friedrich 1972;

Brown and Levinson 1978). Changes in pronoun use of this type, in which

a distinction is lost, must therefore be explained at least partly in

social terms, although this change is also part of more complex shifts

in the paradigm. Connors (1972:148) claims that tu is also used as the

impersonal indefinite on (English one or you, standard French on), that

is, that the second person singular form is taking over the impersonal function hitherto filled by a third person singular form, possibly on the model of English, possibly through internal sources of change. Laberge (1977) has demonstrated that on in turn has taken on the meanings of nous (first person plural), as well as of every other pronoun except vous (second person plural). Further, Quebec French contains the plural subject pronouns nous-autres, vous-autres and eux-autres (literally, we, you and them-others; here, eux can refer to either masculine or feminine, although its standard French counterpart is only masculine). These may be archaic forms; in any case, they generally occur with the clitic forms on, vous, ils and elles, so that they may be classed with the strong paradigm of pronouns moi, toi, lui, nous-autres, vous-autres, eux-autres (Laberge and Sankoff 1980:274). Finally, Labelle (1976:65) discusses differences in the phonetic realization of lui (third person singular indirect object pronoun or strong form pronoun, masculine unless immediately before the verb, in which case it can be masculine or feminine). His five-year-old subjects in France made a distinction between [lyi] and [i] which was based on an animate/inanimate distinction, whereas his Montreal subjects made the same phonetic distinction but on a grammatical basis, in which [lyi] was used as the strong form pronoun, and [i] as pre-verbal clitic.

3) Use of auxiliary verbs. French has two auxiliary verbs; avoir (to have) is dominant and productive; être is restricted to a very small closed class of verbs. In Quebec French there is a high degree of variation in use of the auxiliary in that closed class, in which être varies with avoir, sometimes on a semantic basis, sometimes not (Sankoff

and Thibault 1980). In European French some aspectual distinction is made, although it was probably more widespread in the past than it is today. Indeed, Sankoff and Thibault suggest that alternation between auxiliaries in European French is much more restricted and socially stigmatized in Europe than it is in Quebec (1980:315).

4) A final example appears to indicate an innovation in Quebec French not shared by European French. This is the use of the quantifier tout, adjective or adverb meaning all, completely. In standard French the adverb form is tout ([tu], or [tut] if liaison applies). The adjective paradigm is masculine singular tout [tu], feminine singular toute [tut], masculine plural tous [tu] or [tus], and feminine plural toutes [tut] or [tuts/z]. At issue is the freedom of placement of the adjective form, particularly with regard to [tus], [tu] and the Quebec variant [tUt]. Daoust-Blais and Lemieux-Niéger (1979) show that [tus] has practically disappeared from Quebec French. Lemieux-Niéger et al. (1982) show that, further, the Quebec variant [tUt] floats more easily than standard French [tus], so that, for example, the following sentences are acceptable in EF and QF:

EF J'ai rencontré [tu] les garçons. I met all the boys.
QF J'ai rencontré [tUt] les garçons. I met all the boys.
EF Je les ai [tus] rencontrés, les garçons. I met them all, the boys.
QF Je les ai [tUt] rencontrés, les garçons. I met them all, the boys.

But in the following sentences, placement of the quantifier before the past participle is acceptable in QF, but not in EF:

*EF J'ai [tus] rencontré les garçons. I have all met the boys.
 QF J'ai [tUt] rencontré les garçons. I have all met the boys.

(Lemieux-Niéger et al. 1982:313).

Lemieux-Niéger at al. also identify other variants in QF: [tsy], which occurs in fixed expressions or before [s], [twe], which renders both tous les in en tous les cas (in any case), and both feminine and masculine plural TOUT+plural N; and rarer occurrences of [te], [tə], [t] and [twa], all of which render TOUT+sing N. They conclude that it may be possible to posit either one or two underlying forms for QF ([tUt] alone or [tUt] and [tu]), but that in any case it is clear that the behaviour of this quantifier in QF, as well as its forms, are considerably different from those in EF.

It thus appears that there are features of QF syntax which differ at least in some respects from EF, although since most are internally motivated they are often shared at least to some degree by both spoken variants, although not always by written standard French. Further, the differences seem very restricted, although since work in this area is just beginning it is somewhat difficult to judge whether the relatively short list above is a reflection of the fact that there just aren't many differences, or whether they rather reflect the fact that little work has been done in this domain.

Comparison of QF and EF at the level of morphology reveals a tendency in QF towards regularization of certain verbal and adjectival paradigms, a process which is probably shared by EF, even if the objects of that process are not necessarily the same. One verb which seems particularly affected, partly perhaps as a result of shifts in the subject-pronoun paradigm, is the present tense of the verb aller (to

go): je [va], tu [va], il [va], (nous) on [va], vous [ale], ils [i]
[vɔ]. The subjunctive present of avoir (to have) and être (to be) tend
also to be regularized (Deshaies et al. 1982). Past participles may be
regularized on analogy with the most frequently used forms, e.g.,
faire/fait (to do/done), se taire/tait (vs. standard tu; to remain or
become silent).

More interesting perhaps are morphophonological processes involving
clitic pronouns and definite articles. The basic process is a variable
one of elision of [l]: ils, il are realized as [i], elles, elle as [a]
or as [al] (before a vowel), la as [a], les as [e] (Pupier and Légaré
1973; G. Sankoff and Cedergren 1976; Santerre et al. 1978). This
process is far more advanced in QF than in EF. Labelle (1976:64) gives
the following example from his Montreal subjects: La fille [a] lance le
ballon, pis [al] a cassé une vitre, pis la moman est choquée (the girl
throws the ball, and then she broke a window, and then the mother was
mad). His Paris informants, if they elided [l] at all, did so only
before a vowel. When the definite article is preceded by a preposition
the final consonant of the preposition and the [l] of the article often
elide, e.g.: dans la chambre/ [dæ:] chambre; sur la table/[sæ:] table;
dans les yeux/[dæz] yeux. This is also a result of the way QF treats
contiguous vowels; while EF usually separates them with a glottal stop,
QF either fuses them, producing a long vowel, or, especially if the
vowels are different, making one non-syllabic, e.g.:

        on était trop nono [ɔ:t-ɛtronono]
        on est allé assez souvent [ɔɛtale]
        (Van Ameringen and Cedergren 1982:147)

Other phonological processes differentiate Quebec French from European French. Again, some are preservations of archaic features lost in European French, while others are innovations not shared by the two variants. The following is a list of some of the most socially significant and best-documented features, although it is undoubtedly not exhaustive:

1) Vowels.

a) certain distinctions have been preserved in QF, but lost in EF, e.g.: [a]/[ɑ] In QF [ɑ] is found in stressed closed syllables (part, tard), and in word-final open syllables (climat, tréma); [ɛ]/[e] in the conditional and future first-person singular inflection, e.g. conditional je finirais QF [finiʀɛ], EF [finiʀe], future je finirai QF [finiʀe], EF [finiʀe] (Guilbert 1976:46; Lennig 1979:32).

b) centralisation of [ɔ] is found in EF (specifically Parisian French) but not in QF (Lenning 1979:33).

c) EF and QF have a different system of nasal vowels: EF [ɛ̃], [œ̃], [ã], [ɔ̃] (frein, brun, manteau, bon); QF [ẽj], [ãj], [ɛ̃], [ɔ̃] and its allophone [ãɔ̃] (frein, main, un, vraiment, maison). It is notable that the distinction between [ɛ̃] and [œ̃] has largely been lost in QF, as has that between [ɛ̃] and [ã].

d) In QF the high vowels [i], [y] and [u] have laxed allophones [ɪ], [Y] and [U] in stressed closed syllables except before the consonants [ʀ],

[z], [ʒ], and [v].

e) In QF [ɛ]→[a]/_CC e.g. perdre [paʀd]

f) In QF many vowels are diphthongized before /r/, e.g. beurre [baoeʁ], alors [alaɔʁ], père [pajʁ] (Chantefort 1976:94; Poirier 1978:75).

g) QF preserves [we], an archaic allophone of the EF diphthong [wa], e.g.: moi (me) QF [mwe] EF [mwa]. This generally considered a stereotype of Quebec French.

2) Consonants.

a) In QF there is assibilation of [t] and [d] before high front vowels, e.g., tu [tsy], dire [dziʁ], tout [tsu] (Gendron 1966).

b) Final [t], an archaic dialect feature of French, is often preserved in QF, e.g., fait QF [fɛt], EF [fe] (Juneau 1972).

c) [t] is often used as liaison in place of the final consonant of the preceding word in QF, e.g. je suis allé QF [ʃtale], EF [ʒœsɥizale] (Tousignant and Sankoff 1979). It is worth noting that [t] is used as epenthetic liaison in standard French third person interrogatives, e.g. Il a. A-t-il? (He has. Does he have?).

d) While tongue-tip trill [r] largely disappeared from France several centuries ago, under the effect of the Parisian uvular trill [ʀ], that

change has taken much longer in Quebec, so that it was not until the past generation that the change was extensive (Clermont and Cedergren 1979). [r] is still present, however, especially among older working-class Montreal men.

It is clear that some differences do exist between Quebec French and European French, most of which have to do with the preservation of archaic dialect features lost to European French, or with shared innovations which are more widespread in Quebec French usage than in European French usage, although there are some innovations in each variant not shared by the other. Certain of these differences have become socially and stylistically marked while others pass unnoticed.

3.3 Social and stylistic significance of alternates

The most important point to be made here is that alternates marked positively as Québécois tend to be forms inherited from French, rather than borrowings from English, although as Connors (1972) points out, it is not calquing or borrowing from English that is socially stigmatized per se, but rather individual calques or borrowings that are socially stigmatized. As for styles of French, it appears that phonological and lexical variation is not only the most widespread, it is also the most marked.

Further, as mentioned in the preceding chapter, the social value of alternates is currently undergoing change; English/French language choice is acquiring a social significance it never had before, as well

as becoming more an object of self-conscious awareness due to the process of change and the breakdown of conventions of choice. The direction of influence appears to be shifting. Quebec French/European French alternate choice is no longer purely a reflection of a class distinction between the elite educated speakers and writers of the standard (equated, whether rightly or not, with European French) and working class speakers of the stigmatized Quebec variant. Rather, since class distinctions are changing, and more and more francophones in Quebec are acquiring an education, the gap between written and spoken language in Quebec is breaking down (Kemp 1982). Finally, nationalist mobilization has polarized Quebec French and European French into an insider/outsider distinction. Thus the social significance of alternate choice within French carries both the older class (prestige) distinction and the newer political overtones, making European French (as a symbol of the standard) something to be both feared and respected, accepted and rejected. It is worth noting that it appears that now most Quebec francophones are ready to admit Quebec French usage into situations which in the past would have been judged appropriate only for standard French, and which would probably be judged appropriate to the standard language in analogous situations in Europe. It is also worth mentioning that francophones in Quebec generally claim to be able to understand European French, while Europeans often claim not to be able to understand Quebec French. While attitudes undoubtedly have a lot to do with producing this situation, it is also probable that the fact that Quebec francophones are exposed to standard French more than Europeans are exposed to Quebec French contributes greatly to the asymmetry.

It will be instructive, in Chapter 5, to examine the use of alternates in communicative situations in the brewery, to see to what extent, and how, the distinctions between English and French, and between varieties of French, operate in the daily lives of francophones at work in present-day Montreal, given that those distinctions seem very much alive in the minds of prescriptive linguists, language teachers and linguistic vigilantes in Quebec, as well as in the attitudes of many francophones (Laberge and Chiasson-Lavoie 1971; Lambert 1972a; d'Anglejan and Tucker 1973; Taylor and Clément 1974; Govaert-Gauthier 1979; Noel 1979).

3.4 Conclusion

This chapter contains a description of the features that characterize the relationship between the three major codes used in Montreal: English, European French and Quebec French. These features reveal a separation between English and French which nonetheless allows a certain amount of lexical influence, the direction of which is indicative of the power relationships obtaining between the two groups. While up to this point the literature reveals a dominance of English over French, certain features of usage to be discussed in Chapter 5 reflect possible tendencies in the other direction. The relationship between styles of Quebec French is more complex, since historical relationships with the standard language, coupled with geographical and social separation, have permitted both divergence and parallel development. Further, the class structure supporting a prestige distinction between codes within the community is being challenged by a

nationalist movement which realigns the two codes on an in-group vs. out-group basis. The features of styles or varieties of French spoken, written or recognized in Quebec are therefore currently subject to changes in the social value attributed to them.

Part of this is a result of a redistribution in knowledge and use of the three codes, as increasing numbers of educated anglophones become bilingual (learning QF rather than EF), and the educated francophone middle class learns English in the classroom rather than in the workplace. Moreover, these francophones are rejecting the use of the old elite's standard in favour of their own Quebec French, even though they have been exposed (through education) to the old standard to a greater extent than were their parents. There thus appears to be a shift in the social (and therefore style) stratification of codes in Quebec, and it will be instructive to discover how this is revealed in the workplace, both in terms of conventions of choice for situations, and also in terms of the manipulation of those choices for strategic purposes in conversation.

In order to understand just how the social significance of alternate choice and of language choice is changing it will be necessary to examine language use in its social context. Chapter 4 provides the ethnographic context in reference to which language use will be analyzed.

Note

1. Kemp's examples, as those in most of the Montreal variationist studies, are drawn from the corpus constituted on the basis of the data collected by the project on Montreal French, directed by G. Sankoff and H. Cedergren.

Chapter 4

Harper's Brewery: History and Ethnography

4.0 Introduction

This chapter treats the factors specifically affecting language use and ethnic relations in the brewery chosen as a research site for this study. These factors will be described from historical, demographic and ethnographic points of view.

In Chapter 2 I discussed the role of ethnicity in the social organization of the Montreal community, and the social sources of the symbolism of both ethnicity and, as a consequence, language choice. This chapter builds on that description to discuss the importance of ethnicity in the context of the organization of this particular social institution.

This kind of description is based on the assumption that people act in the light of their knowledge of the social and organizational context which will influence the outcome of their action (Cicourel 1982). It is only within that context that ethnicity and language use have any meaning; decisions about language use are social acts which have immediate consequences in the immediate situation, as well as in the long run of a career. They are only interpretable in the light of

knowledge about the symbolism of language use in the community at large, as well as of knowledge about the particular institution and its role in the community. The purpose of an ethnographic description, then, is to provide information regarding the aspects of the organization of the brewery which render ethnicity, and therefore language choice and language use, meaningful.

The first section of the chapter describes the post-War developments which led to the present demographic profile of the company, and which also led to the company's present language policies governing hiring and promotion practices and language use within the brewery. It also presents the demographic structure of the company at the time of the study, broken down along the following lines: ethnicity, knowledge of languages (i.e. the distribution of bilingualism), age, sex, degree and type of education, and number of years of employment.

Building on this description, the second section outlines the distribution of the employee population in the company's hierarchy and in its various sectors. The company's structure, function and population will be further described in terms of their spatial and temporal arrangements.

The third section analyzes the distribution of the population in terms of communicative networks and communicative needs, in order to arrive at a description of the activities in which various members of the small community participate.

The fourth section uses this description as a basis for discussing the brewery's linguistic repertoire, that is, the distribution of use of the various linguistic codes (English, standard French and Québécois) each of which is spoken and/or written by at least one group in the brewery.

The purpose of this chapter, then, is to provide a framework for the understanding of those factors specific to the brewery which affect the assumptions and expectations brought to activities by participants, and which therefore affect their verbal behaviour in those interactions.

4.1 The brewery's history and demography[1]

Harper's has done business at the same place in Montreal for close to two hundred years. Founded by an immigrant from England, it has remained under the control and ownership of his descendants. It is, however, no small family business, nor has it ever been: from the beginning of its history it has been involved with some of the major financial and technological developments in Montreal and in Canada as a whole. The brewery was the corner-stone of a corporate empire which included ventures into transportation, banking and other affairs.

Harper's had the classic profile of a large Montreal business, with an anglophone management (including many members of the proprietary family), and a largely francophone work force. It was run paternalistically, in a manner which the owners liked to think of as a benevolent patriarchy. To this day employees, particularly the older

ones, talk of themselves as belonging to the Harper Family, even though the manner and circumstances of doing business have radically changed.

While the history of the brewery reflects the economic and social history of Montreal, Quebec and Canada, the post-War period represents a watershed after which developments lead directly to the present situation. I will therefore confine this section to the discussion of the major contemporary trends which affected the process of language shift in the brewery.

The post-War economic boom in Canada, including the increasing importance of Ontario and western Canada, involved a widespread process of economic rationalization which led directly to changes in the company's demography. That rationalization, which began to occur in the late 1940s, can be broken down into three parts: re-organization of the administration, expansion and automation.

Re-organization consisted primarily of the opening up of brewery stock to outside shareholders and a re-shuffling of administrative staff. The object was to create an appropriate base on which to carry out plans not only for the expansion and increase of production by the Montreal plant, but also for the construction of a new plant in Toronto (Denison 1955). The new Toronto plant was designed to meet a growing market in Ontario which was inadequately served by Montreal (both in terms of serving the numbers and in terms of meeting the taste of Ontarians). This double-targeted expansion plan was carried out between 1947 and 1954. Production in Montreal did indeed increase, as did the

growing need for appropriate technology.

The Toronto brewery was only the first in a line of new acquisitions: throughout the 1950s and 1960s the brewery bought out other breweries across Canada so that now the one in Montreal is part of a national chain of breweries. There has been further fissioning: a parent company was created, separate from the breweries, and one branch of the Head Office later was re-located in Toronto, while the other branch of the Head Office, separate from the brewery, remains in Montreal. Other acquisitions have further diversified the company's holdings; firms in various different industries in Canada, the United States, New Zealand, England and Mexico have been added to the list. Finally, at the point at which the study was carried out, the brewery was attempting to expand its share of the U.S. market.

As far as the Montreal branch is now concerned, the horizons of the future are limited. Planners at the brewery expect that maximum production will be achieved by the end of the century, and, further, that the Quebec market is now practically saturated: Harper's, competing with two other strong breweries in Montreal, already has more than its share of the market; beer consumption in Quebec is already high compared to the rest of Canada (in 1977, Quebec accounted for one third of total Canadian beer consumption while comprising only one quarter of the total population); and beer is now, as a result of a recent change in liquor licensing laws, competing with wine in grocery stores, and being taxed at the same rate as wines and spirits in sales to restaurants and hotels. Thus while the Quebec market is clearly

important, expansion has had to occur elsewhere.

A heavy investment in automation also characterized the brewery's expansion. A change in the company's hiring procedures can be directly attributed to automation. Thus while employment increased steadily through the late 1940s and early 1950s, informants within the brewery have said that this situation ceased abruptly around 1956, when all workers with less than three years' employment were laid off, and very few new workers were hired until about 1972.

The effect of expansion and automation on the brewery's population took the following forms:

1) the acquisition of new breweries outside Quebec resulted in the need for experienced management staff in those new breweries. Since all the experienced management staff were located in Montreal, it was from Montreal that they were recruited. The effect, most pronounced starting in the early 1970s, was a vacating of management positions by anglophones. Many also left in a "fuite vers l'ouest [FLIGHT TO THE WEST]" (as one francophone put it) in 1977; these included not only management but also supervisory staff, including the last group of monolingual anglophone foremen;

2) in the late 1960s some of the older employees remaining after the hiring freeze of the late 1950s began to retire; the new wave of hiring which followed was based on a very different form of hiring strategy from those used previously. While at the level of operator it still

continues to be somewhat true that family members of present employees are favoured for hiring, this is no longer as important a source of recruitment as it used to be. Automation created a need for technicians, specialists in either applied science or business, and for the first time in Quebec's history there were francophones with those qualifications (Joy 1972). It is not clear whether the breweries' recruiters deliberately chose not to hire anglophones, or whether there were no anglophones qualified or interested in these positions, but in any case the new hiring wave of the early 1970s produced a massive influx of francophones at all levels of the company's hierarchy[2];

3) in the 1960s the increased concentration of the Montreal branch on business solely in and on the borders of Quebec, plus the increased demands of francophones to be dealt with in their own language, produced within the brewery a bilingualism policy parallel to that which was favoured by the federal government.

For the brewery, bilingualism meant: (a) the creation of bilingual written materials; all official documents were printed in both French and English; (b) the institution of brewery-sponsored French lessons for anglophone executives; (c) the creation of some lexicons of French technical terminology; usually they took the form of English/French technical dictionaries. This job was mainly the responsibility of a few secretaries, partly because they were francophone bilinguals, and partly because of their central position in the brewery's communication networks; and (d) the recruitment of a few individual francophones into the brewery's management, where they were trained and, of course,

learned English if they did not already speak it. This bilingualism policy in fact affected most of the anglophone executives very little, since as long as somebody (usually a secretary) in the office was bilingual, they themselves did not have to use French. There was thus little transfer of French from the classroom to the office.

The Montreal branch appears to have reached a point of stagnation in the early 1970s, just as the other branches began to operate fully. This stagnation took the form of a decrease in the brewery's share of the Quebec market, a failure to increase production, and a general feeling of demoralization. To combat this, in 1972 the company undertook a campaign of revitalization in which more technological innovations (such as the use of computers) were used to rationalize operations and increase production. The campaign was successful, judging from the facts that in 1979 the brewery had the largest share of the Quebec market and that production had increased markedly over the intervening eight years.

Thus by the mid 1970s the employee population was divided into several groups: among both anglophones and francophones there was a major age division, consisting of a dichotomy between those who had been hired before the hiring freeze, and those who came in when hiring was renewed. The older anglophone group had, however, lost many of its members: some had accepted transfer opportunities to the new breweries outside Quebec, others had gone to work at the Head Office when it formally separated from the Montreal brewery, still others were retiring. The remaining anglophones tended to cluster in certain

sectors, and mainly at the management level (the precise distribution of groups inside the brewery will be discussed below). There were very few younger anglophones. Most of the older francophones were found at the lower levels of company hierarchy, while the younger francophones could be found both among labour and among management. The latter, and some of the former as well, were educated, and specialized in the scientific, technological and business knowledge the brewery needed. There is a final small group of bilingual anglophones, most of whom are products of mixed marriages and/or Catholic mixed working class neighbourhoods. Most them occupy supervisory positions, forming a link between labour and management.

In 1977, a new criterion affected the hiring and promotion policies of the brewery, as well as its policies concerning language use within the brewery. Bill 101 required that all employees and job candidates speak French in order to be hired or promoted; further, all official written communication, including sign-posting, had to be in French only. It is worth noting that Head Offices of national corporations are exempt from all these constraints. In order to comply with the law, the brewery, like all other companies over a certain size (measured by the size of the employee population), had to furnish the O.L.F. with a "linguistic analysis", which described the use of languages within the brewery and the distribution of its population according to knowledge of languages. This analysis was used as a basis for negotiations between the O.L.F. and the brewery (represented by a "francisation committee" consisting of representatives of both labour and management) as to the final form and schedule of the francisation programme that the brewery

was legally obligated to undertake. Bill 101 thus altered the relationship between government and labour, and especially affected such communicative ties as those with clients, suppliers, branches and competitors outside the brewery, including those both inside and outside Quebec.

In 1978 Harper's published a language policy which was circulated to all personnel. The policy was designed to re-assert the company's role in determining policy, and to re-affirm its commitment to all employees. Interestingly, most employees refer to the company language policy as though it were independent of that of the government. However, management appears to have differences both with the O.L.F. and with some of its own employees as to where its responsibilities lie. For example, in its negotiations with the O.L.F. it has sought to protect some of the older anglophone employees, clients and suppliers, and some of its bilingual usage in forms, signs and correspondence by asking for delayed deadlines on the strength of the massive francisation (or bilingualisation) and francophonisation that had already occurred before Bill 101[3]. The government, however, feels that it is necessary to push such cases even harder than is normal so that the work "does not remain incomplete"[4]. On the other hand, the brewery's management feels that it is incumbent upon anglophones who desire employment or promotion to prove they can speak French (this is evaluated in the job interview and through use of government tests[5]), and, on a more everyday level, to individually request English copies of official material sent to employees, since otherwise material is issued in French only. Thus some anglophones feel that management does not have their best interests at

heart. Certain incidents, such as the lack of English translations of important security information, or the failure of an anglophone to pass government French tests and his consequent failure to receive promotion, have created in some cases a climate of mistrust. Francophones, on the other hand, tend to look upon Bill 101 as a form of protection, and as an aid to their advancement: it is something they need to have to ensure that they have rightful access to jobs and promotions, and cease to suffer the discrimination, oppression and indignities of the past. Finally, since Bill 101, a handful of young anglophones have in fact come to work at the Montreal branch, under the clear condition that they work in French. These young anglophones are all marginal in some way to the native anglophone population of Montreal. They are from outside Quebec, some are married to francophones, and some are of French origin. Besides their various personal reasons for coming to Montreal, they are aware that to accept the conditions of employment there signals to the Head Office that they are men of initiative, ambition and dedication. The attitudes of these various groups will be discussed in further detail below.

Thus expansion and automation have produced a heterogeneous population, with representatives of the old guard working side by the side with the new. These changes, along with changes legislated by the provincial government, have altered the criteria of hiring and the path to promotion. Further, the circumscription of the Montreal branch's territory to the confines of Quebec, and the opening up of new jobs in the West, have facilitated the entry of francophones into the positions vacated by anglophones, and have altered as well the communicative needs

of employees in those positions. The hiring and expansion in the Montreal branch appear, finally, to have reached a point of saturation by the time this study was completed, although the retirement of many of the remaining anglophones in top management in about five years will touch off a new wave of change, or, rather, bring this cycle of change to completion.

Beyond changing the distribution of ethnic groups in management and labour, and altering the age structure of the company, rationalization has brought about a recruitment policy in which specialists are imported, so that the chances for internal promotion are slim, at least for promotion from semi-skilled to highly skilled positions. Changes have occurred in the distribution of bilingualism: while secretaries still must be bilingual, the burden of bilingualism elsewhere seems to be placed higher up in the hierarchy, among middle and top management (francophone and anglophone). The distribution of the sexes, however, seems to have changed very little: first, there are still very few female employees at all. Second, the only female vice-president in the brewery says that 90% of the female employees occupy secretarial, or, at best, lower management positions. Observations support this claim, with the specification that, besides the position of secretary, females occupy positions as lower-rung lab technicians, key-punchers, administrative assistants and receptionists, with few exceptions. Almost all these women are bilingual francophones. It is interesting to note that while a new track of upward mobility, favouring those with training in basic and applied science, has opened up new opportunities for such employees as lab technicians, it is only male lab technicians

who have successfully made this jump, since the physical strength required in many of the tasks which are part of the apprenticeship is intimidating to the female lab technicians. Thus the gains made by francophones in the brewery seem to have benefited mainly young, specially trained males at management level.

4.2 Structure and function

This heterogeneous population is variously distributed across the brewery. I will first describe the structural dimensions of the company, then the distribution of demographic groups in that structure, and, finally, the spatial and temporal organization which contributes to the restriction of social interaction.

The company can be divided vertically according to sector, each one an administrative unit fulfilling a certain function. These sectors are: production, distribution. marketing, administration, and personnel[6]. Production comprises the following sub-sectors, or departments: engineering, bottling and packaging, brewing, and the quality control laboratories. Distribution contains the departments of shipping, storage, planning and administration. Marketing comprises research, sales and publicity. Administration comprises public relations, finances and communications. Personnel comprises labour relations, benefits, recruiting, security and training.

In additon to these work-related divisions, other organizations exist for leisure activities. These groups have as their main function

the organization of events or outings throughout the year, ranging from dinner-dances to family picnics. Management employees generally do not participate in these organizations; indeed, some of the younger ones insist vehemently on the necessity of separating private life from work.

The company can be divided horizontally in several ways. One major distinction to be made is that between employees who belong to the employee association, a sort of in-house union, and those who do not. The association, established in 1944, includes all workers below the rank of foreman, which is to say all the heavy-machine operators in the plant or on the delivery trucks. Its purpose is to provide an organizational framework for labour-management relations, and originally was designed to forestall the unionization of labour (one of the agreements includes a promise by labour not to strike). The association's officers are elected; the incumbent president has held office for about twenty years.

Another line of horizontal demarcation lies between the foremen and the operators, on the one hand, and management on the other, a major distinction being that the former inhabit the plant while the others inhabit office space, and another being a distinction between labour and supervisory or white-collar workers. Acting as go-betweens, dividing their time between the offices and the plant, are the supervisors. The lower level, from operator to foreman, is found only in the production and distribution sectors.

In management there are distinctions to be made between the lowest-level white-collar workers (secretaries, key punchers, dispatchers in the trouble shooting division of maintenance, receptionists, and lab technicians), middle management (supervisory personnel and sales representatives), and top management (department managers and sector vice-presidents).

Most employees are distinguished according to rank and sector by the clothes they wear. Workers wear T-shirts (colour-coded by department), and foremen wear shirts and pants of certain colours. Supervisors in one department wear over-shirts of another colour. Lab personnel, of course, wear white smocks, and top management tend to wear suits and ties.

Table 1 gives the ethnic distribution of the population in December 1978, according to sector and socio-professional category (operators are split off from foremen, who are included in the supervisory personnel).

It is noticeable that anglophones are clustered in certain sectors (production, and to a lesser extent distribution and administration) and at certain hierarchical levels within those sectors: I, II and IV in production, IV in distribution, and III in administration. Within those sectors it is possible to identify further concentrations: in production, anglophones are clustered in engineering, and also occupy half the top posts; there is also a group in the labs, especially in one small sub-division. In distribution they are found mainly among the truck drivers. In administration they are found in purchasing and

TABLE 1: Demographic Structure of the Brewery

Dept.	Cat.	I	II	III	IV	Total	%
PR.	FR	2+15	49	5	441	512	83.4
	AN	2+9	16	0	75	102	16.6
DI.	FR	6+12	17	19	311	365	96.8
	AN	1	1	1	9	12	3.2
AD.	FR	8	16	32	–	56	74.7
	AN	4	7	8	–	19	25.3
PE.	FR	4	4+2	4	22	36	92.3
	AN	0	0+1	0	2	3	7.7
MA.	FR	10+37	55+6	34	193	335	98.5
	AN	0+4	1	–	–	5	1.5

PR. = Production   Cat. I = management   0 = no personnel in this
DI. = Distribution   II = supervisory   category
AD. = Administration   staff   – = no reply (taken to
PE. = Personnel   III = office staff   equal 0)
MA. = Marketing   IV = operators   x+y = hierarchical sub-
                                                    categorization

inventory. The anglophones are nonetheless vastly outnumbered by the francophones, both in absolute numbers, and also within each sector.

One other ethnographic group remains to be identified: those whose mother tongue is neither French nor English. They do not appear on the table because they all favour either French or English as a second language. They are, in any case, not very numerous. One group consists of older men of East European origin (including a large group of Lithuanians) who were hired as workers immediately after World War II. They have never been promoted; one changed jobs at a time when for reasons of age or ill-health workers were sent to work as lab assistants. Most of these men are now retired. They all speak English as a second language, stating that when they arrived they were told that English was the language they would have to learn, and learn English they did, partly through night courses and partly on the job. Also among the operators is a small group of Italians, more recently arrived. Many of them speak both English and French, but most seem to favour French. At management level there are few immigrants; all of them, however, are either speakers of French (two Vietnamese engineers fall into this category, for example), or speakers of both English and French (such as a highly-educated young Hungarian key-puncher).

Age distribution is fairly even across sectors, taking into account the differential distribution of anglophones. There are more young francophones in production at management level than elsewhere, and also more young anglophones. The few young anglophones at the worker level are clustered in production. One notable anglophone, however, who

claims to be one of the last hired at the operator level, has isolated himself in a job requiring minimal human contact.

Spatial and temporal organization also are important factors in understanding the social differentiation of the employee population. The brewery occupies a restricted site which has meant that it has had to expand vertically. The site is in fact divided in two by a major road, with the administrative offices of the brewery and those of the parent company occupying a building on one side of the road next to the parking lots. The parking lots themselves are divided into three according to rank: head office and top management, worker, and everyone else. All the other sectors of the brewery are located across the road. The production sector and its tall brewing tower are arranged around a central courtyard; extending down the road in either direction are interconnected buildings which house the rest of the brewery's operations. There are several entrances to this uninterrupted series of buildings, each corresponding to internal divisions: the garages, the warehouse, shipping, distribution and production, and sales. Because of this physical layout movement between sectors is restricted.

There are points of common ground within sectors, and others which are open to the brewery as a whole. Those within sectors tend to be rooms set aside for coffee breaks or meetings, and include foremen's lounges, workers' cafeteria/lounges, coffee rooms, etc. Those open to all include the main cafeteria and a sort of pub, part of which can be turned into a restaurant for formal working lunches or a hall for meetings. Finally, there is a reception room which can be used for

in-house or public receptions, and a set of meeting rooms which can be used by groups of employees, or for events such as training seminars. Due to the spatial restrictions on the way the brewery has expanded, pathways through the building are very complex, and essentially employees can arrive at these points of common ground via a number of routes, each of them favoured by different employees.

Not all employees frequent the common areas: women, for example, rarely go to the pub, and some employees take their coffee break and lunch in the cafeteria while others do not. This will be discussed further below in the section on communicative networks.

The temporal organization of the brewery responds in part to the exigencies of what is considered a normal working day. Office personnel and management usually work from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. or from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Other employees, however, must work according to the schedule on which beer is made, a natural process which must be overseen at all times. Thus the production area has a system of three rotating shifts, and a 24-hour production schedule. The schedules of the foremen are often slightly skewed with respect to that of the workers so as to facilitate the change in shifts, that is, to give the departing foreman a chance to brief the incoming one before the new shift arrives. The lab schedule also follows a 24-hour cycle, although many more technicians are needed during the day than at other times. The other set of workers following their own work schedule are the delivery truck drivers, who normally start their day early enough to arrive at their first destination at opening time.

Thus the characteristics of the typical working day are primarily affected by whether or not the employee is on a shift schedule, which is mainly a result of whether or not his (or, rarely, her) work is directly tied in with the process of making beer. Those who do shift work have much less choice about where, when and with whom to spend their break time than do those not on shifts, and at work they generally have fewer opportunities and less need to communicate. Those on shift-work generally spend their working day in semi-skilled or skilled labour, with talking reserved for occasional comments shouted at fellow workers, limited task-oriented interaction usually involving foremen, and brief breaks for lunch. The only partial exception is the shift work of lab technicians, whose day shifts resemble office work, but whose night shifts are usually spent alone except for trips for samples to the plant and some visits from foremen on breaks. Those not on shift work have a much looser structure to their day, and rely much more heavily on communication (both spoken and written) for the accomplishment of their work, whether or not that communication is strictly task-oriented.

One other aspect of employees' lives is worth noting: their neighbourhoods. Almost all employees live either in the eastern half of the city or on the South Shore (as the suburbs across the St. Lawrence River are called, whether or not they actually lie on the river itself). The brewery is located on the river near one of the major bridges connecting the South Shore to the city. It is east of downtown, in a mainly commercial area. Non-management staff, including up to the level of supervisor in the plant, mainly inhabit the eastern part of the city which is largely francophone and working or middle class. White collar

workers and especially higher management inhabit the middle or upper-middle class suburbs south of the city across the St. Lawrence. These suburbs vary from being mainly francophone, to mixed, to mainly anglophone. Some employees live in the western part of the city, some of the few remaining anglophone workers in the traditionally anglophone working class areas in the southwest part of the city, and some of the young francophones in mixed middle class neighbourhoods, but there are very few of these employees. This fact was attested to by the difficulty brewery employees had finding me a ride from my west end home to the brewery during a prolonged public transportation strike.

These structural constraints all operate to affect the opportunities people have to form social ties, and to restrict the nature of their communicative needs. The following section discusses the nature of comunication networks and communicative needs in the brewery, in the context of the situations in which employees participate during the working day.

4.3 Communicative networks and communicative needs

The structural constraints described in the preceding section restrict the access employees have to activities or situations in the brewery. They restrict the number and nature of these situations, and they restrict the ability or possibility of employees to form social ties with other employees either in work-related settings or outside them. One way of looking at the organization of the brewery is to look at it as a set of social networks through which people make contact with

other people in the context of the structure and the function of the brewery. The contacts that people have, then, can be described in terms of the situation constituted by their contact and of the role relations they bear to each other in that situation (which may be partly defined by external factors, such as hierarchical position, and partly negotiable). Structure and function constrain situations and networks, which in turn influence role relations and therefore language choice.

The communicative networks in which people participate and the communicative needs that are part of the interactions that people have can be described in terms of situations. A situation can be taken as the configuration of several factors, including the social identity of the participants, the span of time during which they interact, and the setting (Blom and Gumperz 1972:423). The settings are "distinct locales" into which "natives classify their ecological environment" (Blom and Gumperz 1972:422). The relationship between situations and networks can be seen as follows: situations are social activities (Goffman 1972) to which people are brought through their social networks, and which are appropriately enacted in certain settings. These activities can differ according to the specific role relationships participants bear to each other, and according to the goal of the interaction. Thus networks serve to define role relations and to constrain access to participation in social situations. By studying social ties in specific situations it is possible to arrive at an understanding of the social networks existing in the brewery and the way in which these networks influence behaviour. Further, it is possible to discover the communicative needs arising out of various types of

situations.

Situations in the brewery can be divided into two major types, although of course a continuum exists between the two extremes. These major types are work-related situations and non-work-related situations. One of the reasons that it is possible to make this distinction is the existence of clearly defined separate categories of settings and of highly scheduled movement within the brewery. Furthermore, as will be discussed below, social networks diverge widely along just these lines.

There are separate locales and precise times set aside for leisure activities on the work site: these are the pub, the cafeteria, the lounges and coffee rooms set aside for coffee breaks, lunch and sometimes short interactions after work. A few places, such as the lounges connected to the ladies' rooms, are not specifically designated for certain activities, but are often used for lunch or breaks. Other locales (offices, the plant, the warehouse, the labs) are designated working areas. The situations that arise there are largely those of formal meetings, or less explicitly defined office interaction or interaction on the shop floor. Finally, there are some relatively neutral areas, such as corridors, stairs, elevators and reception areas. The entrance area to the labs, an open space traversed by many different employees, also often functions as such a neutral area. The lab employees themselves refer to it as "Central Station" (the name of one of Montreal's major railway stations).

The precise configuration of territory, time, goal and participants is constrained by hierarchical and demographic factors. Hierarchical factors mainly determine the activities in which people engage and their schedule. I will therefore discuss situations from the point of view of work groups, since these are the basic units of social differentiation in the brewery. I will then further discuss the work groups in terms of differences in behaviour within them.

The largest work group in the company is that of the operators, who are, of course, split up into sectors and shifts. There are two important aspects to their communicative networks: 1) due to the physical and temporal constraints of their work, operators rarely interact with people outside their immediate team, except for their foremen; the only other people they might see are those who work in their area on the day shift, but operators work a rotating schedule and their contacts are thus not continuous; and 2) the noise level in much of the plant is so high as to render verbal interaction impossible; instead there is used a system of gestural communication, containing about thirty signs, many of them iconic. For example, fingering the non-existant collar of one's T-shirt means that the foreman is coming, since foremen wear shirts with collars, while operators wear T-shirts.

The operators thus spend most of their working day together with other members of their work team, although communication among them may be limited. They may also see other operators who work the same shift. The vast majority of operators is francophone, and most are young. Older non-francophones either keep to themselves, or sit with other

members of their team at break or lunch time without actively participating in the conversation. One older Lithuanian reported that he frequents brewery social activities, such as dinners organized for employees of more than 25 years' standing, in order to see the other Lithuanians who work at the brewery. One can conclude from this that he is unable to see them at work since they work on different shifts or on different teams, and that the social events serve to bring them together.

When francophones and non-francophones must mix at work, their physical co-presence does not necessarily imply much interaction. Further, it seems that when they have a choice, such as in certain leisure activities, they separate. This becomes more marked the more choice there is, and choice seems to increase the higher up the hierarchy one goes, and the more anglophones there are in the work group: they are clustered, at the operator level, in areas such as maintenance and truck-driving.

The truck-drivers work in pairs which change from day to day; they thus have intense contact with all members of the group (which numbers about one hundred). Further, they have regular interactions with clients all over the City of Montreal. Some of the few remaining anglophone truck drivers are friends with their francophone co-workers, to the extent at least of joining them for a beer after work. However, some of them do not participate in any kind of social gathering which involves spouses, since their spouses are monolingual anglophones. Others tend to spend their break time at work with other anglophones.

One incident is revealing of the tenuous nature of these men's social ties: a small group, including one semi-bilingual anglophone was sitting together in the pub; some English and some French were being spoken. As more and more colleagues, all of them francophone, joined the group, less and less English was spoken. Finally, the anglophone got up and left.

The only other communicative situations arising in the operators' world have to do with their individual contact with the employees' association and with the personnel office. Verbal interaction with both can be in either language; written language, however, differs due to the constraints imposed on the personnel office, but not on the employees' association, to communicate only in French unless a special individual request is made for materials to be provided in English. Two anecdotes will serve to illustrate the results of this situation. The first concerns an older anglophone who, complaining that it is demeaning to have to ask to have documents in one's own language, cited the employees' association as an example of how all organizations should proceed: the association continues to provide bilingual documentation. The reaction of a francophone colleague was: "C'est pour avoir des votes! [IT'S TO GET VOTES!]". The second concerns the security materials that were sent to all employees in French only. While many of the anglophones, who said that they had requested materials in English, were shocked, the personnel office, although conceding that it was an unfortunate incident, considered their intent to supply English materials sufficient to exonerate them from blame, since they felt they just had not had enough time to get around to translating the French

documents. Translation, here, was considered an extra job which was not part of the normal work of the office. What these anecdotes reveal is a lack of shared understanding concerning the motivation of the personnel office and the employees' association, but also a difference in attitude towards language choice. While most employees, francophone and non-francophone alike, would agree that, as one young francophone put it: "C'est normal qu'on parle français au travail [IT'S NATURAL TO SPEAK FRENCH AT WORK]"[7], most anglophones also feel more comfortable and less threatened if they are "met halfway", which for most anglophones means some way of using both English and French, whether in written or in spoken exchanges. Many francophones, however, feel that to officially sanction the use of English is to negate all that they have worked for over the years. It seems to be a question of each group feeling threatened by the other. While the distance (physical, social, and structural) between francophones and non-francophones at the operator level makes these divergent attitudes hard to reconcile, they can be found also at other hierarchical levels where contact is more frequent.

The situation of the foremen is somewhat different from that of the operators. They tend most often to associate with each other, divided, if at all, only by age group. It is interesting to note that while in the past most foremen were anglophones, now they are mainly francophones, although there are some older bilingual anglophones among them. Besides the interest of the work itself, which involves decision-making and trouble-shooting rather than routine mechanical labour, the major incentive to becoming a foreman (all are former

operators) lies in the perceived opportunities for promotion. Due to the fact that foremen do not belong to the association, they are actually paid less in many cases than operators, so the financial incentives are only based on future prospects. Unfortunately, the pyramidal structure of the company hierarchy has the consequence of making the next promotion step open to only a few foremen, and the tendency of employees not to switch jobs means that foremen and supervisors tend to be replaced only upon retirement. Further, the modern emphasis on technical skills means that higher-level jobs will more likely be filled from outside than through internal promotion. Nonetheless, the position of foreman appears to be a relatively coveted one. However, two acting foremen claimed that the company was using a number of operators as acting foremen without actually promoting them, at least not for a very long time. For them, it was difficult to justify remaining in the acting foreman job indefinitely, partly because there were no financial benefits, and partly because it put them in a position of having to use authority with people they might soon be joining as team-mates again. It appears, then, that even the promotion line from operator to foreman is becoming stagnant. One other aspect of this promotion stage deserves mention, since it reinforces the description of the brewery as becoming increasingly reliant on outside objective measures of evaluation: this is the recently instituted use of an outside psychological testing service to evaluate the "strength of character" of operators whom the brewery considers candidates for promotion.

Despite the problematic nature of the foreman's position, most foremen consider their job as a challenge, and enjoy their role as mediator (between operators, between operators and supervisors, and among foremen), a role which requires great communicative skills (as well as mechanical ability and physical strength). They feel very much a part of the brewery. Most of the francophones (which is to say most of the foremen) feel that the francisation of the brewery is an important process, one which they are deeply committed to; an interesting fact, given that the area they work in is almost totally French anyway.

One domain in their area which is notably influenced by English is that of technical terminology. Not only is it influenced by English, but there is a great deal of variation within the domain, since the users, mostly francophone, are removed from the source of the terminology (American technology), and therefore create many neologisms. Usage thus varies along lines of communication networks, that is, mainly by hierarchical level and by sector, both in written and in spoken language. This local usage competes with the standard English terminology, used by the anglophones in the company, and now also with a form of standard French terminology, introduced largely by the O.L.F. in a campaign to improve and standardize technical terminology in all domains, for use as a French equivalent to the English standard. In Quebec, English terminology receives as much attention as other aspects of language use, or more, and is seen as a particularly strong symbol of anglophone domination.

There is thus outside support for any interest in technical terminology, and indeed many of the young foremen (along with many of the young francophones in management) have taken up the francisation of this domain as their special campaign. They are deeply involved in the translation of terms, and regard it as something akin to a mission to use those terms at work, with operators as their special target. One young francophone said the following about his efforts:

> "Au début, les gars sur le plancher partaient à rire dès que tu parlais de soutireuse. 'C'est quoi ça une soutireuse?' Ca fait vingt-cinq ans qu'ils travaillent sur une filler pis tu leur dis: 'Ce n'est pas une filler, c'est une soutireuse'. Mais ça entre, même si on ne veut pas, ça change. Le système métrique, c'est pareil... Mais avant que ça se rende au bas de l'échelle, il ne faut pas rêver en couleur, ça ne changera pas du jour au lendemain, puis ce n'est pas une loi qui va changer ça... Les jeunes d'aujourd'hui, ils sont plus prêts à le changer parce qu'on est tous relié à la situation québécoise. On veut franciser, on veut être plus libre, mais pour ça il faut faire un effort." [IN THE BEGINNING, THE GUYS ON THE FLOOR STARTED LAUGHING AS SOON AS YOU TALKED ABOUT A "SOUTIREUSE". "WHAT'S THAT, A SOUTIREUSE?" THEY'VE BEEN WORKING ON A FILLER FOR TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AND THEN YOU TELL THEM: "IT'S NOT A 'FILLER', IT'S A 'SOUTIREUSE'." BUT IT GOES IN, EVEN IF YOU DON'T WANT IT TO, IT CHANGES. THE METRIC SYSTEM, IT'S THE SAME THING... BUT BEFORE IT GETS TO THE BOTTOM OF THE LADDER YOU CAN'T DREAM IN COLOUR (i.e. you can't have unrealistic expectations). IT'S NOT GOING TO CHANGE FROM ONE DAY TO THE NEXT, AND IT'S NOT A LAW THAT'S GOING TO CHANGE IT... YOUNG PEOPLE TODAY ARE MORE READY TO CHANGE IT BECAUSE WE'RE ALL TIED TO THE QUEBEC SITUATION. WE WANT TO FRANCISIZE, WE WANT TO BE MORE FREE, BUT FOR THAT YOU HAVE TO MAKE AN EFFORT.]

For this foreman, then, as for his colleagues, francisation of technical terminology is connected to the liberation of francophones in Quebec; it is a symbolic activity. Lévy (Heller et al. 1982:150) has suggested that a motivation can be found in the fact that, apart from their role as voters, these young men are unable to do anything about a situation

in which they feel they are part of an oppressed minority, a situation which they find frustrating. As a result, they turn their energies to this symbolic domain. Another aspect, however, may be equally important or more so, namely that the activity of francisation contributes to a differentiation of status between foremen and workers. It is certainly true that foremen view francisation as both self-improvement and group service, and that they see themselves as the enlightened pioneers of a new way of life whose targets are the relatively unenlightened workers, whom they see as significantly different from themselves in outlook and ambition. The defining characteristic of being a foreman is leadership, and francisation is seen as another domain in which to exercise that leadership. Otherwise, the relative disadvantage in terms of lower salaries and loss of benefits makes the foremen's position not particularly enviable when compared to that of the workers. Thus the sources of prestige are split in terms of material benefits and status, and francisation is a way foremen have begun to use to accrue more status and to further legitimate both the authority in their positions and the choice they have made to give up the benefits of worker status. However, the activity of translation, while it is largely symbolic for the foremen due to the constraints on their communicative activity, has more concrete applications for young francophones in management. I will return to this point later. It is also worth noting that many francophones create a parallel between the shift from English to French and that from the British system of weights and measures to the metric system; they liken language shift, then, to a cognitive shift in one's view of the material world, rather than to a shift in human relations.

The foremen in production and distribution work directly under a small group of supervisors, all of whom are bilingual. The older ones include several men of mixed heritage, men who belong to the small group of working class men of mixed background. As they retire, however, they are being replaced by francophones. (It may be that the foremen take these promotions as an indication of their own potential advancement.) Supervisors mediate between plant and management and are directly responsible to the division manager. They divide their time between inspection and office work. They spend much of their time conferring with their subordinates and coordinating their work, interacting with them face-to-face in their own offices or in the general work area of the sub-department. They also confer regularly with the department manager, individually and with the other department supervisors.

It is at this point that the transition from plant to office takes place. While the offices are separated from the plant, there are many connections and much traffic between the two. The traffic consists mainly of foremen, supervisors, managers and lab technicians. Office personnel rarely go into the plant, however.

This office personnel consists of secretaries, accountants, draughtsmen, dispatchers, key-punchers and others concerned with the daily management of information. Almost all are francophone, and those in certain jobs, such as the dispatchers and the secretaries, are usually also bilingual. Dispatchers are in charge of sending trouble-shooting mechanics, plumbers and electricians to deal with breakdowns or accidents. They must take in and transmit, by telephone,

information from both anglophone and francophone employees. Secretaries also must be able to communicate not only with francophone and anglophone employees, whether they are their bosses or not, but also with outsiders. They have taken on much of the work of translation. As previously mentioned, they were responsible for the creation of the brewery's first English/French technical dictionaries, and they now provide translations (from English to French) for the written work of their anglophone bosses, and occasionally also translate into English the French material their bosses receive and cannot understand. One secretary said that she does not feel that this is a surplus of work for her (it is, after all, not in the job description), but rather a challenge which made her feel that she had some responsibility and a creative outlet. Most secretaries did not seem to mind at all; if the older ones complained, it was about the fact they they had never worked in written French before, and felt the need for training in it. They felt that it was ironic that the brewery provided or paid for second-language classes (only French for anglophones in the past, now English for francophones as well), but not for instruction in the employees' own languages. Nevertheless, some secretaries enrolled in a correspondence course in business French conducted by one of the local French universities.

One other interesting aspect about most of the women at this level (besides those in personnel or in the labs) is that they tended to have varied and fluctuating informal contacts outside their own departments, contacts which included both francophones and anglophones and with whom they spoke either language, generally saying they defer to the language

of their interlocutor. One explanation probably lies in the facts that they are relatively isolated in their departments (i.e., they have no team-mates), and that they are bilingual and accommodating almost by profession.

As previously mentioned, most female lab technicians and the lower management staff in personnel have different sorts of networks. One reason for this is that in each case a group of young francophones works together, and forms a self-sufficient group, although each has contacts among the Production foremen. Further, the departments they work in are almost exclusively, if not entirely, francophone, which is not always the case elsewhere in the brewery. Although their work entails contacts with many employees outside their work group, most of these contacts are plant foremen or operators, most of whom are francophone (while the secretaries' contacts include anglophones). Indeed, one young francophone lab technician said the following, upon hearing English spoken in the lab entrance outside the coffee room where she was sitting:

> C'est quoi cette langue étrangère que j'entends
> soudainement; c'est vrai, c'est rare qu'on entend parler
> anglais icitte...moi je me demande s'il y en a qui
> parlent anglais là-dedans... il doit y en avoir mais je
> pense que même ceux qui parlent anglais s'adressent
> toujours à moi en français... j'ai pas parlé anglais
> pendant ce temps-là... [WHAT'S THAT FOREIGN LANGUAGE I
> HEAR SUDDENLY; IT'S TRUE IT'S RARE TO HEAR ENGLISH SPOKEN
> HERE... I WONDER IF THERE ARE ANY (employees) WHO SPEAK
> ENGLISH THERE (in the plant)... THERE MUST BE SOME BUT I
> THINK THAT EVEN THOSE WHO SPEAK ENGLISH TALK TO ME IN
> FRENCH... I HAVEN'T SPOKEN ENGLISH THE WHOLE TIME (since
> I started working at the brewery).]

The personnel officers and secretaries, then, tend to occupy a table together with their francophone foremen friends in the cafeteria. The francophone lab technicians often eat together in the cafeteria also, and regularly take coffee breaks together in their own coffee room (which doubles as part of the lab outside the regular break times). The difficulty of avoiding this system is revealed by the complaints of the newest lab technician, a young francophone woman. She said she disliked one of her fellow-workers, and therefore did not want to eat with her colleagues; she was unable to break into any of the women's circles, because they had such tight cliques, and if she ate alone in the cafeteria she had to put up with advances from some of the men. As a result she often ate alone in her work area. It seems that while women may be open to interacting with men outside their work group, they often do so in a tightly-formed group of women from within their work group. (Another interesting point made by this lab technician is that for her the fundamental issue in work relations at Harper's concerned not English-French interaction, which affected her not at all, but rather male-female interaction.)

The lab is somewhat more ethnically heterogeneous than is the personnel office, since its employees include not only the majority of young francophones, but also three older anglophones and one older francophone (who was on sick leave during most of the study), and one young anglophone. It thus represents the transition the entire brewery is undergoing, since the labs too were once entirely anglophone (the first francophone was hired in 1964, the second in 1968, and the rest between 1973 and the present; the last one was hired during the study).

The labs are divided into three, and one of the older anglophones works almost entirely alone in one lab (he is in fact a Lithuanian, a former operator with contacts elsewhere in the brewery). The other three anglophones work together in a second small section. All the other employees, all of them francophones, either alternate between the first section and a third, larger section, or work exclusively in the third section. Two supervisors are young francophones, one a young anglophone (one of the three anglophones in the second section). The manager is a young bilingual francophone. While anglophones and francophones must work together, at break time the only anglophone to frequent the coffee room is the young supervisor, and not regularly at that. One of the older anglophones gives this reason for his absence:

> I've been here sixteen years, I used to go. But then
> they'd go back and forth, and now it's just one way. I
> won't go in there, I'm not going to make them condescend
> to speak English... Well, now I'm like a Frenchman in
> the States, the pendulum has swung the other way.

Even the young anglophone, when he goes, participates very little in the conversation, although almost always when he does it is in French.

The coffee breaks are more than a time for relaxation, however. They are the only time when all lab employees (at least all the francophones) can meet together with their (francophone) supervisors, and sometimes their francophone manager also joins them. These gatherings are also used for making decisions about such things as budget proposals, whether or not to ask for a secretary, how shifts and vacation time are to be assigned, and so on. They also discuss scientific, technological and other events which influence their work.

The two francophone supervisors are also involved in the translation not only of the technical terminology in their domain, but of all the lab procedures. They are, however, using the opportunity to bring the procedures "up-to-date". The translation process at this level, then, includes more responsibility and more power than a straight translation normally includes.

As far as it was possible to discern, the only other department which used coffee breaks in a way similar to that used in the labs was purchasing, a very small department where all management staff were English. The manager was preparing to retire, but since the "succession" had not yet actually taken place, (that is, the promotion had been approved but the outgoing manager had not yet left), it is not known whether anyone was hired to take the place vacated by the promoted manager, nor how, if at all, the communicative habits of the department were changed.

The anglophone successor had to spend a great deal of time and effort to learn French in order to pass the French test that enabled him to gain his promotion. The pressure on him to be seen to use French was such that the company official who acted as an initial contact for the study specifically requested that this successor be interviewed in French, despite the fact that the interviewer's mother tongue was English. This anglophone manager remarked at one point that his bilingual francophone wife helped him to learn French, a remark echoed by many anglophones seeking promotion. It is revealing that those anglophones, most of whom had worked at the brewery for over fifteen

years, had never learned French from their spouses until it became crucial to their careers.

The personnel of this department, as well as the anglophone personnel of other departments, including employees from many different hierarchical levels, tended to also meet together for other informal encounters such as lunch in the cafeteria or beer in the pub, although lunch tended to be a more hierarchically stratified affair than beer breaks. Thus francophones, especially the men, tended to interact with the other members of their work group in both work-related and non-work related situations (with both French and English at work in the few remaining mixed departments, mainly or exclusively with other French elsewhere). The anglophones sought each other out from all over the brewery for non-work-related encounters. The young anglophones tended to be divided, sitting sometimes with their francophone colleagues, sometimes with other anglophones. But it is certain that in informal situations a choice has to be made; most everyone is aware of the division, remarking, for example, on the ethnically divided tables in the cafeteria. One of the older French lab technicians said that when he wants to practice his English, he goes to sit with the anglophones at lunch or in the pub. Interestingly, the young anglophone lab supervisor changed his social network after making a career choice which took him out of the labs and into training as an apprentice master-brewer. After having made that choice, he went first into a period of training in the head office, after which he became part of the anglophone network, and no longer associated with his former francophone colleagues.

At the level of lower management communication takes place largely within the brewery, with the exception, of course, of the secretaries. Other major exceptions are the sales representatives and the clerks in charge of taking orders, who have extensive contact with clients. Orders are usually placed by telephone and recorded on computer, one of the technological innovations which was part of the post-1974 re-organization of the brewery. The production and reception of written communication increases significantly at this point in the hierarchy.

For anglophones, then, the necessity to read and write French becomes more important at this level. For francophones, the ability to read English also becomes important, largely because of the influx of scientific and technological documentation in English, mainly from the United States. The problem is probably more acute for the anglophones, since most francophones with a university or technical training have had to learn to read English in the course of that training, either because texts and manuals do not exist in French, or because the English original versions are cheaper. As one young francophone engineer put it:

> Quand on est étudiant, si on va choisir entre un livre
> anglais à sept dollars et la traduction française à
> vingt-cinq dollars, la question ne se pose même pas.
> [WHEN YOU'RE A STUDENT, IF YOU HAVE TO CHOOSE BETWEEN AN
> ENGLISH BOOK AT SEVEN DOLLARS AND THE FRENCH TRANSLATION
> AT TWENTY-FIVE DOLLARS, THE QUESTION DOESN'T EVEN ARISE.]

The few anglophones who deal with French at this level often find that while their passive competence is adequate for reading, writing is a problem. They thus rely on bilingual francophones for help, or switch

to the spoken word as a substitute. The latter strategy is really only possible for those few anglophones who have actually learned French through interaction; most anglophones at management level have learned it, rather, through formal instruction. The only anglophones at this level who pursue French through both channels are the young anglophones.

Just as there are differing degrees and types of bilingualism among anglophones, so there are among francophones. Most francophones who do speak English, especially older ones, have learned it at work, claiming to have been totally monolingual when they arrived at the brewery. It is only within the last seven or eight years that francophones at levels higher than that of operator have been able to remain functionally monolingual, at least until they are or want to be promoted to the level of manager. It is revealing that older francophones and younger anglophones tend to think of their second language as something acquired through interaction, while older anglophones and younger francophones look at it as a skill to be acquired through education. Lambert's (1972b:180) discussion of integrative and instrumental motivations for learning a second language somewhat captures this distinction, although it must be supplemented by an understanding of the available sources of second-language acquisition, and the practical consequences thereof. It is important to know, for example, that while the brewery was totally under anglophone control, francophones could get jobs at lower levels without speaking English. Later on, this became true at management level as well. However, in order to be successful, indeed, in order to survive, it was usually necessary to learn English. This was generally accomplished through interaction. Yet if a francophone were to learn

English so well as to be able to gain access to the most powerful circles it was inevitable that his or her francophone identity would have to be either abandoned or significantly changed. It was not possible to be powerful and to be different. The changes that occurred in the early 1970s altered this situation, so that now, in order to be successful, francophones must first speak French; and yet, to get to the top, they must somehow acquire English as well. But the increasing separation of the two ethnolinguistic groups within the brewery and the increasing power of francophones makes this step less threatening to francophone identity. Anglophones, on the other hand, must not only speak French at work, they must have acquired French before entering the job market. Further, they must be prepared to handle two kinds of evaluation: the formal tests administered by the government, and informal evaluations in face-to-face interactions. Some are prepared for one or the other (through education, which is usually the case for the middle and upper classes, or through interaction, which is usually the case for the working class), but few are prepared for both. Some, of course, are prepared for neither, since poor second-language teaching in schools, buttressed by lack of contact and prejudice, regularly has produced monolinguals. For anglophones, the consequences of failing to learn French now are that life chances within Quebec are drastically reduced. If they do learn French well, however, the consequences are more complicated, for they then find themselves in the position, formerly occupied by francophones, in which their identity is threatened.

This kind of supplementary information is especially important to the supposed "integrative" motivations: for younger anglophones, while it is true that the French they need to learn in order to succeed is interactional French, it is also the case that they feel free to pursue this integrative knowledge because they know they can leave almost whenever they want to, and the skill they are acquiring is one that will serve them well in the future. They waver between instrumental and integrative attitudes. One such anglophone, for example, while proud of his native-like French, and while he bought a house in a French neighbourhood, and sent his children to French schools, nonetheless was upset that his children not only no longer speak English well, they come home from school telling anti-English jokes. For older francophones, the pattern is less one of acquiring a native-like English than it is one of acquiring an English adequate for inter-ethnic interaction, so that it is more a question, perhaps, of integrating with a group of bilinguals, or with a network involving inter-ethnic interaction, than it is of integration to the English group itself. In any case, the brewery, over and above its sponsorship of language classes, has been known to train future francophone managers by sending them on training periods to branches outside Quebec, in English Canada. They are also often sent to training institutions, most of which are in the United States. As a result these young francophones acquire not only the knowledge of the nation-wide operations they will need in their new jobs, but also the English they especially need to operate at that level. It is significant that this form of training operates out of Montreal, but the rest of the company's branches do not usually send out candidates to Montreal and then bring them back to home base.

Managers, then, and the vice-presidents above them as well, are connected not only to networks within the brewery, but to the whole range of possible contacts outside the brewery: other branches, the head offices, clients, suppliers, competitors, training institutions, and professional associations. Since many of these individuals and organizations function only in English, and are outside Quebec, English is necessary at this level.

It appears that the provision of Bill 101 which requires that companies use French not only within the company, but with all external contacts whether or not they are inside Quebec, is probably the most problematic. This is the case partly because the rest of the world does not necessarily share the view that French is the language of Quebec just as German is the language of West Germany (for some reason, West Germany is the country most often used as a parallel when this argument is being made), but rather chooses to regard Quebec as part of bilingual Canada. Moreover, English functions as the international language of business and technology; it is not always the case that business contacts, especially those outside Quebec, understand that provincial government regulations on language use were intended to be in the same category as international tariffs, or other import/export regulations, since they protect an integral part of Quebec's economy: francophone labour.

Within and across sectors managers are also involved in one very important type of situation: the meeting. These meetings certainly occur within each sector, involving department managers and the sector

vice-president, and generally take place in the vice-president's office once a week. Department managers sometimes also hold regular or occasional meetings with their supervisors in their own offices.

One generalization that can be made about communication networks is that hierarchy and sector are two important factors influencing the possibility of contact. For example, while it is theoretically possible for an operator to speak to the president, in fact contact operates tier by tier. Inter-department and inter-sector coordination operate largely through secretaries, and through regular meetings of department and sector heads. Hierarchy and sector both also affect the degree of choice employees have concerning their non-work-related activities at the brewery. Where there is choice ethnicity appears to be the overriding factor determining inclusion in friendship networks. In these ethnically homogeneous groups the only language spoken is that of the ethnic group; as a result, ability to speak the language of the group determines access to the group's leisure activities. What happens in work-related situations regarding language choice and language use is less clear-cut; this will be further discussed in the next chapter. Finally, age and sex seem important as indicators of differences in the life chances of individual members of ethnic groups.

The manager level of the brewery at the time of the study appeared to be undergoing the shift from anglophone to francophone personnel that had previously affected supervisory staff, lower management (except perhaps the secretaries who appear to have been bilingual francophones for a long time), and foremen and operators before them.

Ethnolinguistic shift, then, seems to be moving from the bottom up. As a result, there are still proportionately more anglophones at this high level than elsewhere in management, historically the English preserve. The effect is nuanced by the fact that anglophones do still tend to cluster in certain sectors. The issue of succession is, however, constantly raised, and it is clear that successors are picked from among the young francophone supervisory staff whenever possible. Indeed, during the study one department manager, an anglophone who had worked at the brewery for over twenty-five years, was transferred to the newest plant in Ontario, which was expanding not only to fill growing demand in southern Ontario but also the growing American market, a market previously catered to by Toronto and Montreal. This manager was replaced, not by one of the senior supervisors who had been seen as the "prince héritier" [CROWN PRINCE] (as one personnel officer called him), but by the youngest francophone supervisor. This young man, besides being French, also had the official educational credentials which are now of almost more value in the brewery than those of experience. Interestingly, he had also been responsible for the translation of the signs on a control panel on a computer-run malfunction detection system for the plant; that is, he was heavily involved in francisation efforts. This young man was the latest of several skilled and talented recruits who had been rapidly trained and promoted, and have most recently been promoted to replace anglophones.

It is difficult to separate, in analyzing this pattern of promotions, the technical qualifications of these young men from their linguistic skills. Their linguistic skills are a direct product of

their francophone origins, as are, in some sense, their technical
qualifications, due to the historical conditions prevailing at the
beginning of their careers, which favoured the further education of
francophones in precisely the kinds of skills and knowledge now valued
by companies such as the brewery. This pattern does, however, tend to
create the impression among outsiders that the ethnic French are
favoured over the non-French. On a superficial level this may be true,
especially given the sorts of affirmative action-like policies which are
intended to rectify an old imbalance in access to jobs in private
industry. However, as we have seen, other underlying economic, social
and political causes also favoured the entry of francophones into this
domain at this time. Also a policy change favouring francophones (i.e.,
people who speak French) in fact favoured the ethnic French, since most
of the ethnic English (or other groups) did not speak French at the time
of the change. In any case, it is certainly true that Bill 101 and its
provisions for the use of French legitimate and also facilitate the
careers of these young men, something which is revealed in their
preference for and involvement in the spread of the use of the French
language in the workplace.

At the manager level, then, different factors work for the use of
French as well as of English, factors directly related to the networks
and situations in which these people operate. Other factors similarly
constrain the significance and necessity of using one language over the
other at other levels of the company hierarchy. All these factors have
their origin in the conditions of work at each of these levels, and in
the ways in which these work conditions interact with the historical

conditions which influence each individual's experience of his or her career. These two sets of conditions inform what constitutes behaviour appropriate to successful performance at work and to the successful attainment of personal and career goals.

As has been shown, these conditions affect, and have affected, the English and the French (as well as men and women) differently over time. The overall picture is one of a shift from English to French moving up the hierarchy and across sectors as underlying historical social, economic and political factors open (or close) paths to access to each of these areas. The picture, further, is one in which the shift is but a part of a major organizational change, involving not only the transformation of the relationship between the company and the community, but also its relation to the larger business network. Thus as the brewery shifts its focus to science and technology, thereby changing criteria of decision-making, it also restricts its operations to Quebec as a result of expansion, as major national decisions are made both farther west and in the head office which is now separate from the Montreal branch. Bill 101 can therefore been seen as a support, a facilitator, and as a legitimation of a process which had already started, with deep social and economic causes realized in part through the institutions of Quebec society as they were used by the provincial government to accomplish its goal of mobilizing francophones to take control of decision-making regarding all of Quebec's social and economic activities.

4.4 The brewery's linguistic repertoire

If we look at the brewery as a communicative setting it is possible to distinguish the use of three codes in the brewery's linguistic repertoire (Gumperz 1972), constrained by the communicative networks and ultimately goal-oriented communicative situations which develop in such an institutional setting. These codes have different sources and are used by different sets of people. Those sets of people have overlapping communication networks, however, so that in some situations more than one code can be used.

These codes are: English, Québécois French, and standard French. The source of the first two can be found in the fact that each is the mother tongue of the two most important ethnic groups in contact in the brewery. The third has largely been introduced either through formal education or through the language reform efforts of the provincial government.

Standard French is thus largely confined to written language, while Québécois is mainly only spoken, and English can be both. In the written language, then, there is a competition between English and standard French, and in the spoken language between Québécois and English (although, as we have seen, Québécois itself varies along a continuum approximating standard French to a greater or lesser degree, while never becoming identical to it). The only area where all three compete is in technical terminology.

Indeed, variation in the domain of technical terminology is highly revealing of the social factors influencing verbal behaviour in general. The terminology used in the brewery is largely of American origin. While anglophones do modify the terminology somewhat in spoken language (especially through ellipsis, e.g., <u>stacker</u> for <u>pallet stacker</u>), the English terminology used by anglophones is largely consistent. This is not, however, the case among francophones. One reason for this is the gap between in-house usage and the standard French terminology mentioned earlier, introduced through management by the government, and simultaneously through the young francophones in management and among the foremen. However, even this standard terminology is inconsistent, for while the government has made efforts to produce lexicons for as many technical domains as possible, it still relies to a large extent on efforts from within industry itself. As a result, many companies, including this one, took it upon themselves to draw up such lexicons, resulting in non-comparability between companies in the same domain. However, the three Montreal breweries have recently begun to work on a joint terminology, although it is not known what their method of implementation will be. It will be crucial, since in this brewery at least, there have been several different sources for the in-house lexicons, resulting in variation between sectors as well as up and down the hierarchy in both "standard" and colloquial forms. This continues, as individuals all over the brewery become increasingly involved in translation not just of terms in isolation, but the technical documents that contain them as well.

Within spoken French much variation exists, partly between "standard" forms and older forms, and partly among the older forms themselves. Such variability includes forms such as: <u>fardier</u> vs. <u>towmotor</u> vs. <u>chariot à petite levée</u>, <u>laveuse</u> vs. <u>soaker</u>, or <u>sleeve</u> vs. <u>chemise</u> vs. <u>enveloppe</u> vs. <u>couvercle à rabat</u>. In all these cases the English forms are actually adapted to Québécois phonology. Usage of these terms varies not only from individual to individual, but within the speech of individuals. Indeed, some francophones have taken to referring to the <u>soakerlaveuse</u> or to the <u>fardiertowmotor</u>.

This in-house jargon reveals the distance between most of its users (operators and older foremen, who have direct contact with the machines) and its sources. Although many terms have been borrowed from English, most of the borrowed terms have been adapted in some way to French phonology, or have become loan translations; other terms are neologisms of some kind, usually metaphorical or metonymical usages. Table 2 presents some examples, most of which are not variable within each code.

The recently-arrived francophones in management tend not to use Québécois forms; certain other employees, notably the lab technicians who have contacts with both management and the plant, vary in lexical choice.

While terminology is one powerful socially significant set of alternates within the brewery, other aspects of code choice are also significant, and all involve a choice which in fact constitute a series. The first choice to be made is between English and French, and the

TABLE 2: Categorization of Technical Terminology

Québécois	English	French	Literal translation
Loans: worm tré chemin de clé pasteuriseur infeed	worm tray key-way pasteurizer infeed (con-veyor)	vis sans fin cabaret pasteurisateur convoyeur nourricier	screw without end feeding conveyor
Ellipsis: dépile	uncaser	station de dé-pilage	unpiling station
Metonymy: oreilles table	ear(plug)s soaker	protecteurs à oreilles laveuse	ear protecters washer

Metaphor:
piano (due to
  shape)
tulipe (due to
  shape)
suce
spoutnik
	rinser dis-
	  charge
	beer tube
	
	bottle picker
	case of 12
		sortie de la
		laveuse
		tube à bière
		
		caisse de douze
			washer exit
			
			tulip
			
			sucker
			sputnik[8]

second is between standard French and Québécois.

One of the results of change is that the social stratification of linguistic register, in which standard French was more prestigious than Québécois, and English more prestigious than French, has been altered. In this chapter I have presented some of the ways in which this stratification has changed, and some of the sources of re-evaluation of the codes in the community. The tendency of the change appears to be in the direction of a positive re-evaluation of Québécois as opposed to standard French, and of French as opposed to English. Most francophones in the brewery expect French to be the language of work, as opposed to English. However, most also perceive European French (as opposed to Québécois) as "snobbish", or, worse, "imperialist". Most anglophones agree that French should be the language of work. They have little emotional investment in the issue of what type of French should be used, but many do have a practical investment, since they speak either standard or Québécois, depending on how they learned the language (one learns standard French in the classroom, Québécois "on the street").

However, English and something called "le bon français" [GOOD FRENCH], are still considered important, English because of its undiminished importance in national and international business, science and technology, and "good French", because of the new expanded role of French in business communications within Quebec, and because of the necessity of legitimating the use of French in that role. In the next chapter I will examine more closely the relationship of these opposing factors to actual verbal behaviour in the brewery. One factor to be

taken into account, then, is the social value placed not only on codes, but on the social relations and situations in which they are used.

4.5 Conclusion

This chapter, then, has provided background information on the social, economic, structural and political factors impinging on or internal to the brewery which affect the practical consequences and the symbolism of language choice within the company. The next chapter will examine the way in which language is used in key situations (Gumperz and Cook-Gumperz 1982) in the brewery, in order to discover the way in which changing social relations are realized through language use, and what this reveals about the nature, mechanism and outcome of change.

From the point of view of changes in ethnic relations, the important social groups in the brewery are formed by the cross-cutting distinctions of age (i.e., generation), ethnicity, hierarchical position and sector. In management one finds a new type of employee, the young, educated francophone, older anglophones who (not only in management, but elsewhere as well) are something of the residue of change, and a few younger marginal anglophones, who accept the reversal of ethnic power relations in the brewery without necessarily feeling personally involved in the larger-scale power struggle in Quebec; some of them, however, find, after a certain amount of time, that they are forced to make a choice between one or the other ethnolinguistic group. In the plant, francophones dominate overwhelmingly. Old and young, their attachment to the French language seems more a symbolic means of gaining power than

a need to legitimate that power, which is something that operates at the level of management.

The major situational distinctions are to be made (a) between non-work-related and work-related situations, and (b) between internal and external communication. The higher one goes in the hierarchy the more choice one has in one's leisure-time companions, the more need there is for external communication, the more need there is for reading and writing as well as speaking (both English and French), and the more heterogeneous the internal population (especially in production).

In the next chapter I will look at interaction in some of the key situations in the brewery: these situations are key not only from the point of view of organizational decision-making and of the establishment of communication networks and social relations, but also from the point of view of their role in the change. I will therefore look at work-related and non-work-related situations in various departments (more or less ethnically homogeneous), and at various levels of the hierarchy (where interethnic interaction within the brewery and with contacts outside it are more or less common, and where communicative needs may be more or less elaborated). I will specifically look at situations where new and old participants must interact, especially where older anglophones have new young francophone bosses, where a set of new participants is faced with an old situation, but has little contact with the old participants, and where old participants must now interact under new circumstances.

The points where language choice seems least clear are those which appear to be at the frontier of change. That is, it is precisely at those points where the life chances of anglophones and francophones have most recently changed that there is the most confusion about appropriate behaviour. This confusion is the result of gaps in the communication network to which people who interact belong, or a gap between the former set of participants and the new one. This state of affairs produces situations in which behaviour, along with all the background knowledge informing behaviour, must be negotiated if interaction is going to be mutually satisfactory, indeed, if interaction is going to be possible at all.

The following chapter will describe verbal behaviour in these situations both in terms of the social differentiation of language use and in terms of the strategies used to accomplish social ends. It will thus deal with alternate choice between French and English and between Quebec French and European French; it will also deal with the social and/or stylistic significance of those choices.

This chapter has served to locate situations where verbal behaviour is particularly important not only for accomplishing work but also for establishing social relations, and through that, for establishing social identity. It also has served to identify those situations which have been subject to change, and to describe the nature of the change. This context will be used, in the following chapter, to analyze patterns of verbal behaviour, and, through linking patterns of behaviour to situational context, to describe the way language itself can be used to

define social identity and social role.

Notes

1.   Information in this section is taken from four major sources:
informants within the brewery, official documents furnished by the
brewery (henceforth   referred to as Brewery Documents), articles
published in The Gazette of Montreal on September 22, 1979, and Denison
1955.

2.   The personnel officer in charge of recruiting was asked about the
absence of anglophone recruits. (She was the first francophone hired in
personnel; she was hired as a French teacher in 1963. The sector is now
almost totally francophone). She said that very few anglophones present
themselves now as candidates, partly, she thinks, because the
advertisements placed by the brewery are all in French, even in English
newspapers, and the requests they place with agencies all specify that
full knowledge of French is required. Further, she acknowledges that
she has a tendency to recruit from institutions she knows, which are all
French, but she says that in any case most English institutions produce
candidates with an overly theoretical orientation.   Finally, she
eliminates most anglophones who do present themselves in the job
interview itself, because she feels that they have not "fait les
épreuves avant de se présenter [PROVEN THEMSELVES BEFORE PRESENTING
THEMSELVES]", that is, they have not already shown that they can speak
French.

3.   In Quebec a distinction is usually made between "francisation", a
shift in language use from English to French, and "francophonisation",
or an increase in the numbers of native speakers of French inside some
community or institution.

4.   This information is taken from documents furnished by l'Office de la
Langue Française, and from interviews with O.L.F. staff.

5.   The government tests were designed for the evaluation of petitioners
for professional licenses who were not trained in a francophone
institution. They are, however, used also by this company, and possibly
by others, for the evaluation of their candidates for employment or
promotion.   The tests provide the company with an outside "objective"
measure which facilitates their decision-making.

6.   The fact that personnel is considered a separate sector, rather than
as a department within the administration, is due mainly to the efforts
of its present vice-president.

7.   It should be mentioned that on parle is ambiguous, and could be
translated either as to speak, as for us to speak, or as that we should

speak.

8. The term <u>spoutnik</u> derives from the fact that this small case of beer
is light enough to be tossed from hand to hand during delivery.

Chapter 5

Language Use in its Social Context

5.0 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to discover patterns of language use in social interaction in Harper's Brewery. By analyzing these patterns in the context of the social organization of the brewery it will be possible to discover their significance, both in terms of their inter-actional function of conveying or establishing social and stylistic meaning, and in terms of the way in which, as markers, they may reflect social divisions. The patterns of language use involve both choice of code and choice of linguistic alternates within a code. These choices occur at any level of discourse structure, and may co-vary with shifts in discourse or situational factors such as turn-taking or topic shift. The patterns are linked, due to the multi-level nature of language use in which not only may one thing be said in many ways at once, but many things may also be said simultaneously.

Since the purpose of this analysis is to discover what language use has to do with social change in a goal-oriented institution like a business, the point of departure must be the interactions in which work is accomplished and social relations are defined and acted out. As has been pointed out in Chapter 4, work in the brewery tends to get carried

out more or less informally, although the higher one gets in the hierarchy the more often are certain times and places set aside for specific tasks involving the exchange of information and the making of decisions. Further, with the exception of work orders and lab reports, most of the tasks get carried out through conversation, whether face-to-face or on the telephone.

Rather than analyze language use in interactions all over the brewery, I decided to examine in detail interactions at various hierarchical levels in the one sector which appeared to be the most central to the functioning of the brewery and which also reflects most completely the kinds of social, economic and political changes the brewery was undergoing. This sector, Production, also contained all the social divisions of age, sex, hierarchy, ethnicity and sub-sector typical of the brewery's social organization.

The Production sector contains the following sub-sectors: brewing, bottling and packaging, engineering/maintenance and the labs. One brewing supervisor said: "There's three provinces in the country of Harper: brewing, bottling and maintenance", a reflection of the extent to which these three sub-sectors are held to be central to the basic function of the brewery: the production of beer. These are the front lines, with their day-to-day excitement, crisis management and trouble-shooting. The other sectors have a lower profile, either because so much of their activity takes place off the work site (as in Distribution), or because they are involved in long-range policy and planning. But all their activity, in any case, is about what happens in

Production. Without an understanding of what happens in Production an aspiring executive goes nowhere.

It was possible to tape several different kinds of work situations in the Production area, both in the plant and in the offices, in bottling and packaging, the labs and engineering/maintenance. While it was possible to spend some time in brewing, and to talk extensively with brewing managers and operators, it was not possible to tape there due to the feeling of the master brewer that taping would be contrary to the interests of his sub-sector. Information about this sub-sector, then, comes from interviews and observation. It should be noted that the vice-president of this sector is anglophone. In the sub-sectors there is increasing francophonisation: the present master brewer is the first francophone ever to hold that job; the supervisors under him, either francophone or bilingual marginal anglophones, were recruited either from the labs or from outside: they all have specific scientific training. The labs manager is a young bilingual francopnone whose predecessor was anglophone. The same is true of the manager of engineering/maintenance (indeed, he was promoted during the time of the study). The bottling/packaging manager is anglophone.

In bottling and packaging tapes were made in the following situations:

1) A foremen's office booth in the packaging area of the plant over the course of two working days (day shift). In the plant, the foremen are stationed in a glassed-in booth a few feet away from the line or lines

for which they are responsible; often the booth is placed between two production lines, and houses the foremen responsible for each. During the day, the foremen routinely go out to assign workers, especially the temporaries, to their specific stations on the line, and later to inspect the work flow. They may also go out to deal with specific problems as they come up, some of which they learn about by telephone, some through people (workers, other foremen and supervisors) who come in to tell them, some by what they see from their desks. Their supervisors routinely come in to check in with them. The foremen usually work in teams, two to a sub-section; they also work with the two other pairs of foremen who take the shifts immediately preceding and following (and sometimes overlapping with) their own. They are responsible for dealing with mechanical operations, medical events and staffing: they must keep track of workers' hours and pay, and make decisions regarding worker placement on a daily basis. For example, a foreman may be asked to supply men for another section which is temporarily under-staffed; it is his decision whom, if anyone, to send.

In the station which I was able to observe and in which I was able to tape-record, there were two young francophone men. Georges is a foreman, Ronald an acting foreman. They had both been working at the brewery for a little over ten years. Ronald had held his acting foreman job for about two years, although at one point he gave it up because he felt he was being exploited and had no real chances for permanent promotion. A third man, André, another acting foreman, arrived later in the day. The son of a newly-promoted supervisor, he had worked for Harper's for five years since age nineteen, the last two of which have

been as acting foreman. He left school because he was married and his wife was pregnant, but he talked of possibly going back to school one day. The acting supervisor (the supervisor was on holiday) dropped in several times; a francophone aged about 35 or 40, he had worked at the brewery a year less than Ronald, but had advanced quickly. The workers were mainly francophone; on Ronald's line there were two older Poles, one of whom was universally considered a problem, and was generally ostracized. Twenty-five out of the fifty-two workers on that shift were temporaries.

2) The planning office. This office is staffed by two foremen, one of whom holds his job permanently, the other of whom is on a one-year rotation from the plant. The idea behing the rotation is that (a) it provides foremen with a global view of their sub-sector, thereby enabling them to make more intelligent decisions once they are back in the plant; and (b) it provides management with a way of training and selecting future supervisors. Besides short and long-range decisions regarding what kinds and amounts of beer should be produced on what lines and at what times, the planning office also deals with day-to-day problems resulting from absences and mechanical breakdowns. It is also in many ways a Central Station of the bottling and packaging sector, a place where manager, foremen and supervisors drop in to gossip, chat, look at the newspaper and drink coffee (the coffee machine is just down the hall).

The permanent staffer is of mixed French and Irish origin, and is fluently bilingual. His children are also bilingual, but

English-dominant. He is in a somewhat difficult position, having entered his job directly from the outside, and not having worked his way up. Further, he is the only foreman in his subsector to not work in the plant. He is responsible for the department's budget, but has trained in the other job in the office, as well as in the supervisor's job. The rotating foreman is a young francophone, responsible for "beer, bottles and boxes". Their former supervisor, André's father, had moved to another supervisor's job with increased responsibilities, so at the time they reported directly to the anglophone sub-sector manager. The two foremen, Jimmy and Denis, take coffee in the office with whomever is around; they lunch in the cafeteria with the young women from Personnel and a few other francophone foremen.

In the labs the following situations were tape-recorded:

3) The office of the labs manager. The work that actually takes place in the office involves either the writing of reports, or conversations with people from inside or outside the brewery who come to discuss specific issues with the manager. From inside the brewery these include managers or supervisors from other sectors or employees within the sector who wish to discuss issues concerning sanitation and security and other aspects of quality control; when the manager, Michel, has some-thing to discuss with the anglophone vice-president, he goes to the vice-president's office (communication with the vice-president is always in English, although written reports can be sent to him in French). From outside the brewery there are employees who are being trained and representatives of supplying companies. During the day spent with

Michel, one other manager came to discuss defective cartons as did a representative of the carton-supply firm, a representative of the printing company came to discuss defective printing on the cartons, and two new sales representatives from rural branch offices of Harper's came to learn about the labs. The outside visitors were also taken to the plant to examine the defective material (in the case of the suppliers), and to the labs (in the case of the sales representatives). The manager also spends a part of his day in the labs talking to the technicians, and whenever he can he takes coffee with them. He also has extensive contacts with the (anglophone) Head Office research lab, where indeed he had recently completed a training period. A native speaker of French, he began to speak English seriously in college, although in fact, he needed English primarily for reading English textbooks. Once hired by Harper's (in 1968), he was sent to train for several years in Toronto and Vancouver, where he perfected his English. He was brought back to Montreal in 1976 to replace the anglophone labs manager who had transferred to Ontario. Michel is married to an anglophone and speaks English at home. He intends to send his children to an English school. He feels that to some extent his French has suffered through lack of use, although he speaks French almost exclusively during the working day.

4) The work areas of the bottling lab and the quality control lab. The bottling lab is frequented by the bottling lab staff and by foremen who come in periodically to check on lab results (on which depend decisions about the next steps to take) and/or to chat up one of the young female lab technicians. There are usually one or two technicians on duty; if

there are two, one stays in the lab and the other spends most of his or her time inspecting bottles and cartons on the line. The responsibility of the other is to sample and test beer from the tanks. The bottling lab technicians thus have extensive contact with foremen and workers, although generally they enter into conversations only with foremen. The bottling lab supervisor, Paul, is a young francophone who had previously worked in a similar capacity in another food company which had recently shut down; he has university training. His office is on another floor. The bottling lab staff includes two older men, one Lithuanian and one French, both ex-operators; one francophone man in his early thirties, Pascal, and two young francophone women, Louise and Manon. Pascal, Louise and Manon all have CEGEP (junior college) degrees. They regularly rotate into the quality control lab as well, although the quality control lab staff do not rotate into the bottling lab. The supervisor of the quality control lab is a young francophone, Gilles; under him are two francophone technicians, Hélène and Pierre, both of whom have technical degrees, and both of whom have worked in the labs longer than anyone else except for the three older men from pre-scientific-training days: Mike and Gaston in the bottling lab, and Jack in the microbiology lab. Next to the quality control lab and physically connected to it is the microbiology lab; the supervisor is Henry, a young anglophone from Ontario with a university degree in microbiology. Jack is his technician. Both men work mainly in their lab, but also tour the plant for samples and inspection. Henry also runs the "taste panel", at which experimental beers are tasted blind by staff members. The final lab staff member is an anglophone former operator, Ned, who takes care of equipment, including the cleaning of

glassware and lab coats.

The quality control work area is another place where employees from other sub-sectors tend to congregate. Some secretaries keep their lunches in the lab refrigerator, brewing supervisors come through to check on results or to use lab equipment, as do foremen and supervisors from bottling and packaging. One Head Office technician, who used to work in this lab, often comes in to use the lab equipment; he is an anglophone who speaks some French. Finally, two engineers, one an older anglophone and the other a younger francophone, have desk space in the microbiology lab, so that they and their colleagues are also often around.

The bottling lab work area was recorded at intervals over the course of one day; the quality control work area was recorded on three separate occasions over the course of one month. Because there is a lot of machinery in both labs, the noise level precluded high-quality tape-recording; nonetheless, the material contains some interesting examples.

5) The coffee area of the quality control lab. The employees from each lab, as well as occasional visitors from other sub-sectors, take coffee together every day. The two older anglophones, Mike and Jack, never came; Ned usually only worked afternoons, and Gaston was on sick leave during the time of the study. Pierre, though around, never came in for coffee. Coffee breaks were therefore generally attended only by the younger staff memebers, of whom Henry was the only anglophone. As pre-

viously mentioned, this coffee break was used as a forum for discussion and, often, for decision-making. The break was recorded on six separate occasions over the course of two weeks.

The situations tape-recorded in engineering/maintenance included:

6) Telephone conversations between dispatchers, plant foremen and the electricians, plumbers and mechanics on trouble-shooting duty. The three dispatchers, all bilingual francophone men (two older, one younger) rotate duty, but it is one of the older men who is on duty most of the time, the others covering for him on his breaks, and in the overlap just after his shift when the plant is still on day-shift operation. It is the responsibility of the dispatcher to keep track of trouble-shooters (i.e., who is on duty, where and when), and to assign them to jobs as requests come in from the plant. These conversations were recorded over the course of one day.

7) The receptionist/secretary's desk at the entrance to the engineering/ maintenance office area. The secretary is a young bilingual francophone woman, Linda; she occupies a large space at the entrance, and works as a general receptionist as well as secretary to all the office staff except the manager, who has his own personal secretary, Denise, also a young bilingual francophone. Denise has a desk just outside the manager's office. Linda is often called upon for help in translations; indeed, she is very interested in translation and language per se, often volunteering editing of translation, style and spelling, which, she says, her bosses appreciate and which provides her with some challenging

and interesting work to do. Linda has worked at Harper's for two years; besides her secretarial training she has junior college level training in language and literature. Taping took place over the course of one day.

8) The office of the senior anglophone, supervisor of engineering projects and, at the time the tape was made, acting manager. Bob is Scottish, and has worked at the brewery for about twenty-five years. Under other circumstances Bob would have been promoted to manager when his anglophone boss transferred to Ontario; however, a young bilingual francophone was promoted instead. Bob had known for a long time that he would be passed over for promotion (long before, in fact, the actual candidate surfaced), and had decided just the same to stay in Montreal until retirement. Taping took place in Bob's office, again over the course of a working day. His day was spent largely in pursuing ongoing projects and in planning others. He had one conference with the vice-president in the vice-president's office, which I was not invited to attend. In his own office he had a long conversation with a Vietnamese projects engineer (whose second language was French and whose third language was English) regarding long-term building and renovation plans, shorter conferences with engineering supervisors, and informal talks with other supervisors who happened to be walking by and stuck their heads in the door. Some francophone office personnel from accounting came to discuss specific issues briefly, as did some foremen from other areas within the sub-sector. Bob had telephone and intercom conversations with contractors, suppliers and other supervisors. He made one inspection tour of the garage with representatives of the

brewery's insurance company, which was also tape-recorded.

9) The weekly meeting of the sub-sector manager and supervisors. The francophone manager, Albert, had just returned from holiday. Several supervisors were still on holiday and therefore absent, and their replacements were unable to attend. Present were Bob, Claude (a francophone supervisor of about twenty-five years' employment at Harper's), and Daniel (a young francophone acting supervisor from Stores). Daniel's anglophone boss had recently retired; the senior man under him, an anglophone, bid for the promotion, but failed the Government French test twice and so could not be promoted. While the search for a new supervisor was being conducted Daniel was made acting supervisor.

The tapes thus represent a reasonable sample of what goes on in the plant and in the offices, in open and closed work spaces, in interactions involving most of the hierarchical levels (operators are underrepresented due to the noise level in their work areas, and it was impossible to go higher than the level of manager due to fears of leaking secrets), in defined interactions (coffee breaks, meetings, conferences), as well as in informal spur-of-the-moment encounters.

It must be kept in mind, however, that in each of the represented sub-sectors all the highest positions had until recently been held by anglophones, and, indeed, some of them still were. There remained a high concentration of anglophones among maintenance staff (plumbers, electricians and mechanics), but very few of them are young. The labs

and brewing, also, at all levels above that of operator, were until recently dominated by anglophones: it was only the splitting of the labs into Head Office and Branch, and the replacement of staff in the Branch lab by francophones in the mid-1970s, that made the lab into the francophone area it is today.

In the following section each of the situations described will be analyzed in terms of the patterns of language use within them. Where possible and pertinent, evidence about written language will also be described.

The patterns of language use to be described fall into the following matrix:

| | | Type of Interaction | |
		Intra-ethnic	Interethnic
Possible	QF/EF	* *	*
code			
choice	Eng/Fr	* *	*

This matrix covers the socially significant categories which have emerged from the data. In each cell occur the ways in which code choices are manifested in terms of patterns of language use (e.g., code-switching, corrections, style-shifting, etc.). However, certain things are hidden by the data, and should be explained:

First, on the whole, the categorization of type of interaction emerges from the meaning of language use; thus, if the issue appears to

be choice of French (of whatever kind) or English, the interaction is interethnic. As a result, the upper right-hand cell is something of a contradiction in terms: the fact of speaking (or being able to speak) Quebec French in any interaction already raises the possibility that the interaction is intra-ethnic, so strong is the association of the code with a set of beliefs and values that only a member of the in-group would hold, due to the sociological circumstances under which, in Montreal today, that code can be acquired (see Chapters 2 and 3). That is, it is sociologically unlikely that anyone who has been able to acquire Quebec French is actually not ethnically French. Therefore, and this is the second point, the code choices as elaborated above are the only socially real ones for Montrealers: if the concern is over English/French language choice, then the type of French spoken is, at that stage, immaterial. The importance of the variety of French emerges only when francophone control is established, that is, only when the situation is seen from within the French ethnic group.

The patterns of language use that follow, then, will be examined in terms of their social meaning and value, first in the restricted interactive context in which they are found, and second as part of an overall pattern of interactions in the brewery. In both interethnic and intra-ethnic interaction it will be important to discover, given that language and code choice are a priori related to ethnic identity, what aspects of language are used to define that identity in the context of the social definition of the immediate situation (as an example of a larger social category of situations).

Thus choice of QF or EF features (see chapter 3) is important to the definition of French ethnic identity. In order to discover the substance of that definition the following questions will be asked:

1) to what extent are QF features used in new social domains where they would formerly have been unexpected? This is an index of the extent to which QF is being upgraded in social value;

2) to what extent do QF and EF features compete? Any style-shifting or social stratification, any situational or metaphorical switching (see chapter 1), would further reveal the social value assigned to these features;

3) to what extent are people consciously aware of a difference between QF and EF? What aspects of these codes do they talk about? Why are they important? To what extent is English influence on QF important, as opposed to other distinguishing characteristics of QF (see chapter 3)?

Much the same kinds of questions will be asked about English/French code choice with respect both to English and French ethnic identity and to the relationship between groups:

1) what local conditions produce categorical language choice or code-switching?

2) if there is code-switching, is it situational or metaphorical, and what is actually switched (formulas, routines, lexical items, turns in a

conversation, etc.)?

3) how do these patterns compare across situations, types of interactions, and identity of participants (e.g., do native and marginal anglophones do the same things? in both interethnic and intra-ethnic interaction? at work and at leisure?)?

4) what features of code choice are explicitly commented upon?

5) to what extent have patterns of language choice changed? if they have changed, what specific conditions (as a product of large-scale social change) were responsible?

And, finally, a general question can be asked of both types of code choice: how is code choice used in conversational strategy? Strategies are successful only when knowledge is shared, so that the strategies that occur in the data (for the accomplishment, e.g., of emphasis, role-distancing, closure) can be examined for the shared background knowledge they reveal. Since many of them are based on the shared membership of which language choice is symbolic, they reveal speakers' assumptions about shared or unshared membership in an ethnic group.

Code choice can also be evaluated in terms of two types of consequence that choice may have. The first has to do with the effect of choice on the speaker's chances of participating in the conversation. The extent to which a speaker gets the floor can influence his or her ability to form social relations and gain access to social roles and

activities. The second type of consequence concerns the formation of interlocutors' expectations of one another. This is part of impression formation, and can lead to ethnic categorization to the point of stereotyping. This kind of evaluation forms a link between patterns of verbal behaviour in interaction and processes of definition of group identity, formation of networks and boundaries, and similar large-scale social processes.

These patterns, then, reveal expectations about group membership, about the rights and obligations attendant upon that membership, and about the appropriate way of acting them out in specific kinds of situations. They also reveal the extent to which those expectations are conventionalized or the extent to which, conversely, they must be worked out (both for individuals and for groups to share).

Each of the following situations was chosen because it represents a different aspect of social change in Montreal. In each, language use will be examined for what it reveals about the symbolism of language in the definition of situations and identity. In each case local conditions prevail which render certain aspects of code choice meaningful. Taken together, these patterns provide a picture of the factors affecting the meaning of language use, as well as of the ways language itself is used in the community to re-define the meaning and value of ethnic relations and of the languages symbolic of them.

5.1 Language use in situated interactions

5.1.1 Bottling and packaging

5.1.1.1 The foremen's office

Ronald, acting foreman
André, acting foreman
Georges, foreman
Gaetan Gagnon, foreman
Jean, acting supervisor

The first thing to be noticed here is the extent to which foremen tend to talk to each other almost exclusively. Besides conversations about immediate problems like mechanical breakdowns, conversation revolved around major themes of status and benefits; the problems involved in being an acting foreman rather than a real foreman; sick leave; worker absenteeism and malingering; insurance; overtime. The two acting foremen, despite the difference in age between them (about ten years), seemed to talk to each other a good deal more than either of them did to the full foreman who shared the office.

All three foremen, and other foremen, supervisors and workers who came into the office, shared the same code: Quebec French. Forms that occur frequently in everyone's speech include:

1) icitte (vs. EF ici);

2) pas en tout [paã tʊt] or pas pas en tout (vs. EF pas du toutNOT AT ALL); ex. i veut pas marcher pantout (IT WON'T WORK AT ALL);

3) pis as conjunction (vs. EF et): ex. au Québec t'as pas le choix

verre D—Glass pis C—Glass t'as pas le choix (IN QUEBEC YOU DON'T HAVE A CHOICE GLASS D—GLASS AND C—GLASS YOU DON'T HAVE A CHOICE);

4) [tUt] (vs. EF [tu]): ex. on prend [tUt] les calculs des semaines (YOU TAKE ALL THE CALCULATIONS OF THE WEEKS);

5) Question particle -tu: ex. Tu travailles-tu pour une compagnie? (DO YOU WORK FOR A COMPANY?); Oh, t'as demandé à papa 'je peux-tu avoir d'overtime?' (OH, YOU ASKED DADDY 'CAN I HAVE SOME OVERTIME?'). This form varied with est-ce que, intonation and one case of inversion: (Ronald) est-ce qu'y serait en bas? [WOULD IT BE DOWNSTAIRS?]; veux-tu regarder? [DO YOU WANT TO LOOK?]; (André) à quelle heure tu vas manger? [AT WHAT TIME YOU GO TO EAT?];

6) lexical items: astheur (EF maintenant NOW); correcte (EF bon, bien — OKAY); embarquer (EF mettre GET or PUT IN or ON; lit. TO EMBARK); en tabarouette (intensifier, from tabernacle);

7) loanwords: overtime, filler, packer, stack, stock, tray, towmotor, anyway. Note that most of these, with the exception of anyway, are technical terms;

8) Complementizers with que: ex. Je sais comment que ça marche (EF Je sais comment ça marche I KNOW HOW (THAT) IT WORKS). (There are no cases of any form of the ce que variable in the transcript.);

9) Impersonal tu: ex. l'employé demande d'aller au médical tu

l'envoies pas i i tombe sur le plancher... (THE EMPLOYEE ASKS TO GO TO MEDICAL YOU DON'T SEND HIM HE HE FALLS ON THE FLOOR...) (said with respect to the problems a foreman has in screening real medical problems from malingering);

10) Loss of ne: ex. i arrête pas (HE DOESN'T STOP);

11) Vas form of 1st person singular present, verb aller (TO GO) (vs. EF vais);

12) elision of [l]: ex. i tombe sur le plancher (vs. EF il tombe...- HE FALLS ON THE FLOOR).

Two kinds of shifts, of variation, occurred in the speech of the foremen, although, again, it must be noted that the few cases described here were the only ones occurring in two days of taping and observing; in other words, the foremen used the resources of Quebec French the vast majority of the time. (The internal resources included choice of lexical items from non-work registers, or, more precisely, from non-adult male registers: Oh, t'as demandé à papa; Je m'en vas boire une petite bière (I'M GOING OFF TO DRINK A TEENY BEER); and intonation, etc.)

The first kind of shift was that from Quebec French to European French. This happened only once:

```
1. Ronald (on phone):...attends      [WAIT
              une minute... le tow-    A MINUTE... THE
              motor en bas i          TOWMOTOR DOWNSTAIRS
              arrête pas... là i       IT DOESN'T STOP (RUNNING)
              est... non i veut pas    THERE IT IS... NO IT WON'T
              marcher pas pantÛt...     GO (RUN, WORK) AT ALL...
              ben anyway si vous       WELL ANYWAY IF YOU
              l'avez mon towmotor      HAVE MY TOWMOTOR
              est-ce qu'il serait en   WOULD IT BE DOWNSTAIRS?
              bas?... okay c'est       OKAY THAT'S FINE]
              correcte
              (hangs up)
   Monica: une machine fonctionne     [A MACHINE'S NOT WORKING?]
           pas?
   Ronald: oui ah un fardier          [YES UH A fardier
                                        (=towmotor)]
```

This shift is clearly situational, since it accompanies a shift from a telephone conversation with a colleague to a response to my question. My use of fonctionner instead of marcher may have reinforced the tendency to shift with me.

The second kind of shift is one from French to English, and should be subdivided into situational and metaphorical shifts.

The one situational shift took place when the anglophone Lithuanian, Mike, from the bottling lab, came into the office from his inspection round, carrying several very torn and dirty cartons. He showed them to one of the acting foremen, André, indicating, largely in sign language, that things weren't quite as they should be. The verbal communication that occurred was:

```
2. Mike: they should be better than that
   André: on line three?
   Mike: yeah on line three yeah
```

Clearly, Mike's inability to speak French, and André's limited command

of English, produced the part sign-language and part English communication. It is worth noting that Mike is an old man, close to retirement, who had to learn English in order to get a job when he arrived in Montreal shortly after the Second World War: no one expects him to speak French and no one holds it against him that he doesn't. On the other hand, the francophones also hardly ever talk to him unless, in the line of duty (as here), it is absolutely necessary. Not that they dislike Mike, it is just that he is not someone to whom one can talk because of the language barrier. Here is another example of the barrier: the following conversation took place in the bottling lab, when Mike came in from his rounds. Manon was on duty and had taken a phone message for Mike:

3. Manon: la six elle a pas   [LINE SIX DIDN'T
          décollé pour la   UNSTICK FOR THE
          le (unint)   THE (UNINT)]
   Mike: six [sɪs] no no no   [SIX]
         same thing
   Manon: ah he call he ah
   Mike: he called you yeah
   Manon: he call you uh
   Mike: yeah (laughs) oh

They finally gave up and went back to work. At other times when the problem arose they asked me to act as interpreter. Mike is the only monolingual anglophone the foremen see regularly. Their regular supervisor is a bilingual anglophone, and the allophone employees under them all speak French. Their supervisor, further, was replaced soon after by a francophone.

Metaphorical switches did occasionally occur in conversation, once in a conversation between the acting foremen, Ronald and André, about

the medical centre, and twice in a conversation with the francophone

acting supervisor, Jean. Concerning the medical centre, Ronald said:

4. Ronald:...même moi l'autre   [EVEN ME THE OTHER
           jour j'ai passé au   DAY I WENT TO THE
           médical le le semaine   MEDICAL LAST WEEK
           passée j'étais malade   I WAS SICK
           j'ai eu des bêtises je   I HAD SOME SILLINESS I
           sais comment que ça   KNOW HOW IT
           marche (unint) astheur   WORKS (UNINT) NOW
           rentre à quatre heures   GO IN AT FOUR O'CLOCK
           pis à six heures y a   AND AT SIX O'CLOCK
           personne réunion   NOBODY'S THERE MEETING
           (unint) au médical à   (UNINT) AT MEDICAL AT
           huit heures et demie   EIGHT-THIRTY
           rentré (unint) one   GONE IN (UNINT)
           more un de plus   one more ONE MORE]

Since the medical staff is French it is unlikely that one more is a

quote.

Jean came in to check about the whereabouts of his supervisor, and

to prevent a potential mix-up in the distribution of some cans. He

makes a few phone calls and after he hangs up André tells him:

5. André: mark it on the list
   Jean: (laughs)

Finally, when Jean leaves, he tells the foremen that he's going to

settle the matter with the foreman in charge of the budget, Jimmy:

6. Jean: va aller voir ça avec   [I'M GOING TO LOOK AT THIS
         Leary   WITH LEARY]
   Ronald: avec Jimmy   [WITH JIMMY]
   Jean: (unint)
   Ronald: Jimmy?
   Jean: Jimmy Jimmy Curly Jim

The first two metaphorical switches seem similar to each other, in that they are both summing up statements, which state explicitly and finally that something has happened which should go on record. The third seems to have something to do with the identity of the man referred to (although Jimmy himself claims that at least in some respects he is French), as well as with an attempt at disambiguation since Ronald seems not to be sure to whom Jean is referring.

Thus situational switches are rare, since the foremen rarely participate in situations in which the use of QF is not appropriate. The foremen are, however, aware of the existence of these other kinds of situations, and can change their verbal behaviour accordingly, if only partially. Metaphorical switches are correspondingly rare; the ones that do occur involve only English, not European French, and occur mainly with reference to work in the wider sense, to official records of events, to the public face of brewery life (or what the public face, in their opinion, should be).

Thus within French there seems to be categorical code choice of QF with the exception of certain lexical items, mainly technical terms, which do vary stylistically, with EF terms considered appropriate for more formal registers, for use with outsiders or higher-status people. Certainly, the concept of "good French" is very real. English is used situationally in interethnic interaction, so that it is considered appropriate to speak English with at least some older anglophones. English is also used stylistically in intra-ethnic interaction, and seems to convey emphasis, possibly as a result of the act of switching

itself which functions as a verbal equivalent of underlining or capital

letters, and possibly as a result of the meaning derived from the

historical dominance of English as the brewery's official language.

5.1.1.2 The planning office

Jimmy Leary, budget foreman
Denis, rotating foreman
Manager
Jean, acting supervisor

The two planning foremen, Denis and Jimmy, spend their day speaking

mostly to each other, to other foremen, occasionally to operators who

call in sick, to the francophone staff of the Personnel office, and,

occasionally, to their anglophone boss. This means they speak French

almost exclusively. Jimmy sometimes had occasion to speak to some of

the anglophone staff in engineering/maintenance.

The sector manager, acting temporarily also as planning supervisor,

is an anglophone. The two foremen say they speak to him both in English

and French.   Indeed, early one morning he came into the office and was

looking at the (French) newspaper which a supervisor had left in the

office. Then he came over to talk to Denis.

    7. Denis: sure you don't want a
        seat before you look at this?
     Mgr: not gonna do any good to sit ah
     Denis: hm nous sommes à un et demie   [WE'RE AT ONE AND
        icitte   A HALF HERE]
     Mgr: toute la bière qu'ils ont pris   [ALL THE BEER THAT
        ils ont mis ça dans les (unint)   THEY TOOK THEY PUT

On the only other occasion on which the boss was in the office he spoke to Jean in English:

8. Mgr: fifth floor bottling
   Jean: yeah
   Mgr: cans Port this is with beer
   Jean: yeah
   Mgr: all these all these
   Jean: that's the one we're waiting for the one from the
         lab that's the one who's over pasteurize that's
         the one we take out by hand
   Mgr: they got all their samples?
   Jean: they got all the samples I that's three days ago
         I hasking uh Gilles Leblond and I hask again again
         I'm going now
   Mgr: okay let me know

Only on one other occasion was English used, when Jimmy, the budget and personnel planner, spoke to an English foreman about which worker he could send to the foreman's team when the foreman next finds his team under-staffed.

Other uses of English occurred as part of French conversation:

A. Closure routines

9. Jimmy (on phone): allô Richard   [HELLO RICHARD
            la semaine prochaine i va   NEXT WEEK YOU'LL
            te manquer un gars ça fait   BE MISSING ONE GUY SO
            que à quelle heure est-ce   AT WHAT TIME DO
            que tu veux que je te   YOU WANT ME TO
            l'envoie... okay parfait   SEND HIM TO YOU...
            good   OKAY PERFECT GOOD]

10. Jimmy is talking to a francophone foreman regarding the
    latter's shift schedule and his desire to be on day-shift
    before Christmas:

```
Frman: en tout cas okay au mois     [IN ANY CASE OKAY IN THE
       de décembre je suis de       MONTH OF DECEMBER I'M
       jour?                        ON DAYS?]
Jimmy: semaine su' le B             [WEEK ON B (SHIFT)]
Frman: pas tUt le mois de           [NOT THE WHOLE MONTH OF
       décembre                     DECEMBER]
Jimmy: non mais la fin du mois      [NO BUT THE END OF THE MONTH
       de décembre là               OF DECEMBER THERE]
Frman: oui                          [YES]
Jimmy: à partir du quinze           [STARTING THE FIFTEENTH
       novembre si tu veux su'      NOVEMBER IF YOU WANT ON
       l'⌐B quinze novembre         B FIFTEEN NOVEMBER]
Frman:   └la semaine des fêtes      [THE WEEK OF THE HOLIDAYS
       pour le magasinage ou la     FOR SHOPPING OR THE
       semaine avant                WEEK BEFORE]
Jimmy: le quinze le vingt           [THE FIFTEENTH THE TWENTIETH
       la semaine commençant le     THE WEEK STARTING THE
       vingt-sept le vingt          TWENTY-SEVENTH THE TWENTIETH
       et le vingt-sept de jour     AND THE TWENTY-SEVENTH ON
                                    DAYS]
Frman: merci                        [THANK YOU]
Jimmy: right on Red Rider merci     [...THANK YOU]
```

B. Fixed expressions.

11. Denis is talking to me about California.

```
Denis: as-tu visité Disney         HAVE YOU VISITED DISNEY
       en Californie?               IN CALIFORNIA?]
Monica: oh oui                      [OH YES]
Denis: est-ce qu'il est beau?       [IS IT BEAUTIFUL?
       c'est beau? c'est c'est      IT'S BEAUTIFUL IT'S IT'S
       mieux que celui en Floride   BETTER THAN THE ONE IN
       ... land of make believe     FLORIDA...]
```

C. Loanwords

While loanwords were frequently used, on one occasion the use of a loan-
word was commented upon:

```
Denis:...comme on dit en anglo     [LIKE THEY SAY IN ANGLO
       là pallet stacker            THERE...]
```

This comment brings to mind the widespread use in writing of parentheses

or quotation marks around English terms, which, like Denis' comment, serve to distance the writer from his words, or which absolve him or her from the responsibility of having used it.

Regarding the names of equipment, it is interesting that the only English borrowings that both Jimmy and Denis use (along with Jean and a foreman friend, who is very much in favour of francisation), is la canne (as well as can lid; vs. boîte, canette [can]). They also tend to use tank frequently, but, Denis especially, they tend to prefer cuve [tank]. Jimmy has a greater tendency to use English loanwords: palletizer, filler, filling, bottling, labelling, towmotor. The only French terms Jimmy used were mireuse [bottle inspector] and empaquetage [packaging], although the latter term was used in the following conversation where Jimmy repeats what Gaetan says:

12. Gaetan: ça c'est juste pour   [THAT'S JUST FOR
              l'empaquetage ça   PACKAGING THAT]
    Jimmy: ça c'est juste pour   [THAT'S JUST FOR
              l'empaquetage   PACKAGING]

Both Denis and Gaetan consistently use French equivalents for other terms besides empaquetage, including embouteillage [bottling], soutireuse [filler], and étiquetteuse [labeller]. In several cases, however, the use of these terms was embedded in interesting contexts:

A. Calque.

13. Gaetan:...oui juste au sud   [YES JUST SOUTH
              du numéro un étiquetteuse...   OF THE NUMBER ONE
                                        LABELLER...]

Here, Gaetan uses a word-order calque from English "number one labeller", where French word order demands "étiquetteuse numéro un".

B. Loanwords.

14. Jimmy:...les gars de l'aut' bord   [...THE GUYS FROM THE
          décollaient des tapes...   OTHER SIDE UNGLUED SOME
                                          TAPES...]
    Denis: des tapes des étiquettes   [SOME TAPES SOME LABELS]

Here, Denis corrects Jimmy's use of a loanword.

Despite Denis' efforts to replace English loanwords with French, and his pro-Quebec sentiments, the following loanwords occur frequently: shift (vs. équipe), weekly (as in weekly plan or weekly report), bonus line, feedback, and tower (from English to tow [a car]), and over (as in "I'm two hectolitres over"). Jimmy, however, uses many more loanwords, including bomper (to bump), domper (to dump), spare (as in "two to spare"), and short (as in "I'm two men short").

Finally, English loanwords turn up more regularly in the speech of Jimmy's interlocutors than in that of Denis'.

15. Jimmy:...le labelling i est   [THE LABELLING IT IS
          juste correcte zéro   JUST RIGHT ZERO
          huit juste correcte si   EIGHT JUST RIGHT IF
          Desbiens ne revient pas   DESBIENS DOESN'T COME
          i a deux de spare   BACK THERE ARE TWO SPARE]
    Frman: le labelling i est-tu   [THE LABELLING IS IT
          juste juste juste   JUST JUST JUST (RIGHT)]
    Jimmy: ça va faire...un over   [THAT'LL MAKE ONE OVER
          à zéro huit là pis   AT ZERO EIGHT THERE AND
          deux over au filling   TWO OVER AT FILLING]

and:

```
16. Jimmy: des des spares je les     [SPARES I LEAVE
            laisse au filling        THEM AT FILLING]
    Jean: au filling oui i vont      [AT FILLING YES THEY'LL
          êt' là                     BE THERE]
    Jimmy: deux gars gars deux       [TWO GUYS GUYS TWO
           spares d d deux over      SPARES T T TWO OVER
           totalement                TOTALLY]
```

Both Denis and Jimmy use stereotypical Quebec French forms:

1) pis: (Denis) i en avait de plus pis le lendemain pis toute la semaine i en a eu de plus [THERE WAS EXTRA AND THE NEXT DAY AND ALL WEEK THERE WAS EXTRA]; (Jimmy) pis i vont sortir soixante-cinq [AND THEY'RE GOING TO PRODUCE SIXTY-FIVE]; (Jimmy) c'est des gars de B pis C là [IT'S GUYS FROM B AND C THERE];

2) pas + NEG: (Denis) i en reste pas aucune [THERE ARE NONE LEFT]; (Jimmy) on voit pas les gars nulle part [WE DON'T SEE THE GUYS ANYWHERE];

3) Question particle -tu: (Jimmy) ...fait que tu le prends-tu? [SO YOU ARE TAKING IT?]; (Denis) c'est-tu nous-autres qui avaient les filières des contre-maîtres, non? [WAS IT US WHO HAD THE FOREMEN'S FILES NO?]. This form varies with est-ce que: (Jimmy) à quelle heure est-ce que tu veux que je te l'envoie? [AT WHAT TIME DO YOU WANT ME TO SEND HIM TO YOU?];

4) juste: (Denis) juste le verre [JUST THE GLASS]; (Jimmy) i attendent juste pour changer le moteur [THEY'RE JUST WAITING TO CHANGE THE MOTOR]; But Jimmy also uses QF rien que (only, just): y a rien qu'une petite différence [THERE'S ONLY A SMALL DIFFERENCE];

5) a ma future (always first person singular): (Jimmy) là là a ma t'appeler [THERE THERE I'LL CALL YOU]; (Jimmy) a ma aller voir [I'LL GO SEE]; (Denis) a ma rappeler demain matin [I'LL CALL BACK TOMORROW];

Also je vas: (Denis) je vas avertir ton contre-maître [I'LL NOTIFY YOUR FOREMAN]; (Jimmy) je vas couper la ligne [I'LL CUT THE LINE];

6) Complementizer + que: (Denis) à quel hôpital que tu travaillais? [AT WHAT HOSPITAL DID YOU WORK AT?]; (Jimmy) ...il veut savoir quelle job qu'i va faire [HE WANTS TO KNOW WHAT JOB HE'S GOING TO DO];

Plus que/plus qu'est-ce que: (Denis) le restaurateur paie plus cher... qu'est-ce que nous-autres on paie... [THE RESTAURANT OWNER PAYS MORE THAN WHAT WE PAY]; ...i peuvent pas nous donner plus qu'est-ce qu'y a [THEY CAN'T GIVE US MORE THAN THERE IS].;

7) [tUt] and [twe]: (Denis) i nous a tous [tUt] manqué d'à peu près cinq six pouces là [HE MISSED US ALL BY ABOUT FIVE SIX INCHES THERE]; (Jimmy) sont tous [tUt] des c'est des gars de B pis C là [THEY'RE ALL IT'S GUYS FROM B AND C THERE]; (Denis) tous les [twe] deux sont sûrs qu'i ont pas de Ménard [BOTH OF THEM ARE SURE THEY DON'T HAVE A MENARD];

8) elision of [l]: (Jimmy) j'ai embarqué Desbiens [sæ:] liste des malades [I PUT DESBIENS ON THE SICK LIST]; (Denis) i a fait une grosse indigestion [HE HAD BAD INDIGESTION];

9) correcte, astheur: (Denis) j'ai oublié de vous mettre au courant

d'une affaire astheur c'est sept cycles là [I FORGOT TO TELL YOU ABOUT SOMETHING NOW IT'S SEVEN CYCLES THERE]; (Jimmy) okay on va l'envoyer au zéro neuf A d'accord en haut okay correcte [OKAY WE'LL SEND HIM TO ZERO NINE A OKAY UPSTAIRS OKAY FINE];

The only features used by one and not by the other were the [sətʌ] pronunciation of <u>cette</u> by Denis, and the use of the progressive form <u>après</u> + <u>infinitive</u>, by Jimmy.

(Denis) on prend [sətʌ] cuve-là [WE TAKE THIS TANK HERE]

(Jimmy) i est après monter permanent [HE IS RISING TO PERMANENT]

Jimmy also used the elided form <u>donnes-i</u> [dɔnzi], from <u>donnes-lui</u> (after elision of [l]; both Jimmy and Denis used the <u>r</u> elision in <u>je suis</u> <u>arrivé</u> [ʃtarive].

The features cited here represent the dominant forms characterizing the speech of Denis and Jimmy and their francophone interlocutors. It is worth noting that many of them are variable, notably the choice of lexical alternates, the yes/no question particle -<u>tu</u> (which varies with other syntactic forms for yes/no questions), and the <u>a ma</u> vs. <u>je vas</u> forms of the future; others are less variable, even categorical, notably: [tUt], elision of [l] (especially with personal subject prounouns), and negation forms (loss of <u>ne</u>).

Variation seems unconditioned by either social or stylistic factors: both Jimmy and Denis use all variants in all sorts of conversations. Jimmy has a tendency to use QF forms more regularly than does Denis, especially as regards lexical items (including loanwords). This may be explained by the fact that Jimmy is older than Denis (by about ten years), and that the importance of improving the quality of the French language for political reasons is less an issue for him than it is for Denis. Further, his Irish heritage and English-dominant home sphere, combined with the tenuousness of his status, make it that much more necessary for Jimmy to prove that he is one of the boys, to not put on airs of either an ethnic or a class variety. Thus Jimmy's use of English in intra-ethnic interaction resembles much more the usage of francophones of his generation and older (with his use of loanwords and borrowed phatic responses) than it does the usage of younger francophones like Denis. Similarly, Denis seems to be more comfortable speaking French to his anglophone boss than does Jimmy (or, for that matter, Jean). Still, it should be noted that in example (7) Denis goes through an opening routine in English with his boss before switching into French for the substance of the conversation. I believe that the manager's willingness to speak French derives from a sense that not to speak French would put too great a distance between himself and his subordinates, not to mention potentially demonstrating socio-political reasons for resisting French. Should this be seen to be the case, the legitimacy of his position would be at risk, since it is based on his ability to manage an increasingly francophone department with contacts with an increasingly francophone world.

5.1.2 The labs

5.1.2.1 The lab manager's office

Michel Lebrun, labs manager
Gaston, lab technician
Léon, distribution manager
Supply company representative

It should first be noted that while Michel spoke only to francophones during the course of the day he says he does frequently have occasion to use English: in speaking to American suppliers or Canadian ones outside Quebec, to researchers in the Head Office lab, to colleagues in other Canadian branches of the firm, and to his boss, the vice-president of the Production sector. However, while it is necessary for him to be able to speak English, it is equally clear that the majority of his daily interactions are with francophones and in French.

Nonetheless, his style of speech differs markedly from that of other francophones in the brewery. Part of this is due to what appears to be an idiosyncracy: the use of <u>disons</u> (let's say) as a hesitation marker.


```
ex.:  Michel: okay mais regarde        [OKAY BUT LOOK
               j'avais un mémo disons    I HAD A MEMO LET'S SAY
               de Buck Weaver disons qui FROM BUCK WEAVER LET'S
               qui expliquait disons     SAY WHICH WHICH EXPLAINED
               les différences entre     LET'S SAY THE DIFFERENCES
               Montréal pis Toronto      BETWEEN MONTREAL AND
                                         TORONTO]
```


He also uses an historically Québécois pronunciation of <u>gens</u> (people) as [ʒãs] instead of [ʒã] in all environments. This pronunciation derives

from analogic levelling or regularization of the singular and plural forms (EF has no singular; QF sing. gen and plural gens); this process is actually common to spoken (popular) European French and to Quebec French (Brent 1971:41). However, Michel seems to be the only one to use this form in my data.

Some features of Michel's speech differ variably from that of the francophones described above (as well as from that of Michel's interlocutors) and some differ categorically. Some features are shared. Shared features include:

1) pis: ex. pis là on a décidé que on va vous mettre un peu plus de pression uh pis uh ça pis ça c'est pas amélioré pis là on voudrait (unint) [AND NOW WE'VE DECIDED TO PUT ON A LITTLE MORE PRESSURE UH AND UH IT AND IT HASN'T GOTTEN BETTER AND NOW WE'D LIKE (UNINT)].

Variable features include:

1) elision of [l]: ex. i est satisfait où il est [HE'S SATISFIED WHERE HE IS]. However the elided forms dominate: ex. fait qu'i aimaient rester [SO THEY PREFERRED TO STAY]; ils [i:z] ont des bons travaux [THEY HAVE GOOD JOBS]; lorsqu'ils [i:z] avaient [WHEN THEY HAD]; i font le travail pour lequel i ont été préparés [THEY DO THE JOB FOR WHICH THEY HAVE BEEN PREPARED].

2) fait que/donc (so, therefore): Michel uses fait que more often than donc, but he uses donc more often than do other francophones at the

brewery.

Michel:...pour lui offrir un	[...TO OFFER HIM THE
poste de gerant d'un	JOB OF MANAGER OF A
plant de yogourt <u>donc</u>	YOGOURT PLANT SO
uh ce qui s'est arrivé	UH WHAT HAPPENED
c'est plusieurs de nos	IS THAT MANY OF OUR
jeunes...qu'on préparait	YOUNG ONES...WHOM WE
pour la relève <u>donc</u>	WERE PREPARING FOR
pour uh uh y a <u>plusieurs</u>	TAKING OVER SO FOR UH UH
de ces jeunes-là qui	THERE ARE MANY OF
trouvaient disons que la	THOSE YOUNG ONES WHO
progression n'allait pas	FOUND LET'S SAY THAT THE
assez...parce que les les	PROGRESSION WASN'T GOING
disons les plus vieux	ENOUGH...BECAUSE THE THE
restaient ici là <u>fait</u>	LET'S SAY THE OLDER
<u>que</u> ce qui est	ONES WERE STAYING HERE
arrivé c'est que ils	THERE SO WHAT HAPPENED IS
ont eu des offres plus	THAT THEY GOT MORE ATTRACTIVE
alléchants <u>fait que</u>	OFFERS...SO WE LOST MANY
on en a perdu beaucoup	LIKE THAT]
plusieurs comme ça	

3) <u>juste/seulement</u>:   <u>juste</u> en regardant le carton [JUST BY LOOKING AT THE CARTON]; on a <u>seulement</u> deux lignes [WE ONLY HAVE TWO LINES];   c'est <u>seulement</u> qu'un côté de la ligne [IT'S ONLY THAT ONE SIDE OF THE LINE]; c'est <u>juste</u> une chose que c'est p sur le mémo [THERE'S ONLY ONE THING THAT IT'S N ON THE MEMO]; pas pour l'étiquette c'est <u>seulement</u> pour... [NOT FOR THE LABEL IT'S ONLY FOR...]. Michel never uses <u>rien que</u>, but note <u>seulement que</u> above.

4) [tUt]/[tu], [tus]: Michel uses the standard form almost exclusively: tous [tu] les tests qu'on a [ALL THE TESTS WE HAVE]; tout [tu] faire ça [DO ALL THAT]. Sometimes he uses standard forms in a way that is grammatically incorrect, that is, he substitutes the standard masculine [tu] for the standard feminine form [tut], which happens to be isomorphic with QF [tUt] once QF phonological rules have applied. This

use is thus probably a hypercorrection: avant que toute [tu] la relève [BEFORE THE WHOLE REPLACEMENT]; à toutes [tu] les années [EVERY YEAR]. And a self-correction: moi je pensais qu'i faisaient tout [tus] tout [tu] à Toronto [ME I THOUGHT THAT THEY DID ALL EVERYTHING IN TORONTO].

Michel uses the QF form [tUt] twice; the first instance is in conversation with an older francophone lab technician:

```
-- Gaston: c'est-tu le lettrage qui      [IS IT THE LETTERING
           fait qui est défectueux?       WHICH DOES WHICH IS
                                           FAULTY?]
   Michel: c'est [tUt] s tab s            [IT'S ALL ON TAB ON
           tablock hein?                   TABLOCK EH?]
```

The second was in conversation with two young sales representatives from outside Montreal; Michel is about to give them a tour of the labs and introduce them to the technicians: i vont [tUt] nous dévoiler nos secrets [THEY'RE GOING TO REVEAL US ALL OUR SECRETS].

5) qu'est-ce que/ce que: mais c'est plus que ce que la brasserie a connu dans les dernières cinquante ans [BUT IT'S MORE THAN WHAT THE BREWERY HAS EXPERIENCED IN THE LAST FIFTY YEARS]; c'est que ce que nous ce qu'on fait là [IT'S THAT WHAT US WHAT WE DO THERE]; and one case of qu'est-ce que (said to the Harper's sales representatives at the end of the day): pour savoir qu'est-ce que comment qu'on communiquait [TO SEE WHAT HOW WE COMMUNICATED]. And one of Michel's interlocutors (Gaston) said: il dira qu'est-ce qu'il dira [HE'LL SAY WHAT HE'LL SAY].

Other notable features include the consistent use of standard interrogative forms (never -tu), the full form of the aller + infinitive

future (never <u>a ma</u>, even though some of his interlocutors use it), and consistent use of [fe] (never [fɛt]).

The question of Michel's lexical choice is also interesting. Michel uses not only <u>gens</u> to refer to "people", but also <u>types</u>, and sometimes also <u>personnes</u>. <u>Type</u> is not used by anyone else in my data; further, Michel never uses the term most often used by others: <u>gars</u> (from <u>garçons</u>, boys), even though in all cases the referents are indeed masculine. With respect to technical terminology, Michel tends to use French forms: <u>canette</u>, <u>dégustation de bière</u>, <u>embouteillage</u>, <u>étiquette</u> (can, taste panel --literally, beer tasting--, bottling, label). The two variable terms were <u>plant/usine</u> and <u>shift/équipe</u>, and in each case the French variant was used in conversation with me. He also corrected himself, or showed himself to be unsure in some instances, about the proper choice:

```
Michel: on en fait plus de        [SO WE DON'T DO ANY
        transferts donc du plant   MORE TRANSFERS FROM
        au laboratoire c'est       THE PLANT TO THE LAB
        plutôt le contraire t'sais IT'S MORE LIKELY THE
        du laboratoire au (pause)  REVERSE YOU KNOW FROM
                                   THE LAB TO (PAUSE)]
Monica: à au                       [TO TO THE]
Michel: au à la production         [TO TO PRODUCTION]
```

And elsewhere: des travails travaux [JOBS]; taux de rendement de de un taux de rotation disons [RATE OF RETURN OF OF A RATE OF TURNOVER LET'S SAY]; donc les cha les taux de rotation [SO THE CHA(NGES) THE RATES OF TURNOVER].

In other cases, the terms had to be supplied and/or negotiated:

17. Michel is talking to the representative of the company
which prints the cartons; the representative is explaining
why the printing on a competitor's case seems clearer
than that on Harper's':

Repr:	y a pas de trapping	[THERE'S NO TRAPPING]
Michel:	de quoi?	[OF WHAT?]
Repr:	de trapping y a très peu de superposition de couleurs	[OF TRAPPING THERE'S VERY LITTLE SUPERIMPOS- ITION OF COLOURS]

18. Michel is talking to Léon, a manager from Distribution who has to
get some information about the codes used on bottles sent to the U.S.:

Michel:	une chose t'es au courant hein c'est que le lo on le code sur la capsule uh	[ONE THING YOU KNOW ABOUT THIS EH IT'S THAT THE THE WE THE CODE ON THE CAP UH]
Léon:	la corche	[THE CAP]
Michel:	la corche uh ben quand on a mettons un surplus de production	[THE CAP UH WELL WHEN WE HAVE SAY A SURPLUS OF PRODUCTION]
Léon:	est-ce que tu as la la corche la capsule américaine aussi?	[DO YOU HAVE THE THE CAP THE AMERICAN CAP TOO?]

• • • • •

Léon:	le bouchon	[THE CAP]
Michel:	oui	[YES]
Léon:	(unint) de Québec	[(UNINT) OF QUEBEC]
Michel:	c'est ça	[THAT'S RIGHT]
Léon:	la capsule du Québec s'il t'en reste	[THE QUEBEC CAP IF YOU HAVE ANY LEFT]

• • • • •

Michel:	y a toujours une coche sur la capsule qu'on a pour le pour le Québec	[THERE'S ALWAYS A NOTCH ON THE CAP WHICH WE HAVE FOR FOR QUEBEC]

• • • • •

Léon:	la coche pour les Etats ne veut rien dire sur la capsule	[THE NOTCH FOR THE STATES DOESN'T MEAN ANYTHING ON THE CAP]

Here Léon and Michel negotiate the word for bottle cap, using

capsule (a word used for certain kinds of caps, though usually not

bottle caps), corche (the origin of which is unclear to me, though a

relation to cork seems possible), and bouchon (stopper), and finally

ending up with _capsule_.

The only use of English in Michel's office is by Michel's interlocutors: the printing company representative uses it for technical terms (trapping, D point), and Léon uses it for stylistic effect: s'il reste vingt boîtes _that's_ _it_ [IF TWENTY BOXES ARE LEFT...]. Here again, code-switching seems used for emphasis, as verbal capital letters, in a context where the switched utterance is a final summing-up statement of closure.

Michel is interesting in that he seems to take pains to keep his English and his French separate, to avoid some stereotypical QF forms but not others, to vary in the use of QF and standard French forms, and to be uncertain about many of those forms. It is difficult to tell to what extent the high degree of hesitation in his speech is related to this, but it too is worth noting. With the possible exception of Léon, the people Michel speaks to are entirely unaffected by Michel's speech pattern: they consistently use the _qu'est-ce_ _que_ complementizer, the _a_ _ma_ future, etc. Léon is considerably older than Michel, but is his hierarchical equal. However, at the end of the day, when Michel is speaking to the two Harper's representatives from outside Montreal, he uses, for the first time, the QF forms [tUt] and _qu'est-ce_ _que_, _comment_ _que_, and _seulement_ _que_ complementizers. Is it possible that Michel is trying to be not too French but just French enough, indeed, that this issue of identity is an issue for him in a way that it is not for Ronald, André, Jean, Denis or Michel's interlocutors? As one who has risen due at least in part to his francophone identity, but who is on

the verge of assimilating to the anglophone community (and whose
knowledge of English is vital to his rise) Michel is in a particularly
conflicted position. His style-shifting and scrupulous avoidance of
English indicate perhaps some degree of hypercorrection, or at least an
attempt to cope with the conflicting English/French forces at play in
his life, by separating the two as much as possible. His forging of a
new set of conventions for French usage adds to this, since in his usage
he avoids forms with social meaning attached to Québécois identity, and
seems to be moving towards a new identity free of such significance, an
identity of a bilingual businessman with access to the national and
international business networks where provincial identities play no part
in the achievement of success.

5.1.2.2 The lab work areas

Gilles Leblond, quality control lab supervisor
Paul, bottling lab supervisor
Henry, microbiology lab supervisor
Louise, bottling lab technician
Manon, bottling lab technician
Pascal, bottling lab technician
Mike, bottling lab technician
Hélène, quality control lab technician
Pierre, quality control lab technician
Jack, microbiology lab technician
Ned, lab aide
Jacques, former bottling lab technician, now brewing apprentice
Terry, brewing supervisor
M. Legros, master brewer
Marcel, projects engineer

In each of the three laboratory work areas (bottling, quality
control and microbiology) different people interact and verbal behaviour
forms different patterns.

In the bottling lab there is interaction principally between the technician on duty and the plant foremen; everyone involved is francophone. The francophone lab supervisor often drops in or calls. Each technician has worked out a way of communicating with the one anglophone (Mike): they either speak to him in English (if they can), or in sign language, and he uses the little French he has:

19. (see also example 3):
    Manon: (unint)
    Mike: yeah I know
    Manon: i avance pas   [IT'S NOT GOING
                                  FORWARD]
    Mike: oui   [YES]
    Manon: oh

20. Mike: bonjour Louise   [HELLO LOUISE]
    Louise: hi
    Mike: how are you feeling today?
    (The rest of the conversation, about the weather,
    is in English.)

Mike often has conversations in the lab with his own anglophone colleagues; there is a definite separation between Mike's network and that of the francophone lab technicians.

Interaction between francophone lab technicians, especially the female ones, and the male foremen, is often joking. It is usually limited to a few minutes and the technicians are usually simultaneously occupied with recording test results. Outside the lab, the only anglophone the technicians encounter is a young foreman who works alone in an area which the technicians visit every day to take samples. He is generally one of the first to be mentioned when the technicians offer a list of "têtes carrées" (literally, square-heads; a derogatory term for

anglophones; sometimes, the term used is "tête dure", or hard-head, a term reserved for someone who is stubbornly resisting something, in the case of anglophones, resisting speaking French). The technicians claim that they know he can speak French, so his failure to do so must mean that he is deliberately refusing to. As a result the technicians refuse to speak to him, although they have plenty to say about him. The foreman's point of view is that he has as much "right" to speak English as they have to speak French. He also says that he deliberately chose his job, alone in the basement, so that he wouldn't have to be part of a team; he thinks of himself as a loner.

Thus English and French are separate for all concerned, and coping strategies of essentially inefficient sign language are used for people like Mike who are recognized to be too old to cope with the new rules of the game. This state of affairs is increasingly reinforced by real francophone monolingualism. The cellar foreman, being young, is expected, however, to be flexible, but has encountered the difficulties surrounding the change (loss of identity, feelings of inadequacy, etc., produced by recognition of the reversal in the balance of power and subsequent inability to be one's usual charming self in an inadequately-mastered second language in the situations where now that language is newly dominant). In order to avoid those difficulties he has fled to the basement to be alone.

Notable features in the speech of the francophone bottling lab technicians include:

1) reciprocal use of the pronoun tu, with each other and with foremen and the lab supervisor;

2) [sətʌ]: (Manon) mais i marche mal cette [sətʌ] cuve-là [BUT IT'S WORKING BADLY THIS TANK HERE]. Note also the use of i for elle (cuve is feminine);

3) rien que/seulement que: (Manon) y a rien que deux à faire [THERE ARE ONLY TWO TO DO]; c'était seulement que la période de l'été [IT WAS JUST THE SUMMER PERIOD]; (Paul) y a rien qu'à descendre [ONE ONLY HAS TO GO DOWN];

4) combien que: (Paul) combien qu'y a eu en bas? [HOW MUCH WAS THERE DOWNSTAIRS?];

5) fait que: (Manon) fait que j'avais absolument rien [SO I HAD ABSOLUTELY NOTHING]; (Paul) fait que là i va y avoir encore plus [SO THERE THERE'S GOING TO BE EVEN MORE];

6) aller + infinitive/ simple future: (Manon) je vas être là [I'LL BE THERE]; (Paul) Jacques la répétera [JACQUES WILL REPEAT IT];

7) [fɛt]; (Manon) i ont pas fait [fɛt] un concours [THEY DIDN'T HAVE A COMPETITION];

8) [tUt]: (Paul) i sont tous [tUt] pas mal... [THEY'RE ALL PRETTY MUCH...];

9) <u>rester</u> (vs. EF <u>habiter</u>, to live in a place, on a street): (Paul) où est-ce que c'est la rue où tu <u>restes</u>? [WHERE IS THE STREET WHERE YOU LIVE?]; (Manon) je <u>restais</u> la plus proche [I LIVED THE CLOSEST];

10) use of reduplication for emphasis or intensification: (Paul) ça va être <u>plein</u> <u>plein</u> <u>plein</u> de monde demain [IT'S GOING TO BE FULL FULL FULL OF PEOPLE TOMORROW]; (Manon) y en a qui sont toujours <u>actives</u> <u>actives</u> [THERE ARE SOME WHO ARE ALWAYS ACTIVE ACTIVE];

11) low use of English loanwords; the only examples are: (Manon) c'est lui qui m'a donné mon <u>training</u> [HE'S THE ONE WHO GAVE ME MY TRAINING]; (Louise) c'est plus un <u>challenge</u> tu vas te marier [IT'S NOT A CHALLENGE ANY MORE YOU'RE GETTING MARRIED].

A final point of interest: Manon's use of standard French pronunciation to disambiguate something which I was having trouble understanding:

```
21. Manon:   soixante-dix [dzɪs]         [SEVENTY SEVENTY
             soixante-dix [dzɪs] cinq    FIVE]
     Monica:  hein?                       [EH?]
     Manon:   soixante-dix [dis]          [SEVENTY]
     Monica:  oh ah
     Manon:   soixante-dix [dis] cinq     [SEVENTY FIVE
             soixante-dix [dis]           SEVENTY]
```

It seems, then, that English plays next to no role in the bottling lab, and that the normal code is Quebec French, although European French is used in the "underlining" fashion in which English is used elsewhere.

The microbiology lab is an anglophone preserve. As Jack put it:
"Oh, the other side [the Quality Control Lab], that's a whole nother
kettle of fish, you'd better wave your PQ [Parti Québécois] flag".
Despite the presence of two engineers, very little conversation actually
takes place in the microbiology lab. Jack and Henry each have their own
relationship with the Quality Control Lab. Jack keeps largely to
himself at work; the only regular interaction he has with lab staff
(besides Henry) is with Hélène, with whom he sometimes has lunch in the
coffee area. Jack claims not to be able to speak any French. One
conversation with Hélène went like this:

```
22. Hélène: va-t-on manger de la      [ARE WE HAVING
            soupe aujourd'hui?        SOUP TODAY?]
    Jack:   I'm going to I don't know
            if anyone wants to join me
    Hélène: je veux bien qu'est-ce    [I DO WHAT'LL WE
            qu'on mange?              HAVE?]
    Jack:   oh I'll take care of it
    Hélène: il y en a aux tomates     [THERE'S SOME
            aux légumes               TOMATO SOME
                                      VEGETABLE]
```

Jack also uses French for stylistic effect, generally when not
talking to anyone in particular, but when Henry and I are present:
watch out, c'est chaud, c'est ben chaud, maudit! [...IT'S HOT IT'S VERY
HOT DAMMIT!]; here's my patron! [...BOSS!].

But while Jack speaks English to people he knows (to the point of
giving them anglicized nicknames), he held the following conversation
with a francophone worker who came in asking for a gallon of acetone:

```
23. Jack: ...acetone
    Wker: you should give us a gallon
    Jack: tell Kovacs to parler avec    [SPEAK WITH MR.
          ┌monsieur Leblond              LEBLOND]
    Wker: └Gilles           okay okay
          enough
    Jack: encore un p'tit peu           [A LITTLE BIT MORE]
    Wker: un p'tit peu                  [A LITTLE BIT]
    Jack: pay a dollar get a dollar's
          worth
    Wker: ah okay okay merci
```

Jack's use of French seems directly related to his ability to control the conversation, which, in turn, is directly related to the role relationship he bears to his interlocutors, and whether or not he is on his "turf". Even with Hélène, whom he has known for twelve years and with whom he eats lunch (in the very room into which he refuses to set foot for coffee), he does not let himself speak French, because she is part of the "other side".

The aide, Ned, feels as strongly about French as Jack. He is not well-liked by anybody, and so very few people speak to him anyway, but when they do they speak English. For example:

```
24. Gilles: eh christie Hélène         [HEY JEEZ HELENE
            (unint) eh vous avez pas    (UNINT) HEY YOU DON'T
            de ciga personne de vous    HAVE ANY CIGA NONE OF
            autres a une cigarette?     YOU HAS A CIGARETTE?]
    Hélène: non                         [NO]
    Pierre: cigarette
    Gilles: (unint) Pierre
    Hélène: (sings "La Cucuracha"; she had recently
            returned from a holiday in Mexico)
    Gilles: Ned
    Ned:    (unint)
    Gilles: have you got a cigarette?
```

For Ned, actually, the issue is less English vs. French, at least as far as his own repertoire is concerned, but rather of Canadian

English vs. Irish English: he is very proud of his Irish origins, and tends to speak with an Irish accent when he talks about his family (although Hélène equates his Irish accent with the sentimental mood he gets into when he's had a drink or two; for Hélène, however, the accent is English: "Quand il commence à parler en Limey là..." [WHEN HE STARTS TO TALK IN LIMEY THERE]). Ned rarely interacts with francophones, so that French is effectively not part of his life, rather, it is sort of background noise to him. Still, on one occasion, when Henry (who hadn't quite decided whether I was English or French) broke in in French on a conversation I was having with Ned in English, and I replied to Henry in French, Ned pulled back and said: "You having a personal conversation here?"

Henry is one of the young marginal anglophones referred to earlier. He tends to speak to his francophone colleagues sometimes in English and sometimes in French, but, since he was hired on condition that he work in French, he uses the "when in doubt, speak French" principle. His francophone colleagues, equally, speak to him in either language, but, Louise and Hélène especially, they have also taken him under their wing as far as encouraging him to use and therefore learn French (rarely explicitly, rather by correcting him, and sometimes mocking him). Hélène probably speaks to him the most, often switching back and forth from conversation to conversation or within a conversation from turn to turn. The comments that Hélène and Louise make about him and his French include:

1) Louise remarked to her colleagues that she had called Henry and he

had answered "ouais" (with a Quebec accent); everyone (except Henry) laughed, and Louise joked that Henry was becoming assimilated.

2) Hélène corrected his usage when he picked up a hot coffee pot and said:

```
Henry:  ouch! hot! hot!
Hélène: quoi?              [WHAT?]
Henry:  hot hot hot
Hélène: chaud chaud        [HOT HOT]
Henry:  hot hot
Hélène: chaud chaud        [HOT HOT]
```

However, people still categorize Henry as English and treat him accordingly. A francophone brewing supervisor, speaking English to Henry in Hélène's presence (although Hélène was occupied with some procedures), was inquiring about a broken piece of equipment. He turned to Hélène and said:

```
25. Sup.:   Hél
     Hélène: ça ne fonctionne pas      [IT DOESN'T WORK]
     Sup. (to Henry): it's not working
```

The supervisor clearly separated Henry from Hélène, despite the fact that both Henry and Hélène were capable of understanding everything that was said, and that they do regularly talk to each other in both French and English.

In another episode, Hélène pointed Henry out to a visiting anglophone who had once worked in the Montreal lab but had since transferred to Lethbridge, Alberta. In pointing him out, she said: "Voilà notre Anglais!" [THERE'S OUR ENGLISH MAN].

Thus Henry's status is ambiguous: on the one hand he is categorized as English, on the other hand he is encouraged to (and must) speak French. And yet, if he speaks French too well it becomes the subject of explicit comments.

In conversations with other marginal anglophones Henry uses both English and French, although in those conversations French is generally used only for routines and formulaic expressions, while English is reserved for substantive conversation. Thus, just as some older francophones use good and perfect in otherwise French conversations[1], Henry, and other anglophones, use parfait [PERFECT], bon [GOOD], merci [THANK YOU], bienvenu [YOU'RE WELCOME] and bonjour [HELLO or GOODBYE]. Still, certain routines are common to most anglophones, others just to marginal young anglophones. The common routines are exemplified by the following greetings, said by the anglophone Head Office technician (Mark), his wife, and some anglophone supervisors and foremen:

-- bonjour Hélène how's the suntan?
-- bonjour good morning tout le monde [EVERYONE]
-- bonjour tout le monde how's everything?
-- bonjour is Mark there please?

Henry tends to use French more extensively, especially with Charles, another marginal Ontarian who is actually of francophone origin. For example:

26. Charles: bonjour Henri   [the French equivalent
                                      of Henry]
    Henry: bonjour
    Charles: comment ça va?   [HOW'S IT GOING?]
    Henry: bien toi?   [FINE YOU?]
    Charles: ça va bien j'ai une   [IT'S GOING FINE I

```
                    question pour toi        HAVE A QUESTION FOR
                                             YOU]
    Henry:    oui?                           [YES?]
    Charles: what are the specs for...
```

Both Charles and Henry want to perfect their French, and are concerned with learning French and being seen to speak it. They feel free to correct each other:

```
27. Henry:    x per champ              [X PER FIELD]
    Charles: champ?                    [FIELD?]
    Henry:    Monica! champ?           [...FIELD?]
    Monica:  what?
    Henry:    champ, what does champ
              mean to you?
    Monica:  field
    Henry (to Charles): yeah see?
              field
```

```
28. (In the presence of the francophone lab technicians, at
    a coffee break, during a conversation in French):
    Henry:....spigot
    Charles:         robinet Henry    [SPIGOT HENRY
             robinet si tu dis         SPIGOT IF YOU
             "spigot" à M. Legros      SAY "SPIGOT" TO
             il dit toujours           MR. LEGROS HE
             "robinet, robinet"        ALWAYS SAYS
                                       "ROBINET, ROBINET"]
```

Spigot is a term frequently used by francophones, and is one of the loanwords targeted for replacement by the francisation programme (both in its formal institutional guise, and, in the case of people like M. Legros, the master brewer and Charles' boss, in its informal guise).

One of the issues that people like Henry create is that of the political significance of language choice, or the absence of such significance. Tied to the issue of political significance is the issue of politeness and face. Gilles, like Hélène, deals with the problem of

potential misinterpretation by code-switching. In a conversation with Terry, another marginal anglophone, he switched regularly while Terry continued to speak English. In the following conversation Gilles' switch elicits an apparently defensive reaction from Henry, causing tension which Gilles neutralizes by joking:

29. Gilles (to Jack): do you have any
              coats? do you have any coats?
          (to Henry): je reviens   [I'LL BE BACK IN
              dans dix minutes   TEN MINUTES]
      (pause)
              I'll be back in ten
              minutes
    Henry: I can never figure out if
              you're speaking English
              or French my ear's not
              attuned to it
    Gilles: with me the problem's
              not my ear it's my tongue

With his joke Gilles is putting himself in the same situation as Henry, as a second language learner, saying essentially that he wasn't being judgmental by switching, and so Henry shouldn't take it amiss. In fact, Henry himself regularly switches if there is a delayed response from an interlocutor, and in doing so switches either from French to English or from English to French. And Henry is not the only one who does this: it can happen, apparently, in any interaction where both parties are at least functionally bilingual. Such switching functions in the same way raising one's voice or spelling something out does among monolinguals. But this can be done safely only in intra-ethnic interaction, since in interethnic interaction the potential for political significance is always there. Henry's ambiguous status makes it unclear whether he should expect political significance or not.

In other encounters, where unlike at work knowledge about one's interlocutor is not readily available, Henry and others report speaking "bling"; this has the function of immediately disambiguating the intent, that is, of neutralizing the potential for political interpretation. For example:

    — may I help you est-ce que je peux vous aider?
    — oui yes
    — anglais ou français English or French?[2]

Indeed, the latter was one of the first things Hélène said to me when she met me.

For the majority of the staff in the Quality Control Lab life is not quite so complicated: there are anglophones to whom one speaks English, and francophones to whom one speaks French. Occasionally one speaks French to anglophones (especially in the presence of another francophone). Hélène is the one with the greatest amount of interaction with anglophones, mainly with older men with whom she has a joking relationship involving a certain amount of sexual innuendo. With them she tends to play on English routines, "inappropriately" taking them literally:

30. Man: hello sweetheart
    Hélène: hello heart

31. Man: whatcha say doll?
    Hélène: nothing
    Man: okay good can I ask you a question?
             are you busy?
    Hélène: yes I am

Man: you are I see you got company
         I won't disturb you

While Pierre rarely has long conversations with anyone in English at work, he is the one Gilles calls on to interpret for him (for example, with monolingual anglophone repairmen from maintenance), and he does go out of his way at times to sit with anglophones in the pub on his breaks.

Within the group English is used in several different ways: to quote anglophones, to use loanwords with or without stylistic effect, and to discuss translations. Loanwords used without stylistic effect tend to be technical terms, more or less integrated into French: mash-tub [maeʃ'tʌb], cooler [ku'loer], spigot [spɪ'gɔt], beer mold [bir'mɔl], FTU [ɛftey] (formazine temperature unit). Sometimes these vary with French terms, both in spoken and in written usage. For example, both sample [saemp] and the French equivalent échantillon are used. Sometimes usage varies from spoken to written language: for example, apparent extracts are referred to in spoken French as extraits apparents, but in written French as A.E.

As elsewhere in the brewery, technical terminology in the labs was originally in English, and all procedures, texts and manuals were in English. Gilles was only recently given the task of translating lab procedures into French; he is profiting from the task to simultaneously up-date them, although certain procedures concerning all brewery branches are kept unchanged and the English versions retained in case any question arises necessitating contact with the English labs outside

Quebec. As a result of the translation process, for which Gilles has enlisted the help of his colleagues[3], there is a sharpened awareness of distinctions between French and English, and an attempt to make the translations conform to some notion of "le bon français" [GOOD FRENCH]. For example, when I asked Gilles what G.O. and O.G. meant (both terms are used in spoken and written French), he replied that G.O. meant "gravité originale", a calque on O.G. (original gravity), which, he said, should really be translated as "extrait primitif". Similarly, when discussing a translation Gilles had given Paul to check, Paul said: "A propos, en bon français on ne dit pas 'pure culture', on dit 'culture pure'" [SPEAKING OF THAT, IN GOOD FRENCH YOU DON'T SAY 'PURE CULTURE' YOU SAY 'CULTURE PURE'] -- a comment on Gilles' rendering of the English "pure culture" (of yeast), which did not respect French word order of noun + adjective, but rather kept the English adjective + noun order.

The lab technicians, as previously mentioned, are not the only ones concerned with good French. For example, as Hélène and I were stripping the logo off bottle caps, Marcel, one of the young francophone engineers from the desk in the microbiology lab, wandered in, saying:

32. Marcel: qu'est-ce que tu fais?   [WHAT ARE YOU DOING?]
    Hélène: on est en train   [WE'RE TAKING THIS
            d'enlever ça avec du   OFF WITH TANNER]
            tanner⌐
    Marcel: └oh de décaper   [OH STRIPPING]
    Hélène: 'scuse oui de décaper   [EXCUSE ME YES
                                        STRIPPING]

Sensitivity to the issue touches all aspects of work. Gilles and Hélène were preparing a package for shipping. Hélène said: "Voilà ce que tu fais pour indiquer right side up" [HERE'S WHAT YOU DO TO INDICATE

RIGHT SIDE UP], and began to draw arrows with UP marked next to them. Gilles said: "Up! up!" and then, turning to me, said: "Tu vois, c'est en français: Fragile" [YOU SEE IT'S IN FRENCH: FRAGILE].

However, this concern with good French is clearly separate from European French, especially given the explicit comments made about "les Français de France" and their language (e.g. "c'est trop serré" [IT'S TOO TIGHT]), as well as the use Pascal makes of European French to make fun of me: "Hé et vous mademoiselle gamine? Comment allez-vous? Parlez pas fort vous mademoiselle gamine!" [HEY AND YOU MISS CUTIE? HOW ARE YOU? YOU AREN'T TALKING VERY LOUD YOU MISS CUTIE!]. Pascal, it should be noted, was very surprised to learn that I was not in fact from France at all, and thereafter stopped teasing me.

English is still sometimes used for stylistic effect:

— (Jacques, a former lab technician turned brewing apprentice, at the end of a conversations with Gilles): forget it!

— (Hélène, to a francophone foreman whom she is helping to find a piece of equipment, when she finds it and gives it to him): surprise!

— (Hélène, to Louise and Gilles, during a coffee break discussion about food): ce qui est vraiment murder là c'est les huîtres fraîches [WHAT'S REALLY MURDER THERE IS FRESH OYSTERS];

— (Hélène, to Louise, about Hélène's holiday): il pleuvait on and off

[IT RAINED ON AND OFF].

It is notable that Hélène, one of the older employees with the greatest amount of contact with anglophones, uses English as a stylistic device more often than do the others. The first two examples seem to fall into the category of code-switching for closure and emphasis, while the latter two may or may not be integrated loanwords. If not, then they can be interpreted as a use of borrowed formulaic expressions (like phatic responses) which are used in intra-ethnic interaction.

The work areas of the labs are thus split up into several networks of communication; because of its space people can move in and out of conversations or avoid them altogether: they can create their own space. However, because of the movement necessitated by the type of work done in the labs, very few conversations can be sustained over long periods of time. Rather, themes get brought up, dropped, brought up again, and are usually resolved only when people can really sit down to discuss things. Translations are debated, complaints aired, jokes made, but only on rare occasions is anything decided in the work area while people are on the job.

Besides the variable lexicon, features of the French used in this area include:

1) variable question formation: (Louise) c'est-tu possible? [IS IT POSSIBLE?]; veux-tu aller voir? [DO YOU WANT TO GO SEE?]; (Pascal) est-ce que les deux chars sont okay? [ARE THE TWO CARS OKAY?];

2) elision of [l]: (Louise) s'i tourne [IF IT'S TURNING]; (Hélène) sur

la [sae:] table [ON THE TABLE];

3) pas + neg: (Pierre) y a pas personne [THERE'S NO ONE THERE];

4) aller + infinitive/a ma future: (Hélène) je vas regarder mes dates

[I'M GOING TO LOOK AT MY DATES]; (Pierre) a ma être ici [I'LL BE HERE];

5) ce que: (Hélène) j'ai pas compris ce que j'ai fait [fɛt] [I DIDN'T

UNDERSTAND WHAT I WAS DOING]; vas faire tout ce que j'ai à faire [I'M

GOING TO DO EVERYTHING I HAVE TO DO].

Thus QF features are used and not stigmatized, even in a group

explicitly concerned with and engaged in the promotion of "good French";

it is therefore not the case that QF as a whole is considered "bad

French", but rather certain characteristics of it, notably the use of

English loanwords or English syntax for technical terminology.

5.1.2.3 Lab coffee breaks

A good deal of interaction among lab technicians takes place not in

the work areas but in the coffee room at break time. Many of the topics

raised during work get treated more deeply during these breaks, as are

topics raised during the break itself. These topics may include who is

responsible for what tasks during demonstrations for new employees, the

extent to which more staff is needed in the lab, translations, vacation

and shift schedules, and so on. Visitors often drop in. Subjects not

related to immediate tasks are also discussed, with topics tending to revolve around personal experience (vacations, gardening, food, clothes, expenses, cars, careers, courses, children and transportation strikes).

The conversation tends to be dominated by Louise, especially in that she introduces a disproportionately high number of new topics. Work topics dominate when Gilles is present, since as supervisor (and, for a time, acting manager) he makes most of the decisions and is a central point in the information network. Also, the coffee break is the one time of day when the whole group is together. For example, Louise and Hélène were discussing shift schedules when Gilles came in and wanted to know what they were talking about. Hélène answered: "Non, c'est parce qu'on parlait de commencer à six heures du matin" [NO IT'S BECAUSE WE WERE TALKING ABOUT STARTING AT SIX IN THE MORNING] -- thus embarking on a long three-way discussion about shifts and personnel, during which Louise and Hélène had a chance to tell their boss about their opposition to split shifts, and to try to persuade him to try to make a new position in the lab for a "secrétaire-technicienne" [SECRETARY-TECHNICIAN]. In another case, a coffee break began with a discussion of the taping, and of what they were eating. Gilles slowly introduced a "work" topic, a discussion of vacation schedules:

33. Gilles: non c'est parce qu'il   [NO IT'S BECAUSE HE'S
            surveille sa ligne   WATCHING HIS FIGURE
            Hélène   HELENE]
    Hélène: j'aime pas ça tes   [I DON'T LIKE THAT
            biscuits   YOUR COOKIES]
    Pascal: je les aime pas ça mais   [I DON'T LIKE THEM
                                      THAT BUT]
    Gilles: anyway
    Louise: il les mange par force   [HE'S EATING THEM
                                      BECAUSE HE HAS TO]

```
Gilles: le jour d'action de    [THANKSGIVING DAY]
        grâce
Louise: mm
Hélène: affaire de congé       [QUESTION OF A
                               HOLIDAY]
Louise: on regrette (unint) je [WE'RE SORRY (UNINT)
        sais pas quoi mais voyons I DON'T KNOW WHAT BUT
        Gilles tous tes (unint) LOOK GILLES ALL YOUR
        que tu t'informes le   (UNINT) THAT YOU YOU
        monde hein ça c'était  INFORM PEOPLE EH
        pour que t'informes    THAT THAT WAS SO THAT
                               YOU INFORM PEOPLE]
Hélène: (unint) tableau        [(UNINT) BOARD]
Gilles: ça va être sur le      [IT'LL BE ON THE
        tableau de toute façon BOARD IN ANY CASE
        Michel Lebrun va en    MICHEL LEBRUN WILL
        avoir un lui aussi     HAVE ONE HIMSELF
                               TOO]
```

After the discussion of vacation schedules, the conversation went on to other work-related topics (electron microscopy, conductivity meters) until a friend, one of the former lab technicians turned brewing apprentice, arrived to join them for coffee.

On another occasion Gilles entered singing, then announced: "Suite à notre conversation j'ai rempli deux pages de planification à court-terme et à long-terme" [FOLLOWING UP ON OUR CONVERSATION (a phrase usually used in business correspondence) I HAVE FILLED OUT TWO PAGES OF SHORT AND LONG-TERM PLANNING]. In every case, Gilles' arrival signals "work talk", although once "work talk" is over, topics shift. For example, a long discussion about measuring pH turns into a discussion of gardens:

```
34. Gilles: c'est toi qui a dit ça [IT WAS YOU WHO SAID
            de ces histoires de    THAT THOSE STORIES
            potasse uh azote êt'    ABOUT POTASH UH
            puis uh pour faire ton  NITROGEN TO BE AND TO
            jardin                  MAKE YOUR GARDEN]
    Hélène: c'est ça                [THAT'S RIGHT]
```

```
Gilles: (unint)      |je sais que  [(UNINT) I KNOW
        mon père i i              MY FATHER HE HE]
Hélène: c'est un certain          [IT'S A CERTAIN
        pourcentage de potasse    PERCENTAGE OF POTASH
        qui pousse certains       WHICH GROWS CERTAIN
        légumes                   VEGETABLES]
```

Sometimes decisions are reached in "work talk", sometimes not. In every case all those present have a say if they wish. The degree of conversational cooperation is high among the francophones. There is a good deal of feedback (mm, oui), supplying of words and picking up of phrases:

```
35. Hélène: compiler des     [COMPILE SOME]
    Louise: des rapports     [REPORTS]
    Hélène: des rapports     [REPORTS]
```

```
36. Pascal: c'est Jacques qui    [IT'S JACQUES WHO'S
            remplace             REPLACING]
    Louise:  |c'est Jacques qui  [IT'S JACQUES WHO'S
            remplace Gaston de soir  REPLACING GASTON ON
                                 EVENING SHIFT]
```

```
37. Gilles: où est-ce qu'elle a  [WHERE DID SHE LEARN
            appris ça?           THAT ?]
    Louise: je sais pas je sais où  [I DON'T KNOW I KNOW
            s qu'elle a appris ça   WHERE SHE LEARNED THAT]
```

```
38. Louise: avec tous les légumes  [WITH ALL THE
            dedans                 VEGETABLES IN IT]
    Hélène: avec [tUt] les légumes  [WITH ALL THE
            qui rentrent dedans    VEGETABLES THAT GO IN]
```

```
39. Paul:   c'était pas comme ici là  [IT WASN'T LIKE
            la folie furieuse         HERE THERE CRAZINESS]
    Hélène: la folie furieuse         [CRAZINESS]
```

```
40. Louise: ça ça ça va mal       [IT'S IT'S IT'S
                                  GOING BADLY]
    Gilles: oh Seigneur ça va-tu mal  [OH LORD IS IT
                                  GOING BADLY]
```

The possible exception to this cooperation is Henry, whose French is not good enough to enable him to participate in most conversations. He participates usually when specifically addressed:

41. Louise: tu as un panel?   [YOU HAVE A PANEL?]
     Henry: oui   [OUI]

42. Louise: Henry y a-tu un taste   [HENRY IS THERE A
     panel ce matin?   TASTE PANEL THIS
          MORNING?]
     Henry: ce matin   [THIS MORNING]
     Louise: oh Seigneur   [OH LORD]
     Henry: je peux l'arranger si tu   [I CAN ARRANGE IT
     veux   IF YOU WANT]

43. Hélène: Henry y a rien pour toi   [HENRY THERE'S
     parce que tu partages   NOTHING FOR YOU
     pas   BECAUSE YOU DON'T
          SHARE]
     Henry: oh Hélène

In one instance Henry was asked to take the floor, but he didn't keep it very long:

44. Gilles: y a personne qui sait   [THERE'S NOBODY WHO
     comment s qu'on fait le   KNOWS HOW TO DO A
     pH sur la terre?   pH ON SOIL?]
     Pascal: la terre allez allez dis   [SOIL GO ON GO ON
     dis   TELL TELL]
     Gilles: sais-tu toi?   [DO YOU KNOW YOU?]
     Pascal: dis non   [SAY NO]
     Louise: (unint)
     Henry: le pH sur la terre?   [pH ON SOIL?]
     Hélène: la terre uh   [SOIL UH]
     Henry: oui y a une chose très   [YES THERE'S
     spécifique   SOMETHING VERY
          SPECIFIC]
     Gilles: oui c'est ça c'est quoi   [YES THAT'S IT WHAT'S
     la méthode?   THE METHOD?]
     Henry: on ajoute du silver   [YOU ADD SILVER]
     Gilles: on peut pas acheter pour   [YOU CAN'T BUY TO
     faire la terre (unint)   DO SOIL (UNINT)
     on ajoute ça à quoi?   YOU ADD THAT TO WHAT?]
     Henry: on ajoute d'eau mais   [YOU ADD WATER BUT]

Gilles: ça Henry y a une douzaine [THAT HENRY THERE'S
        de chaque pour toi...   A DOZEN OF EACH FOR
                                 YOU...]

Gilles changes the subject temporarily upon the arrival of some cases of beer which are to be used as experimental samples; when the conversation returns to pH levels Henry never gets to say more than: "Je pense qu'" [I THINK THAT].

There are only two occasions during which Henry's participation is extensive. One is during a coffee break at which only Louise, Hélène and I are present. The conversation is about the ongoing strike of the Quebec Liquor Commission (the state-run liquor stores). Henry is helped by Louise, who is the principal speaker:

45. Henry: j'ai j'ai lu que on a pas [I I READ THAT THEY
            perdu beaucoup d'a de de DIDN'T LOSE MUCH MUCH
            (pause) de monnaie   MUCH (PAUSE) CHANGE]
    Louise: ⌈d'argent   [MONEY]
    Monica: ⌊d'argent   [MONEY]
    Henry: le gouverne le gouverne- [THE GOVERN THE
            ment n'a pas payé les   GOVERNMENT DIDN'T
            (pause)   PAY THE (PAUSE)]
    Louise: les gars?   [THE GUYS?]
    Henry: les gars oui mais on a [THE GUYS YES BUT
            vendu les vins   THEY SOLD THE WINE]
    Louise: oui mais c'est ça qui les [YES BUT IT'S THAT
            coûte là   WHICH COSTS THEM
                                     THERE]

The other instance occurred when Charles came to have coffee with the lab technicians. During the break, at which (besides Charles and Henry) Louise, Paul and Hélène were present, Charles and Henry spoke to each other in English, but switched to French when the conversation involved the group at large. Charles acted as a sort of bridge between Henry and the group, and was very facile at going back and forth. Henry

and Charles started out talking in English about Ontario, while the others talked to each other in French about a gas leak that had occurred earlier that day. Hélène was looking at a document from Personnel.

46. Henry: I think what they
    have is the capacity to
    Charles: the ability to   Louise: voyons   [LET'S SEE
    decide photographic   voyons   LET'S SEE]
    memories
    ça c'est triste elle   [THAT'S SAD
    lit ses rapports sur   SHE READS
    son break   HER REPORTS
                                                      ON HER BREAK]
                                 Paul: ça fait   [IT'S BEEN A
                                 longtemps que   LONG TIME
                                 j'ai dit des   SINCE I SAID
                                 choses dans   THINGS IN THE
                                 le même   SAME (UNINT)]
                                 (unint)
    Charles: Hélène je pense   [HELENE I THINK
             que t'as besoin des   YOU NEED A
             vacances   VACATION]
    (Louise laughs)
    Hélène: 'scuse-moi j'étais pas   [EXCUSE ME I
             au dodo je suis vraiment   WASN'T ASLEEP I'M
             désolée   REALLY SORRY]
    Charles: non c'est pas ça t'as   [NO IT'S NOT THAT
             tu lis des rapports   YOU HAVE YOU READ
             pendant ton break ça   REPORTS DURING
             c'est triste   YOUR BREAK THAT'S
                                             SAD]
    Louise: elle vient des vacances   [SHE'S COMING FROM
                                             VACATION]
    Hélène: mes vacances ça a pas   [MY VACATION WASN'T
             été assez long   LONG ENOUGH]
    (Henry starts eating something)
             tu partages pas   [YOU'RE NOT SHARING]

Charles' comment makes the conversation general. Hélène and Louise start teasing Henry about not sharing his food; Charles looks at Hélène's reading material and starts talking about that. The document is about the lab's participation in a short training course for new employees.

```
47. Louise:  ça va être des       [THERE ARE GOING TO BE
             petits dîners        LITTLE DINNERS]
    Charles: gratuits?            [FREE?]
    Louise:  oui                  [YES]
    Henry:   qui?                 [WHO?]
    Hélène:  qui? les             [WHO? THE
             nouveaux employés    NEW EMPLOYEES]
```

Later, Charles brings Henry into a conversation about taking sterile

samples, and Henry makes a joke which is first taken up (and rendered

literal) by Hélène, before the others take it up:

```
48. Charles: j'ai un bon pro-     [I HAVE A GOOD
             fesseur pour m'en-   TEACHER TO TEACH
             seigner comment      ME HOW TO TAKE
             prendre les          THE
             steriles ⌈ces temps-citte  STERILES THESE DAYS]
    Louise:         ⌊oui          [YES]
    Hélène:  ah oui? Henry?       [OH YES? HENRY?]
    Louise:  ah Henry il est bien [AH HENRY HE'S GOOD]
    Charles: oui avec un (unint)  [YES WITH A (UNINT)]
    Louise:  pas flame (unint)?   [NOT FLAME (UNINT)?]
    Charles: (unint)
    Hélène:  (unint) alcool       [ALCOHOL]
    Louise:  flambé te faire      [IN FLAMES MAKE YOURSELF
             flamboyer t'envoyer  GO UP IN FLAMES SEND
                                  YOURSELF]
    Henry:   spigot Diane
    Charles: des robinets des     [SPIGOTS
             robinets              SPIGOTS]
    Hélène:  pourquoi spigot      [WHY SPIGOT
             Diane au lieu de     DIANE INSTEAD OF
             steack Diane         STEAK DIANE]
    Charles: des robinets         [SPIGOTS]
    Hélène:  steack au poivre     [PEPPER STEAK
             Diane                DIANE]
    Charles: quand tu parles à    [WHEN YOU SPEAK TO
             monsieur Legros pour MISTER LEGROS TO
             pas laisse faire     NOT LET]
    Hélène:  ah Henry il va       [AH HENRY HE'LL
             toujours amener ça   ALWAYS BRING IT AROUND
             à Diane hein le      TO DIANE EH
             spigot Diane pis     SPIGOT DIANE AND]
    Paul:    hein?                [EH?]
    Hélène:  c'est sa femme       [IT'S HIS WIFE]
    Louise:  femme chaude femme   [HOT WOMAN
             chaude               HOT WOMAN]
```

In another conversation about oxygen and carbon dioxide levels between Paul and Charles, Hélène and Louise interrupt to tease Charles about the colour of his socks. Henry tries, pretty much in vain, to bring the conversation back to the original subject:

49. Henry: sais-tu combien de 02   [DO YOU KNOW HOW MUCH
    hier dans le CO2 combien 02 YESTERDAY IN THE CO2
    d'02 dans le CO2   HOW MUCH 02 IN THE CO2]
    Charles: oxygène   [OXYGEN]
    Paul: ben oxygène   [WELL OXYGEN]
    Henry: oxygène   [OXYGEN]
    Paul: oui y a 02 dans le CO2 [YES THERE'S 02 IN CO2]
    Henry: non mais   [NO BUT]
    Paul: est-ce que de l'oxygène [IS SOME OXYGEN
    encore je pense pas   STILL I DON'T THINK SO]
    (Pause)
    ben y en a peut-être   [WELL MAYBE THERE'S A
    un petit peu il doit pas LITTLE BIT THERE SHOULDN'T
    en avoir beaucoup sans   BE MUCH WITHOUT
    ça quand on purge une   THAT WHEN YOU PURGE A
    (unint) avec du CO2 on   (UNINT) WITH CO2 YOU
    (unint) de on la (unint) (UNINT) SOME YOU (UNINT)
    on (unint) de l'oxygène   YOU (UNINT) SOME OXYGEN]
    Charles: (unint) oxygène   [OXYGEN]
    Henry: parce que   [BECAUSE]
    Paul: si on purge avec du CO2 . [IF YOU PURGE WITH CO2
    (unint) de l'air on met   (UNINT) SOME AIR YOU PUT
    de l'air on met y y a y   THERE THERE THERE'S
    l'0 de l'oxygène dans   0 OXYGEN IN THE
    la CO2 ça marche pas   CO2 IT DOESN'T WORK]
    Henry: parce que j'utilise   [BECAUSE I USE THE CO2 FROM
    le CO2 de l'usine pour   THE PLANT FOR]
    Paul: les analyses   [THE ANALYSES]
    Henry: de temps en temps je [FROM TIME TO TIME I
    trouve des moisissures   FIND SOME FUNGUS
    qui (unint)   WHICH (UNINT)]

Charles finally decides that the different readings on 02 levels are a result of defective machinery. It is notable that Paul and Charles have done most of the work in the conversation in finding out what the conversation is about, discussing the various angles and coming to a resolution, when in fact the problem was one first raised by Henry. After this conversational episode, Charles switches to English, talks to

Henry about his job schedule, and then switches to French to talk more about schedules with Paul, back to English to talk to Henry, and then into French again to greet Pascal as he enters the coffee room. For a short while, during a discussion between Henry and Charles about Henry's parents in Ontario, Pascal joins in in English:

50. Charles: well your parents live in Toronto
    Henry: not any more they just moved
    Charles: where to?
    Henry: Unionville
    Charles: oh what is there in Unionville it's a
             little square town
    Henry: well it's really nice
    Pascal: you move?
    Henry: no just my parents I wouldn't leave Quebec

As Charles and Henry go on talking Pascal changes the subject with me, to talk about the difference between European French and Quebec French accents, European French sounds "trop serré" [TOO TIGHT, TOO CLOSED], one of Pascal's favourite topics, especially when I am around, since he likes to tease me that my accent is too European.

The coffee breaks are, then, a forum for discussion and jokes, in which all the francophones regularly participate. With the exception of Paul, all the francophones, and Henry and Charles as well, are the butt of jokes (Gilles is teased about his fancy shirts and habit of going to expensive restaurants; Louise gets teased about work; Manon about break time; Pascal about his choice of food; Charles about his socks; Henry about not sharing his food; Hélène about her holidays). Henry, however, is the only one who does not tease as well as get teased. At least, he does not tease successfully: his one attempt occurred when Louise, with her mouth full, pointed to a spoon she wanted Henry to pass her, and

Henry proceeded to pick up every object in sight except the spoon. Louise did not react in any way except that she appeared to be slightly annoyed. Henry's participation is most successful when he has someone like Charles to help him, or is talking one-on-one with one of the others. As for the others, they participate in decision-making (for example, Paul gives Gilles his permission for Gilles to go ahead in making a recommendation to the manager of bottling and packaging, after he and Gilles discuss the pros and cons at length; Gilles proposes to Hélène that she go directly to Michel with a suggestion she and Gilles have been discussing for some time; etc.). English is marginal to this world, and European French is deliberately excluded from it, although the "quality of language" is important to technicians' image of themselves as dynamic figures in the forefront of change.

5.1.3 Engineering/Maintenance

5.1.3.1 The dispatchers' office

Dispatcher
Foremen
Repairmen
Office personnel

The dispatchers' job consists primarily in recording the nature and location of breakdowns of machinery in the plant and in assigning repairmen to fix them. Information and instructions come in and go out over the telephone. The vast majority of interactions are in French (119 out of 138 exchanges in one day were in French), since the majority of foremen and repairmen are francophone (23 out of 30 interactants on that day were French). Of the other interactants, one was a trilingual Italian, and the rest were anglophone. All but one of the non-francophones were repairmen. Among the francophones, nine were repairmen, four were office personnel, and the rest were foremen. The three dispatchers are all bilingual francophones. English and French are kept separate. The anglophones answer the phone in English ("yuh", "machine shop"), and speak in English when they call, although the dispatcher always answers the phone in French.

```
51. Disp.: bonjour              [HELLO]
    Angl.: Mackey
    Disp.: oui Pete             [YES PETE]
    Angl.: that door on the fourth
           floor is fixed


52. Disp.: bonjour              [HELLO]
```

```
Angl.: is Dickie Brunet there?
Disp.: eh?
Angl.: oh is that you John
       oh oh
Disp.: yeah Dickie Brunet may
       be at four five three
```

```
53. Disp.: bonjour              [HELLO]
    Angl.: Howells going for lunch
    Disp.: okay Dave
    Angl.: right
    Disp.: bye
    Angl.: bye
```

With anglophones there is very rarely any code-switching. One instance involved a bilingual anglophone who uses English to speak to his co-worker, and for part of his closing routine with the dispatcher:

```
54. Fran.: Georges ici                    [GEORGES HERE]
    Disp.: eh Georges (unint)
           aux alentours                  [...AROUND]
    Fran.: oui justement là oui           [YES IN FACT THERE YES]
    Disp.: bon tu veux me le passer       [GOOD YOU WANT TO PASS
           là s'il te plaît               HIM TO ME THERE PLEASE]
    Angl. (to fran.): you onna
           phone take it upstairs
    Fran. (to disp.): i va t'appeler      [HE'LL CALL YOU]
    Angl. (to disp.): Jean i est-tu       [JEAN IS HE ON SOME MACHINE
           sur une machine quel-          THERE DO YOU HAVE THAT
           conque là as-tu ça listé       LISTED SOMEWHERE]
           quelque part
    Disp.: non non je l'ai pas listé      [NO NO I DON'T HAVE THAT
                                          LISTED]
    Angl.: t'es i est-tu parti à          [YOU'RE IS HE GONE ON HIS
           son break ça là                BREAK THAT THERE]
    Disp.: Blouin Blouin Blouin ça        [...THAT GOES (UNINT) NOT
           va (unint) pas marqué          MARKED EITHER]
           non plus
    Angl.: bon                            [OKAY]
    Disp.: eh
    Angl.: okay
    Disp.: okay
    Angl.: thank you salut bye            [BYE]
```

"Bye" is frequently used among francophones in general, much in the same way that "ciao" is used by anglophones inside and outside Quebec.

In the second case, the dispatcher had just had a conversation with a foreman which ended thus:

55. Disp.: deux mailles ça c'est le   [TWO LINKS THAT IT'S
           petit convoyeur for beer   THE SMALL CONVEYOR...]
           dumping okay
    (The foreman had referred to the conveyor as: le petit
    convoyeur du dumping.)

The dispatcher then called a mechanic:

    Mech.: hi south shop Connolly
    Disp.: Pat
    Mech.: yup
    Disp.: cinq soaker bière five   [FIVE...BEER...]
           soaker there
    Mech.: yup
    Disp.: beer dumping the there's
           two uh links broken in
           the conveyor

The code-switch in the first conversation (with the foreman) is probably related to the fact that _dumping_ is almost universally referred to through the English form, and possibly also to the anticipated explanation to the anglophone repairman. The second switch is more likely a repair from French to English. One last instance of code-switching with anglophones involved the use of another French closing routine by an anglophone repairman:

56. Disp.: contrôle   [CONTROL]
    Angl.: hello there
    Disp.: yes
    Angl.: I'm going for lunch sir
    Disp.: okay Pat
    Angl.: and uh monsieur Pelletier
           is going out on the can
           filler okay
    Disp.: he's he's gone on can
           filler

```
Angl.: he's going there now
Disp.: okay
Angl.: right
Disp.: right
Angl.: salut                        [BYE]
Disp.: right
```

The final notable pattern in exchanges involving anglophones is the dispatcher's use of "very well" as a closure routine, a term which the anglophones themselves never use (they use salut, okay, good, all right and right), which seems, if not arch, at least archaic. It must be seen as a direct translation of "c'est bien" [IT'S OKAY, IT'S FINE] or "très bien" [VERY GOOD], both of which the dispatcher uses in his French conversations.

In the French conversations perhaps the most salient phenomenon is the variation in technical terminology. There is variation from turn to turn, from one conversation to the next, within turns; there is variation between French and English terms, in noun-adjective order, and in gender classification of French terms. Examples:

```
57. Disp.: E soaker                 [i]
    Mech.: E laveuse                [oe]


58. Frman. (to disp.): oui ça me    [YES I WOULD NEED AN
           prendrait un électricien ELECTRICIAN ON
           sur la colleuse six A    BLOWER SIX A]

    Disp. (to electrician): veux-tu [DO YOU WANT TO GO TO
           aller à six A blower     SIX A BLOWER TO DO AN
           faire un ajustement sur  ADJUSTMENT ON THE GLUE
           les jets à colle         JETS]


59. Frman.: overload au cinquième   [OVERLOAD ON THE FIFTH
            étage                    FLOOR]
    Disp.: surcharge au cinquième    [OVERLOAD ON THE FIFTH
            étage                    FLOOR]
```

```
60. Frman. (to disp.): quatre A        [FOUR A...]
            palletizer
___
     Disp. (to electrician): l'empi-   [PALLETIZER (MASC.) FOUR
            leur de caisses quatre A    A]
     Elec. (to disp.): palletizer
            quatre A                    [...FOUR A]
     Disp.: oui monsieur                [YES SIR]


61. Disp. (to another mechanic about the same machine):
            c'est le quatre A l'empi-  [IT'S THE FOUR A (MASC.)
            leuse quatre A là quatre    PALLETIZER (FEM.) FOUR
            A palletizer là le meter    A THERE FOUR A PALLETIZER
            haute vitesse high-speed    THERE THE METER HIGH-SPEED
            ou belt-meter               OR BELT-METER]
     Mech.: le belt? meter?
     Disp.: en tout cas tu verras       [IN ANY CASE YOU'LL SEE
            dès que tu vas avoir        AS SOON AS YOU'LL GET A
            une chance tu verras        CHANCE YOU'LL SEE BLOUIN
            Blouin (unint) la           (UNINT) THE DIRECTION]
            direction
     Mech.: oui okay                     [YES OKAY]
     Disp.: high high speed meter
            belt t'sais le meter        [...YOU KNOW THE METER
            pour la courroie            FOR THE BELT]
```

In fact it often happens that terms are repeated in one form and then
another; see example 61 above, and:

```
62. Mech.: les leaks uh une fuite      [THE LEAKS UH AN OIL
            d'huile                     LEAK]


63. Disp.: F basement F sous-sol       [...BASEMENT]


64. Disp.: uh six A labeller
            étiquetteuse là             [....LABELLER THERE]
```

In the latter two cases each term (basement, sous-sol, étiquetteuse,

labeller and label as well) turn up regularly elsewhere. The fact that

the French term generally follows the English may reflect an attempt to

up-grade language spoken, but since the reverse does exist (see example

61), it may be another case of code-switching for the sake of clarity

through redundancy, something which is especially important over the
phone. In any case confusion over the meaning of terms can happen,
whether or not the confusion becomes explicit:

65. Disp.: uh on a une mini-   [UH WE HAVE A MINI-
           urgence au Salle Terrasse EMERGENCY AT THE TERRACE
           en haut on a un m uh   ROOM UPSTAIRS WE HAVE A M
           moteur   UH MOTOR]
    Mech.: oh
    Disp.: de ventilateur qui est [OF A VENTILATOR WHICH IS
           défectueux   FAULTY]
    Mech.: un compresseur? c'est   [A COMPRESSOR? WHAT'S A
           quoi un moteur de   VENTILATOR MOTOR?]
           ventilateur?
    Disp.: ben i m'a dit c'est un   [WELL HE TOLD ME IT'S A FAN
           moteur de fan un moteur MOTOR A VENTILATOR MOTOR OF
           de ventilateur du com-   THE COMPRESSOR]
           presseur

66. Frman: pis à l'abreuvoir l'eau [AND IN THE TROUGH THE
           est chaude   WATER IS HOT]
    Disp.: à quelle place que l'eau [WHERE (IS) THE WATER]
    Frman: est chaude   [IS HOT]
    Disp.: oui à quelle place ça   [YES IN WHAT PLACE THAT]
    Frman: à l'entrée de la cantine [AT THE ENTRANCE TO THE
           là   CANTEEN THERE]
    Disp.: oui   [YES]
    Frman: en bas   [DOWNSTAIRS]
    Disp.: l'eau est chaude tu dis [THE WATER IS HOT YOU SAY
           l'abreuvoir l'abreuvoir THE TROUGH THE TROUGH]
    Frman: oui l'abreuvoir   [YES THE TROUGH]
    Disp.: mhm
    Frman: l'eau est chaude je sais [THE WATER IS HOT I DON'T
           pas si c'est des...   KNOW IF IT'S SOME...]

Dispatchers, then, have to master both English and French routines
of opening and closing, and terminology, as well as the various forms of
either French or integrated loanwords that exist in the brewery lexicon.
In cases where their knowledge breaks down they rely on the ability of
the two other interested parties (the foreman and the repairman) to fix
up any gaps, sometimes explicitly telling one of them to call the other
directly. However, given that many of the repairmen are anglophone and

most of the foremen are francophone, the dispatcher is an important mediator of information which might otherwise get transmitted only with great difficulty. Indeed, in the labs, Gilles, the francophone supervisor, often relied on bilinguals in the lab to get messages across to anglophone repairmen who came to fix things like sporadic gas leaks.

Another function of the dispatcher is to act as emotional mediator and safety-valve: injured parties can mouth off at this neutral voice on the phone, and then quietly go off and do their jobs:

67. Mech.: yuh
    Disp.: uh Dick
    Mech.: yuh
    Disp.: uh on the fourth floor uh the main office uh the
           door for the women's toilet is banging closed
           making noise
    Mech.: yup good
    Disp.: well they don't like that at all eh?
    Mech.: good wake them up
    Disp.: yeah
    Mech. (accelerates): okay I'll go over right away
    Disp.: okay
    Mech.: okay right bye

68. Disp.: uh six A labeller
           étiquetteuse là   [...LABELLER THERE]
    Mech.: oui   [YES]
    Disp.: les brosses du neck   [THE BRUSHES OF THE NECK
           label devraient être   LABEL SHOULD BE CHANGED
           changées Ledoux qui a   LEDOUX WHO CALLED]
           appelé
    Mech.: ah oui mais c'est pas le   [AH YES BUT IT'S NOT THE
           temps de changer ça sur   TIME TO CHANGE THAT DURING
           la production   PRODUCTION]
    Disp.: oui oh pour ça parce que   [YES OH FOR THAT BECAUSE YOU
           tu vois te mettre au   SEE KEEP YOU POSTED]
           courant
    Mech.: a ma aller voir ça avant   [I'LL GO SEE THAT BEFORE
           là   THERE]
    Disp.: oui   [YES]
    Mech.: okay
    Disp.: okay c'est très bien salut   [OKAY THAT'S VERY GOOD BYE]

Opening and closing routines in French conversations often include borrowings from English:

69. Disp.: très bien Robert   [VERY GOOD ROBERT]
    Mech.: okey doke

70. Mech.: long time no see

71. Disp.: okay monsieur   [OKAY SIR]
    Mech.: salut   [BYE]
    Disp.: right

72. Disp.: tu l'appeler si tu veux   [YOU TO CALL HIM IF YOU
                                      WANT]
    Mech.: right
    Disp.: okay bien bonjour   [OKAY GOOD GOODBYE]

73. Disp.: ça se peut (laughs) okay [THAT COULD BE...]
    Mech.: right salut
    Disp.: right Dick

There are two examples of calques, both uttered by the dispatcher:

— dès que tu vas avoir une chance   [AS SOON AS YOU HAVE A CHANCE]
— Joe i vient de prendre le call   [JOE JUST TOOK THE CALL]

Other features of speech that are worth noting include:

1. high use of the <u>a ma</u> future: a ma expliquer [I'LL EXPLAIN]

2. [tUt]: [tUt] les cadres [ALL THE MANAGERS]; y a rien là [tUt] marche [THERE'S NOTHING THERE EVERYTHING WORKS];

3. [fɛt]: [a: fɛt] ça hier [IT DID THAT YESTERDAY);

4. elision of [l]: [a] scanne pas [IT DOESN'T SCAN];

5. devoiced and velarized [ʒ]: c'est Galipeau que je voudrais rejoindrer [xoe βudre rəxwɛ̃dre] [IT'S GALIPEAU I'D LIKE TO GET IN TOUGH WITH];

6. __fait__ __que__: fait qu'à dix heures et demie là [SO THAT AT TEN-THIRTY THERE];

7. -__tu__ questions: y a-tu personne là? [IS NOBODY THERE?]

8. __pas__ + __neg__: y a pas personne icitte [THERE'S NOBODY HERE]; i est pas jamais là [HE'S NEVER THERE];

9. __pis__: faudrait que j'aie un gars absolument pis i rouvre la porte pis lui va monter en haut pis i va i va voir comment ça fonctionne [IT'LL BE ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY FOR ME TO HAVE A GUY AND HE'LL OPEN THE DOOR AND HE'LL CLIMB UP AND HE'LL SEE HOW IT WORKS];

10. __qu'est-ce__ __que/qu'osque__: le EBI c'est qu'osqui mirent les bouteilles [THE EBI IS WHAT INSPECTS THE BOTTLES]; je voulais m'informer à lui qu'est-ce qu'y avait exactement [I WANTED TO GET THE INFORMATION FROM HIM WHAT THERE WAS EXACTLY].

Although all these features are variable, nonetheless it is possible to characterize the French code used as Quebec French, with the caveat that the interlocutors here, especially the dispatcher and

certain young upwardly mobile francophone foremen, are quite aware of the social significance of QF English loanwords vs. EF technical terms, and tend to try to use EF terms as much as possible in careful speech (e.g. at the beginning of the day when the dispatcher was very aware of being taped; example 59 is an illustration of this, an apt one since later in the day the dispatcher had difficulty locating the record of the overload because he was asked for (and presumably was looking for) overload, and the record was filed as surcharge).

The dispatcher's world is made of direct talk, information and little else; the occasional friendly exchange in slow periods, but little in the way of personal conversation. Constraints of time and urgency make the conversations short and to the point. Since they are telephone conversations only a certain amount of shared knowledge can be assumed and the rest has to be supplied. Significantly, of the one hundred and thirty-eight conversations recorded there was only one case of conversational breakdown, a breakdown which illustrates the amount of knowledge about the dispatcher's job, about the role of the telephone and about language choice which can be seen to have been shared in the other one hundred and thirty-seven exchanges.

```
74. Mech.: hello
    Disp.: qui c'est qui parle là,    [WHO'S SPEAKING THERE,
           Michel?                     MICHEL?]
    Mech.: yes
    Disp.: who's that speaking?
    Mech.: eh?
    Disp.: hello qu'essé qui parle    [...WHO'S SPEAKING THERE?]
           là?
    Mech.: this is the electrical shop
    Disp.: yeah oh uh
    Mech.:      what you want
    Disp.: chose est-tu là Rodgers    [WHAT'S HIS NAME IS HE THERE
```

	parce qu'y a un couple d'affaires que lui pourrait (unint)	RODGERS BECAUSE THERE ARE A COUPLE OF THINGS WHICH HE COULD (UNINT)]
Mech.:	no he's not here	
Disp.:	son boss n'est pas là non plus	[HIS BOSS ISN'T THERE EITHER]
Mech.:	no sir	
Disp.:	le patron n'est pas là	[THE BOSS ISN'T THERE]
Mech.:	what the fuck you want?	
Disp.:	oui	[YES]
Mech.:	owsh	
Disp.:	hm uh la cantine bottling l'horloge fonctionne pas	[THE CANTEEN BOTTLING THE CLOCK ISN'T WORKING]
Mech.:	il est là le breaker il est là il les oui	[IT'S THERE THE BREAKER IT'S THERE IT (X) THEM YES]
Disp.:	mais c'est pour ça que Rodgers	[BUT IT'S BECAUSE OF THAT THAT RODGERS]
Mech.:	ouais pis rien que ça?	[YEAH AND THAT'S ALL?]
Disp.:	l'eau dans l'abreuvoir est chaude à part de't ça fait que ça doit être la même	[THE WATER IN THE TROUGH IS HOT ON TOP OF THAT SO THAT IT MUST BE THE SAME]
Mech.:	c'est ça le breaker il a été débarqué	[THAT'S IT THE BREAKER WAS REMOVED]
Disp.:	oui	[YES]
Mech.:	y a rien là	[THERE'S NOTHING THERE]
Disp.:	fait que (unint) parler à Rodger	[SO THAT (UNINT) SPEAK TO RODGER]
Mech.:	i est pas icitte hostie Roger over and out	[HE'S NOT HERE CHRIST ROGER OVER AND OUT]
Disp.:	i i laisse une note laisse une note à ton	[HE HE LEAVE A NOTE LEAVE A NOTE FOR YOUR]
Mech.:	goodbye moi je suis pas icitte pour faire des messages à part de't ça	[...ME I'M NOT HERE TO TAKE MESSAGES ON TOP OF THAT]
Disp.:	réponds pas d'abord	[SO DON'T ANSWER]
Mech.:	bonjour	[GOODBYE]
Disp.:	okay salut (hangs up)	[OKAY BYE]
Mech.:	on est-tu supposé de répondre au téléphone (hangs up)	[ARE YOU SUPPOSED TO ANSWER THE TELEPHONE]

This breakdown should be compared to the conversational cooperation established in such conversations as:

75. Disp.:	bonjour contrôle	[HELLO CONTROL]
Mech.:	oui ça me prendrait un électricien sur la colleuse six A	[YES I WOULD NEED AN ELECTRICIAN ON BLOWER SIX A]

```
Disp.: six A
Mech.: oui
Disp.: ça c'est                          [THAT IS]
Mech.: pour ajuster les jets à           [TO ADJUST THE GLUE
       colle                             JETS]
Disp.: okay
Mech.: okay?
Disp.: oui
Mech.: merci                             [THANK YOU]
```

```
76. Disp.: bonjour                       [HELLO]
    Frman: oui St-Pierre                 [YES ST-PIERRE]
    Disp.: oui
    Frman: veux-tu m'envoyer un bottling [DO YOU WANT TO SEND ME A
           mécanique pour uh le petit    BOTTLING MECHANIC FOR UH
           convoyeur qu'on sert pour     THE SMALL CONVEYOR WHICH
           domper la bière en arrière    WE USE FOR DUMPING BEER
           du soaker numéro cinq         BEHIND SOAKER NUMBER FIVE]
    Disp.: convoyeur beer c'est quel     [CONVEYOR BEER IT'S WHICH
           qui va pas                    THAT'S NOT WORKING]
    Frman: la chaîne elle a débarqué     [THE CHAIN IT CAME OFF
           dessus la chaîne du moteur    THE MOTOR CHAIN THERE AND
           là pis elle empêche le        IT'S STOPPING THE CONVEYOR
           convoyeur de tourner          FROM TURNING]
    Disp.: ookay
    Frman: merci
    Disp.: ça marche                     [lit. IT'S WORKING;
                                         FINE, GOOD]
```

```
77. Mech.: Poirier ENR
    Disp.: Jacques bonjour
    Mech.: bonjour
    Disp.: à l'uncaser le convoyeur      [AT THE UNCASER THE
           en arrière du cinq pour       CONVEYOR BEHIND FIVE
           domper la bière la chaîne     FOR BEER DUMPING THE
           est débarquée dessus          CHAIN CAME OFF IT]
    Mech.: le convoyeur pour le dompage  [THE CONVEYOR FOR DUMPING
           de en bas du cinq là          FROM BELOW FIVE THERE]
    Disp.: c'est ça                      [THAT'S IT]
    Mech.: okay
    Disp.: okay mon cher ami?            [OKAY MY DEAR FRIEND?]
    Mech.: okay parfait                  [OKAY PERFECT]
    Disp.: merci bonjour
```

```
78. Frman: ello
    Disp.: contrôle bonjour
    Frman: oui Gagnon à l'appareil       [YES GAGNON SPEAKING]
    Disp.: ello
    Frman: oui ça me prendrait un        [YES I WOULD NEED AN
           électricien sur le            ELECTRICIAN ON THE NUMBER
           vertical (?) numéro cinq      FIVE VERTICAL OVERLOAD
```

```
                  overload au cinquième étage   ON THE FIFTH FLOOR]
       Disp.:  surcharge au cinquième      [OVERLOAD ON THE FIFTH
                  étage okay monsieur Gagnon FLOOR OKAY MISTER GAGNON]
       Frman: kay?
       Disp.:  salut
       Frman: bye bye
```

```
79. Frman: ya wanna send an electrician to four B one ⌈labeller
    Disp.:                                            ⌊mhm
           four B one label eh?
    Frman: yeah there's a switch not working there
    Disp.:  mhm
    Frman: for the back label
    Disp.:  okay
    Frman: all right?
    Disp.:  very well now
    Frman: so long
```

In these examples the minimum amount of information is routinely

provided; if some part of it is missing, it is elicited by the

dispatcher through the use of such routines as:

— ça c'est (pause) [THAT IS (PAUSE)]
— c'est quel qui va pas? [IT'S WHICH THAT'S NOT WORKING?]
— à quelle place ça? [AT WHAT PLACE THAT?]

The overlaps, the conventionalized form of the conversations, the

rapid rhythmicity, the perfectly timed openings and closings (or the

ease of repair if the turn-taking doesn't go just right, as in example

78), all these factors indicate shared background knowledge regarding

both the physical reality which forms the topic of the conversations,

and also the socially constructed interactive routines which structure

work and allow it to flow smoothly. Furthermore, the contrast between

example 74 and examples 75-79 shows the importance of ethnolinguistic

categorization in that construction of the world of work. In example

74, the mechanic's refusal to cooperate in the matter of language choice

is but a part of his refusal to cooperate in general in the whole

purpose of the call, from providing or taking information to taking a message for Rodgers. The proper identification of oneself and one's interlocutor, which is part of language choice, is as important a part of getting the message across as is proper idenitification of the nature of the breakdown or the location of the machine. And for the dispatcher, clearly, that categorization is composed of French and English as two separate categories, with code-switching permitted only within each category, and then only confined to opening and closing routines. Under the conditions of work faced by the dispatchers, this separation seems to be the only way of ensuring the establishment of conversational cooperation and the rapid attention to breakdowns necessitated by the overall goal of rapid, efficient and high production.

5.1.3.2 The secretary: main office

Linda, general secretary
Woman
Foreman
Engineering apprentice

While the secretary, Linda, does have contact with the many anglophones in the sector, on the day which I spent with her she spoke only to francophones. She answered the phone in French, greeted visitors in French, and talked to other secretaries, foremen and engineering apprentices in French. There were English conversations occurring in the office area, but they did not involve her.

Linda's greatest involvement with English revolved around translation problems brought to her by others. The dictionaries and lexicons are in her office; she also expresses a great interest in "good" language, and likes to edit and translate, even though:

> "Moi, j'insiste plus du côté grammaire les accords tout ça mais comme vocabulaire c'est pas ce qu'y a de plus élaboré parce que j'ai jamais l'occasion de le mettre en pratique pis j'aime pas beaucoup" [ME I'M MORE INTERESTED IN THE GRAMMAR SIDE ACCORD ALL THAT BUT IN THE WAY OF VOCABULARY IT'S NOT THE MOST EXTENSIVE IN THE WORLD BECAUSE I NEVER HAVE A CHANCE TO PUT IT INTO PRACTICE AND I DON'T LIKE (IT) VERY MUCH].

However, she also feels that:

> "Où j'apprends le plus c'est les informations qui me sont demandées pis je recherche (unint) un dictionnaire c'est comme ça que j'apprends" [WHERE I LEARN THE MOST IS IN THE INFORMATION ASKED OF ME AND I RESEARCH (UNINT) A DICTIONARY THAT'S HOW I LEARN].

In any case, it is certainly true that people come to her for help:

80. Linda: j'ai juste cherché un dictionnaire oh (unint) [I JUST LOOKED FOR A DICTIONARY OH]

Frman: homme d'atelier fait une traduction litérale parfaite ["HOMME D'ATELIER" MAKES A PERFECT LITERAL TRANS-LATION]

Woman: que veux-tu que je te dise [WHAT DO YOU WANT ME TO TELL YOU]

Linda: quoi en anglais? [WHAT IN ENGLISH?]

Woman: shopman

Frman: shopman

Woman: c'est un gars qui travaille dans un atelier un homme d'atelier ben non [IT'S A GUY WHO WORKS IN A SHOP A MAN OF SHOP WELL NO]

Linda: un journalier [A DAY-LABOURER]

Woman: un journalier j'ai vu ça quelque part [A DAY-LABOURER I'VE SEEN THAT SOMEWHERE]

Frman: non journalier ça fait pas mon affaire [NO DAY-LABOURER IS NOT WHAT I WANT]

Linda: non un manutentionnaire [NO A MANAGER/STOREKEEPER]

Frman: un manutentionnaire ça fait pas mon affaire non [A MANAGER/STOREKEEPER ISN'T WHAT I WANT EITHER

```
              plus un homme d'atelier    A MAN-OF-SHOP THAT'S WHAT
              ça fait mon affaire        I WANT]
(laughter)
Woman: mais qu'est-ce que ça         [BUT WHAT DOES THAT MEAN?]
       veut dire?
Frman: là c'est le c'est             [THERE IT'S THE IT'S]
Woman: ça c'est pourquoi les         [THAT IT'S WHY THE (UNINT)?]
       (unint)?
Frman: ben c'est pour                [WELL IT'S FOR]
Woman: c'est les le les gars de      [IT'S THE THE THE GUYS FROM
       l'usine                       PLANT]
Frman: c'est ça va être un           [THAT'S RIGHT IT'LL BE A
       mécanicien qui va être        MECHANIC WHO'LL BE EMPLOYED
       employé comme gofer gofer     AS GOFER..]
       dis gofer dat
(laughter)
Woman: y a un mot pour ça            [THERE'S A WORD FOR THAT]
Frman: un BT                         [A BT]
Woman: girl Friday
Frman: non pas un bachelier pas      [NO NOT A BACHELOR NOT A
       un bachelier                  BACHELOR]
Linda: non un boy Friday             [NO A BOY FRIDAY]
Woman: un boy Friday
Linda: un boy Friday
Frman: (unint) sensible i va         [(UNINT) SENSITIVE HE'LL
       travailler fort               WORK HARD]
Woman: social i va travailler        [SOCIAL HE'LL WORK WHERE
       là où j'ai travaillé          I WORKED BEFORE MY
       avant ma petite fille la      LITTLE GIRL THE LITTLE GIRL
       petite fille elle             SHE WAS LOOKING YOU KNOW
       cherchait t'sais un           FOR A FULL-TIME JOB AND
       travail à temps complet   SHE SAW THAT IN THE NEWS-
       pis elle a vu ça dans le      PAPER GIRL FRIDAY DIDN'T
       journal Girl Friday savait KNOW THAT IT WAS THOUGHT
       pas que c'était pensait       SHE WORKED JUST ON
       qu'elle travaillait juste  FRIDAYS]
       le vendredi
(laughter)
```

While the three people here never come to an agreement about the "proper" term to use in French for "shopman", they _are_ in the process of working out together their ideas about the meanings of terms and about the appropriate conditions of their use.

Similarly, a request from the stores to disambiguate an _oil seal_ from a _gasket_ brought Linda to a discussion of joints and the different

semantic fields covered by the two English terms and the French <u>joint</u> <u>d'étanchéité</u>.

The other major part of Linda's work involved a job of typing something prepared by an engineering apprentice. Rather than simply typing up what he brought her, however, Linda entered into discussions with him about the size and placement of the figures, and took the opportunity to teach the apprentice a thing or two about typing, reducing and copying. In this domain as well as that of other aspects of her work, Linda shows her involvement and her interest in producing high-quality work with the participation of others.

Finally, it is notable that Linda's speech retains only some of the QF features found in the speech of others. She never uses loanwords or calques. She does consistently use <u>juste</u>, <u>fait que</u> and <u>pis</u>, but most other features are variable.

1) par périodes ça va être pas mal uh occupé <u>pis</u> d'autres j'ai presque rien ça <u>fait</u> <u>que</u> elle m'aide beaucoup t'sais [SOME PERIODS WILL BE PRETTY BUSY AND OTHERS I HAVE ALMOST NOTHING SO SHE HELPS ME A LOT YOU KNOW];

2) <u>je</u> <u>vais</u>/<u>je</u> <u>vas</u>: je <u>vais</u> les reperdre [I'LL LOSE THEM AGAIN]; je <u>vas</u> chercher la personne [I'LL LOOK FOR THE PERSON];

3) [<u>tu</u>]/[<u>tUt</u>]: celle-là par exemple je l'ai <u>toute</u> [<u>tUt</u>] lue [THAT ONE FOR EXAMPLE I READ IT ALL; this is possibly just the QF phonological

variant of EF [tut]]; faut tout [tu] que ce soit tapé [THE WHOLE THING HAS TO BE TYPED];

4) [fe]/[fɛt]: j'ai fait [fe] mes études en lettres [I STUDIED ARTS]; une fois que t'as fait [fɛt] preuve [ONCE YOU'VE PROVED];

5) ce que/ qu'est-ce que: je pense ce qui est écrit reste plus [I THINK THAT WHICH IS WRITTEN STAYS LONGER]; les noms on sait absolument pas ce que c'est d'après le nom [THE NAMES YOU ABSOLUTELY DON'T KNOW THAT WHICH IT IS ACCORDING TO THE NAME]; je perds le fil de ce que je lis [I LOSE THE THREAD OF THAT WHICH I'M READING]; pis aussi c'est que ce que je remarque c'est que souvent... [AND ALSO IT'S THAT THAT WHICH I NOTICE IS THAT OFTEN...]; tu sais pas au juste qu'est-ce qu'ils veulent dire [YOU DON'T KNOW EXACTLY WHAT THEY MEAN]; pis qu'est-ce qui est question vocabulaire ben j'ai des livres qui peuvent m'aider [AND WHAT IS A QUESTION OF VOCABULARY GRAMMAR WELL I HAVE BOOKS WHICH CAN HELP ME]; mais c'est vrai je pense qu'est-ce que tu dis [BUT IT'S TRUE I THINK WHAT YOU SAY];

6) quand/quand que: juste quand qu'ils commencent à vieillir [JUST WHEN THEY START TO GET OLDER]; quand on va au restaurant [WHEN YOU GO TO A RESTAURANT];

7) est-ce que/ -tu: est-ce que je peux prendre le message? [CAN I TAKE THE MESSAGE?]; est-ce que Pierre est là? [IS PIERRE THERE?]; comment est-ce qu'on dit ça en français [HOW DO YOU SAY THAT IN FRENCH?]; tu peux-tu mettre une abbréviation? [CAN YOU PUT AN ABBREVIATION?].

The QF variables occur in conversation with me or with the engineering apprentice, never on the telephone. They are also much rarer in occurrence than the EF features. But it is interesting that many QF features in Linda's speech are invariable, especially since she is someone who makes a living from and gets satisfaction from encouraging the use of "good French". Also, her use of English is practically nonexistent, so that again "good French" seems to be something that is, above all, not influenced by English, while at the same time Linda's use of features that are less QF than EF indicates some form of covert differentiation of codes stratified according to prestige, i.e. appropriate or not for use in Linda's official capacity as department representative. The simultaneous invariable use of some QF features indicates a differentiation of social value among QF features.

5.1.3.3 The office of the acting manager and permanent projects supervisor

Bob MacDonald, acting manager
Claude Tremblay, maintenance supervisor
Denise, manager's secretary
Jean, foreman
Jacques, foreman
Martin, foreman
Lucien, foreman
Bernard, accountant
Anne, accountant
Nguyen, projects engineer
Mr. Schneider, distribution vice-president
M. Legros, master brewer

Mr. MacDonald spends time in his office talking to the various engineering staff members who come to see him, and outside the office talking to his bosses (one anglophone and one recently promoted francophone). He therefore deals regularly with both francophones and anglophones.

Mr. MacDonald (henceforth Bob) tends to use French for opening and closing routines, whether his interlocutor is francophone or anglophone. (It should be noted that in some of the following examples, and in others in this section, conversation touches on a sign on Bob's desk: wood and brass, it is classically "executive style", and has three sides, each of which bears an inscription describing the boss' state of mind, so that innocent underlings may be forewarned when they come into the office. On this day the block was turned to: "Danger -- le patron est de mauvaise humeur" [DANGER -- THE BOSS IS IN A BAD MOOD].). Also, even though I will refer to him here as Bob, everyone inferior to him in age or rank refers to him and addresses him as Mr. MacDonald.

81. Bob:	bonjour ma fleur comment ça va?	[HELLO MY FLOWER HOW IS IT GOING?]
Denise:	bonjour monsieur MacDonald bien et vous?	[HELLO MISTER MACDONALD WELL AND YOU?]
Bob:	ça va merci	[FINE THANKS]
Denise:	well you won't say that when I (unint) you this	
Bob:	uh huh a	
Denise:	did you see that?	
Bob:	oh oui	[OH YES]
Denise:	still excellent?	
Bob:	not excellent	
Denise:	I thought so	
Bob:	merci bien	[THANK YOU VERY MUCH]
Denise:	you're welcome	

82. Bob (on intercom with an anglophone colleague):
        excellent merci (pause)   [EXCELLENT THANK YOU]
        yeah sure which one that's
        the chap...

83. Claude: excuse me sir excusez-moi [EXCUSE ME]
   Bob: vous connais um Ellen   [YOU (PL) KNOW (SING)...]
         eh Monica? Heller?
   Claude: je l'ai vue aux   [I'VE SEEN HER AROUND
         alentours hm?   HM?]
   Bob: hm? he's never been the
         same since
   Claude (laughs): it's only two hundred
         and seventy-three thousand
         bucks it's all in the budget
         this is the normal painting
         cleaning of overhaul

The conversation goes on in English for quite some time, until a false

close:

   Claude:...and it was signed by the
         president last year and all
         that okay? merci beaucoup [THANK YOU VERY MUCH...]
         monsieur MacDonald
   Bob: merci bien uh Claude I'll [THANK YOU VERY MUCH...]
         get back to you tonight
   Claude: I am
         buying half a dozen fan
         as directed by...

The conversation then goes on again for some time on the new topic of

fans, and ends finally in English with a joke:

   Claude: I have a choice pension or
         divorce simple eh?
   Bob: I'm betting you're better off
         I don't know which one you're
         better off taking

More openings and closings:

84. Bob: bonjour comment ça va?   [HELLO HOW'S IT GOING?]

```
Jean:  ça va                      [lit. IT'S GOING; FINE, OKAY]
Bob:   pas vacances aujourd'hui?  [NOT VACATIONS TODAY?
       non? le reste est bien?    NO? THE REST IS GOOD?]
(pause)
Bob:   ah sh c'est pour moi oui   [...IT'S FOR ME YES]
Jean:  a lot of work in there
Bob:   merci                      [THANK YOU]
Jean:  don't worry about it
Bob:   okay good
```

```
85. Bob:      excusez-moi there's    [EXCUSE ME...]
              a couple of rules where
              are they tu-tu-t-t-t-t
              these ones here and you're
              replacing Roland okay
    Jacques:  yeah
    Bob:      you should initial it here
              on that one and that one
    Jacques:  I just sign here
```

In a few other cases code-switching is more extensive, and in these

cases the interlocutor is always francophone:

86. The following conversation takes place between Bob and Bernard, an
    office employee, in the presence of me and of a Vietnamese
    engineer with whom Bob was in the midst of consultations.
    Bob (to Nguyen): excuse me
    Bernard: danger le patron est de
             mauvaise humeur
    (pause)
             ha we have to meet together
             for the Cantlie report for
             June we have to chat discuss
    Bob: quelle date yesterday   [WHAT DATE...]
    Bernard: ha ha ha
    Bob: remember the agreement we
             reached x months ago where
             you give me two weeks' notice?
    Bernard: yeah but two weeks ago
             it was impossible to
    Bob: okay
             pas aujourd'hui pas   [NOT TODAY NOT
             demain   TOMORROW]
    Bernard: demain   [TOMORROW]
    Bob: pas demain   [NOT TOMORROW]
    Bernard: pas demain   [NOT TOMORROW]
    Bob: pas demain   [NOT TOMORROW]
    Bernard: when

```
Bob:      pas lundi this is what    [NOT MONDAY...]
          I said beforehand you
          know I need about a couple
          of weeks' advance notice
          you give me two two minutes'
          advance notice mardi?     [...TUESDAY?]
Bernard:  c'est pas possible        [IT'S NOT POSSIBLE
          lundi?                    MONDAY?]
Bob:      (unint) pas possible      [(UNINT) NOT POSSIBLE]
Bernard:  pas possible              [NOT POSSIBLE]
Bob:      mercredi?                 [WEDNESDAY?]
Bernard:  mm
Bob:      jeudi                     [THURSDAY]
Bernard:  non mardi au plus tard    [NO TUESDAY AT THE
          mardi matin               LATEST TUESDAY MORNING]
Bob:      my schedule has gone out
          the window
Bernard:  mhm
Bob:      lundi deux heures         [MONDAY TWO O'CLOCK]
Bernard:  (unint)
Bob:      okay do you want it ahead
          of that?
Bernard:  what?
Bob:      do you want it before two
          o'clock?
Bernard:  for what?
Bob:      our meeting
Bernard:  (unint)
Bob:      quelle heure?             [WHAT TIME?]
Bernard:  (unint) on pourrait       [(UNINT) WE COULD
          commencer à dix heures    START AT TEN
          (unint)                   O'CLOCK (UNINT)]
Bob:      dix heures? okay pour     [TEN O'CLOCK? OKAY
          certain?                  FOR CERTAIN?]
Bernard:  oui oui certain           [YES YES CERTAIN]
Bob:      okay pas de problème      [OKAY NO PROBLEM
          (unint) vacances          (UNINT) VACATIONS]
Bernard:  ha ha ha non pas les      [HA HA HA NO NOT
          vacances                  VACATIONS]
Bob:      lundi                     [MONDAY]
Bernard:  lundi (unint) pas aux     [MONDAY (UNINT) NOT
          Madeleines (?)            TO THE MAGDALENS (?)]
Bob:      non c'est pas silence     [NO ITS NOT SILENCE
          c'est danger              IT'S DANGER]
Bernard:  hey it's in French
Bob:      oui                       [YES]
Bernard:  see that
Bob:      pourquoi pas? so be       [WHY NOT?...]
          be careful okay (unint)
Bernard:  okay
Bob:      merci bien lundi          [THANKS VERY MUCH MONDAY]
Bernard:  oui                       [YES]
(Bernard leaves)
Bob (to Nguyen and me): every time
```

```
           I say to him give me two
           weeks' notice (pause) every
           time he gives me two minutes'
           notice (pause)...
```

Even here, however, the real substance of the conversation takes place in English, except for parts of the negotiations about day and time, which are in French probably because Bernard didn't always seem to understand what Bob said in English. One of the things Bob does seem able to demonstrate in this conversation is a certain flexibility, both as regards language choice and as regards scheduling, which may go some way towards offsetting the facts that he has to meet Bernard on Bernard's schedule, and (re language) that Bob does not speak French very well and Bernard does not speak English very well. Bernard's use of English is thus in some measure just as much a gesture of respect towards Bob as is Bob's use of French towards Bernard and the situation in general.

```
87. Bob is talking to Martin, a francophone foreman.
    Accompanying Martin is Lucien, another foreman, who,
    however, does very little talking.
    Martin:  the list mark remplacer    [...REPLACE THE
             le convoyeur four A four    CONVEYOR...]
             B (unint) thirty-five
    Lucien:  oui
    Bob:     I think that's (pause)
             (unint) un deux le ligne    [...ONE TWO THE
             numéro cinq troisième       (MASC) LINE (FEM)
             étage okay bon              NUMBER FIVE THIRD
                                         FLOOR OKAY GOOD]
    Martin:  convoyeur numéro cinq       [CONVEYOR NUMBER
             see that's number           FIVE...]
             eighteen
    Bob:     okay bon numéro neuf        [OKAY GOOD NUMBER
             hein c'est pour ligne       NINE EH IT'S FOR LINE
             numéro six hein             NUMBER SIX EH]
    Martin:  convoyeur numéro six        [CONVEYOR NUMBER SIX]
    Bob:     okay (reads to self) zéro   [...ZERO TWO ZERO FOUR
             teux zéro quatre et-        ...IT'S THE SAME THING
             cetera c'est la même        AS NUMBER FOUR?]
```

```
                   chose que le numéro quatre?
Martin:  four yes this one conveyor
         four A four B should should
         have number thirty-five (unint)
Bob:     trente trente-et-un          [THIRTY THIRTY-ONE
         trente-deux trente-trois     THIRTY-TWO THIRTY-
                                      THREE]
Martin:  (unint) sorti sur (unint)    [(UNINT) GONE OUT ON
                                      (UNINT)]
Bob:     okay?
Martin:  okay I'll send this one
Bob:     c'est certain?               [IT'S CERTAIN?]
Martin:  (unint) convoyeur des        [(UNINT) BOTTLE
         bouteilles neuf à partir     CONVEYOR NINE
         des soutireuses jusqu'à      STARTING FROM THE
         l'entrée du pasteuriseur     FILLERS UP TO THE
         quatre                       ENTRY OF PASTEURIZER
                                      FOUR]
Bob:     oui oui bon                  [YES YES GOOD]
Martin:  (unint) service
Bob:     all you're doing is buying
         chain
Martin:  on this no replace the whole
         frame
Bob:     the frame aussi?             [...ALSO?]
Martin:  yeah it's all rusted on
         the end
Bob:     ooh okay good
Martin:  so I'll put a number here
         for the for the uh brewery
         ABC
Bob:     ah oui                       [AH YES]
Martin:  eh I've I've got all this
         those are new (unint) five
         four pump eh moteur          [MOTOR CHECK A
         vérifie un (unint)           (UNINT).....
         motor okay replace the       ..............
         motor désuet the old         ....USED/OBSOLETE]
         uh (pause) unrepair
         unrepairable
Bob:     oh oui uh uh                 [...YES...]
Martin:  motor (pause) feed-tray
         six [sɪs] soaker             [...SIX...]
Bob:     ah oui                       [...YES]
Martin:  feed-tray [(unint) number six
Bob:               [soaker oui oui    [YES YES THE
         les trays i marchent pas?    TRAYS DON'T WORK?
         vraiment? vraiment i         REALLY? REALLY
         marchent pas?                THEY DON'T WORK?]
Martin:  yeah oh yeah (pause)
         replace all the piping
Bob:     piping
Martin:  for water and steam on six
         and seven pasteurizer outside
```

```
              they all all rusted
Bob:     okay
Martin: you locate the pumphouse
              station on filler four A
              four B? we are having problems
              with the rust
Bob:     because each year you have problems
              with the exposure okay
Martin:          ⌊because you are you are
Bob:     bon                      [GOOD]
Martin: that's uh under service  [...SERVICE]
              for EBI for Garry-Baker
Bob:                      (unint)
              okay bon                 [...GOOD]
Martin: I replace
Bob:     so line number numéro   [...NUMBER FIVE?]
              cinq?
Martin: yeah you have one for this
              year for line number four
Bob:     oui                          [YES]
Martin: it's gonna be the same for five
Bob:     I see
Martin: but here you would like to get
              it in the (unint) of steel like
              the same on line number one
Bob:     okay somebody tell you to keep
              me busy?
Martin: no
Bob:     no you just doing it naturally
              eh au naturel okay        [lit. IN/TO THE NATURAL,
                                         but idiomatically
                                         NAKED]
Martin: (unint) (laughs) can just
              put this over your desk
              on there or here?
Bob:     you better.better leave it
              here you see this desk is
              a ⌈mess
Martin:  ⌊(laughs)
Bob:     now you see the other one's
              clean so
(Martin leaves)
```

Here too the greater part of the exchange is in English. Martin's French consists mainly of reading out work orders which were filled out in French. Bob, on the other hand, uses French a good deal, mainly for asking Martin all or part of a question, which then gets followed up in English, so that the two interlocutors often end up each speaking the

other's language.

88. In this example, Bob is talking to a woman from
    engineering accounting who has come into his office
    to ask for his help.

Anne:	j'essaie de le trouver	[I TRY TO FIND IT
	pis je le trouve pas	AND I DON'T FIND IT]
Bob:	well prob	
Anne:	I can't find that par	
	are you sure of the	
Bob:	you always come to me for	
	assistance don't you eh?	
	what a (unint)	
Anne:	yes	
Bob:	they always come to me for	
	help danger	[...DANGER]
Anne:	danger	[DANGER]
Bob:	[danger	[DANGER]
Anne:	[le patron est	[THE BOSS IS IN A
	de mauvaise humeur? oh non	BAD MOOD? OH NO
	vous êtes pas jamais de	YOU'RE NEVER IN A
	mauvaise humeur	BAD MOOD]
Bob:	(unint) projet	[(UNINT) PROJECT]
Anne:	oui mais he's supposed to	[YES BUT...]
	be complete that project	
Bob:	it is complete mister Smith	
	seems to get a little bit lost	
	when it has to be till then	
Anne:	me	
Bob:	the job was completed in	
	March nineteen seventy-nine	
	and the invoice is in May	
Anne:	it's only fifty-six dollar	
Bob:	fifty-six dollars he signed	
	that (unint) account	
	number (unint)	
Anne:	yes he signed that but (unint)	
Bob:	purchase order merci uh	[...THANK YOU...]
Anne:	i ont pas donné le number	[THEY DIDN'T GIVE THE...]
Bob:	what number?	
Anne:	you need the par number (unint)	
Bob:	(unint) that's the par number	
	there two eight nine eight	
Anne:	ah okay I have no choice okay	
	(sighs)	
Bob:	tragique	[TRAGIC]
Anne:	tragique hein? (unint)	[TRAGIC EH? (UNINT)]
Bob:	quel numéro? oh that's	[WHAT NUMBER?...]
	the work order number	
Anne:	ouais okay	[YEAH OKAY]
Bob:	okay mon amie?	[OKAY MY FRIEND?]
Anne:	thank you	

```
Bob:  merci                    [THANK YOU]
(Anne leaves)
```

Here as well the real work gets done in English: most of the French used is either repeated in English or represents material that Anne and Bob can both assume is previously understood (such as the sign on Bob's desk, which he presumably wouldn't place there nor comment on unless he knew what it meant).

Two other types of code-switching occur in Bob's office. The first kind occurs in the course of a long conversation with Nguyen, the trilingual Vietnamese engineer. (With no other anglophone does this kind of switch occur; indeed if there is any switching at all with other anglophones, it is restricted to conversational openings and closings). This first kind of switch concerns shared associations with work, including straight quotes from anglophone colleagues.

```
89.  Nguyen: number five's going down
     Bob:                    ⌐oh it's
             changed
     Nguyen: no it's not changed but
             they make the change because
             they might want to work off
             line number five they made five
     Bob:    oh mais numéro cinq       [OH BUT NUMBER
             c'est Tom                  FIVE IS TOM]
     Nguyen: mm last week of I don't
             know the last year seventy-
             nine


90.  Nguyen: and take off the back already
             five B [be]


91.  Nguyen: ...that (unint) the whole
             Distribution [distribysjo]
             (unint) start to take a lot
             of my time ⌐(unint) to finalize
```

```
Bob:                        |mhm
                  who're you dealing with there
                  now is that Béguin?
Nguyen: for which project?
Bob:     the marketing offices is he
         involved?
Nguyen: no no no that's a secret
Bob:     that's a secret
Nguyen: ultra-confidentiel      [ULTRA-CONFIDENTIAL
         dossier                FILE]
Bob:     dossier                [FILE]
Nguyen: Mister Schneider sh sh sh
Bob:     whispering campaign okay
         I think we've got it
```

92. Nguyen:...what he says is
              amélioration what I'm   [...IMPROVEMENT...]
              saying is additional conveyor

The second type of code-switching, seen in the other examples here,

is the disambiguation code-switch, here from French to English and also

from Scottish English to Canadian English.

93. In the following example, the master-brewer came into Bob's
    office to set up a meeting with him.
    M. Legros: à quelle heure?   [AT WHAT TIME?]
    (pause)
              at what time?
    Bob: yeah I got it

Here Bob makes it clear that the pause was not due to his inability to

understand French.

94. Here Nguyen sticks his head in the door after his
    meeting with Bob had just finished; he had been out
    of the office only a few minutes.
    Nguyen: je vais aller voir   [I'M GOING TO GO
            voir quelqu'un maintenant SEE SOMEONE NOW]
    Bob: très bien où vas-tu?   [VERY GOOD WHERE
                                      ARE YOU GOING?]
    Nguyen: de l'autre côté voir   [ACROSS THE STREET TO
            monsieur (unint)   SEE MISTER (UNINT)]
    Bob: qui?   [WHO?]
    Nguyen: monsieur (unint)   [MISTER (UNINT)]

(pause)
        mister (unint)

95. In the following example Bob is speaking first to
    me and then answers the telephone.
    Bob: ...however we're not all perfect [pɛːrfɛkt] (louder)
         the only way you're perfect's [pɛːrfɛkts] when you're
         Scottish then you're perfect [pɛːrfɛkt] (softer) oh
         oh God where do we go from here (phone rings) MacDonald
         speaking well how are you? well I was thinking of you
         [yoe] t'other day [tʌðərde] (pause) (louder) I was
         thinking of you [yu] the other day [dej]

Making yourself clear, then, requires attention to the additional
source of redundancy (and therefore of potential trouble) in the
repertoire, namely language choice, and so requires not only such
conventional strategies of monolingual communities as raising your
voice, but also requires code-switching.

Bob's interlocutors seem to share his notion that code-switching is
an appropriate strategy for the mutual (reflexive and reciprocal)
preservation of face, and that the appropriate place for code-switching
is most often in greetings, phatic responses and closings. In more
extended conversation, especially with younger upwardly mobile
francophones, turn-to-turn switching also occurs, since as the social
importance of the use of French increases so does the importance of
expressing content in French. Since Bob initiates many of these
turn-to-turn switches the problem of saving Bob's face is resolved.

Bob is clearly not fluently bilingual. He is, however, adept at a
certain kind of code-switching which involves largely symbolic gestures,
and which allows him to continue to function without acquiring the
reputation of a "tête dure", that is, to keep his position and dignity

while the rules of the game change.

5.1.3.4 The weekly meeting; engineering/maintenance manager
         and supervisors

Albert, manager
Bob, projects supervisor
Claude, maintenance supervisor
Daniel, acting stores supervisor

Two patterns of communication stand out at this meeting. These are
patterns of code-switching, coupled with negotiations of what is
supposed to happen in this meeting: Albert, a francophone, has only
been manager for a few months, and this is his first meeting after
several weeks' holiday; there has thus been little time for routines to
be established, but Albert has had time to think about how he wants to
run things.

Of the four people present, Albert, Bob, Claude and Daniel, Albert
and Claude do by far the most talking, followed by Bob. Daniel, a
newcomer, speaks very little (except to chat during an informal session
towards the end of the meeting, which is precisely when Bob is least
involved). When Daniel speaks, it is only in French. It is not clear
to what extent he speaks English (if at all). Bob and Claude have
worked together for a long time under an anglophone manager; they are
therefore used to having the meetings conducted in English. Indeed,
they both continue to write (and to read) their reports in English.

The dominant pattern of code-switching which emerges from the data
is a situational one: Albert, Claude and Daniel speak to each other in
French and in English to Bob.   While Claude reads his reports in
English, his side comments to Albert are in French. Albert, or so he
claims, takes care to speak to Claude in French, and uses French to
speak to the meeting at large (namely, to open and close the meeting).

When the meeting begins Albert is talking to Bob in English. He
switches to French to open the meeting, and back to English to speak to
Bob, and then back to French for a general introduction.


```
96. Albert: he would have got
    Bob:    he's twenty-one years of age
    Albert: yeah twenty-one years of age
    (pause)
                bon mais vous pouvez      [GOOD BUT YOU CAN
                fermer la porte c'est     CLOSE THE DOOR THAT'S
                tout ce qu'on va avoir    ALL WE'RE GOING TO
                aujourd'hui               HAVE TODAY]
    Claude: Coutu?
    Albert: Coutu i s'est trompé      [COUTU HE GOT THE
                de la cédule pis i est     WRONG SCHEDULE AND
                parti de l'affaire de      HE WENT OFF ON THE
                                           THING OF]
    Claude: ooh
    Albert: de de son rapport de      [OF OF HIS NEGOTIATION
                négociation                REPORT]
    (pause; door is closed, papers shuffled)
                tout le monde connaît     [EVERYONE KNOWS MONICA?]
                Monica? Bob have you met
                Monica?
    Bob:    more to the point Monica's
                met me
    (laughter)
    Albert: pour le bénéfice de       [FOR MONICA'S BENEFIT
                Monica c'est un meeting    THIS IS A REDUCED
                réduit aujourd'hui         MEETING TODAY NORMALLY
                normalement on est cinq    WE'RE FIVE DICKIE PARENT
                Dickie Parent qui est pas  WHO'S NOT HERE WHO IS UH
                ici qui est uh l'adminis   THE ADMINIS UH THE
                uh l'adjoint administrat-  ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR
                if qui est en vacances     WHO IS ON VACATION AND
                pis uh René Champagne      UH RENE CHAMPAGNE WHO
```

qui est surintendant de	IS THE SUPERVISOR OF THE
section d'empaquetage	SECTION OF PACKAGING
entretien entretien	MAINTENANCE MAINTENANCE
d'empaquetage qui est en	OF PACKAGING WHO IS ON
vacances son remplaçant	VACATION HIS· REPLACEMENT
a dû aller uh à un	HAD TO GO UH TO A
rencontre ce matin quand-	MEETING THIS MORNING ALL
même ça va te donner	THE SAME THIS WILL GIVE
une idée de tout ce	YOU AN IDEA OF EVERYTHING
qu'on fait uh habituelle-	WE DO UH NORMALLY MISTER
ment monsieur Tremblay	TREMBLAY DO YOU WANT TO
voulez-vous commencer?	START?]

Similarly, Albert closes the meeting in French:

97. Albert: la séance est levée   [MEETING ADJOURNED]
    Claude: merci   [THANK YOU]

In example 96, speaking in formal style, Albert addresses Claude by title and last name, and uses the formal vous. Claude then begins to read his report in English and French, and uses French to comment on the contents to Albert.

98. Claude: oui uh vacation staff Roland [YES...]
Masse George Kovacs cette [THIS WEEK NEXT
semaine la semaine prochaine WEEK]
Roland Masse George Kovacs
again uh uh temp Denis Blais
he's on the lubrication survey
Léo Charrette uh working on
the expense budget but he's
going off for two weeks
hein? i prend deux semaines [EH? HE'S TAKING
de vacances ça je l'avais TWO WEEKS' VACATION
donné ça y a un bout de THAT I GAVE THAT A
temps WHILE AGO]
Albert: c'est-tu [IS IT]
Claude: ben des vacances des [WELL VACATION VACATION
vacances à ses frais on AT HIS OWN EXPENSE THEY
les paie à quatre pour cent PAY THEM AT FOUR PERCENT]
Albert: d'accord mais c'est-tu un [OKAY BUT IS HE AN EIGHT
huit mois ou un quatre mois MONTH OR A FOUR MONTH HIM?]
lui?
Claude: lui c'est un huit mois [HIM HE'S AN EIGHT MONTH]
Albert: deux semaines c'est un [TWO WEEKS THAT'S A FOUR

```
               quatre mois                    MONTH]
    (laughs)
    Claude: ouais uh sick Marcel I hope    [YEAH...]
            he's gonna come back early in
            August accident monsieur
            Quintal two accidents in the same
            week uh first a cut to the left
            hand while fabricating a piece of
            stainless steel on B shift then he
            went for an encore (laughs) second
            accident deep cut on the left hand
            thumb at least he kept the same hand
            while handling the yeast knives
            and he's off
    Albert: (unint)
    Claude: lost time accident
```

Bob comments in English and then Albert in French.

```
    Bob:    was he wuh was he wearing gloves?
    Claude (whispers): of course not
            (louder) I haven't seen the
            report of the accident yet
            it's not done I could almost
            bet on it
    Albert: parce que            [BECAUSE]
    Claude: pardon?              [PARDON?]
    Albert: (unint) sur deux     [(UNINT) OUT OF TWO]
    Claude: oui mais j'aurais peur i  [YES BUT I WOULD BE
            (unint) reste plus rien   AFRAID THAT THERE
                                      (UNINT) WOULD BE
                                      NOTHING LEFT]
    (laughter)
```

Albert consistently speaks to Claude in French when the comment concerns only Claude. In some sense, though, he doesn't have to worry about whether or not Bob understands, since Claude is presenting all the information in English, and his use of English gives Bob an opening in which to ask questions.

```
    99. Claude: ...permanent fifty-one
                actual fifty and I have
                one to hire to replace
                monsieur Carver who's
```

```
           leaving next year
Albert: bon avant d'aller plus      [GOOD BEFORE GOING
        loin sur la (unint) avez-   FARTHER ON THE (UNINT)
        vous des nouvelles de de    DO YOU HAVE ANY NEWS
        d'affichage?                ABOUT THE THE THE
                                    SIGN-POSTING?]
Claude: ben c'est fait              [WELL IT'S DONE]


100. Claude: ...uh temps plant eight
             actual seven overtime
             Saturday now I'm up to
             seven men couple of job
             in place cleaning number
             four wort tank underlet
     Albert: i travaillent encore en  [THEY'RE STILL WORKING
             fin de semaine?          WEEKENDS?]
     Claude: i ont i ont réduit des   [THEY'VE THEY'VE REDUCED
             brasses ben la dernière  THE BREWS WELL THE LAST
             affaire que j'ai entendu  THING I HEARD SPOKEN
             parlé hier uh            YESTERDAY UH]
```

In the following example Claude brings up the subject of sprinklers;

Claude and Albert talk in French about the problem of locks for

sprinklers, and Bob later brings up another aspect of the sprinkler

issue, which, being tangential to the immediate subject of conversation

between Albert and Claude, somewhat mystifies Albert.

```
101. Claude: j'ai peur pour ma vie moi [I FEAR FOR MY LIFE ME
             des fois un visitor        SOMETIMES ONE...]
             monsieur Robert Asselin
             de l'Asson de Fils de
             Mont-Rougemont concerning
             the safety devices devices
             came and looked at some of
             our tanks locks for sprinklers
             c'était dû le vingt-huit   [IT WAS DUE THE
             juillet i sont pas         TWENTY-EIGHTH OF
             arrivés par exemple        JULY THEY HAVEN'T
             encore à ce que je sache   EVEN YET ARRIVED
                                        THOUGH AS FAR AS I
                                        KNOW]
     Albert: le vingt-huit c'est       [THE TWENTY-EIGHTH
             lundi là on va se faire    THAT'S MONDAY THERE
             tirer pis                  WE'RE GOING TO GET
                                        OURSELVES PULLED AND]
     Claude: le temps de passé que     [THE AMOUNT OF TIME
```

t'as rempli ça	THAT'S GONE BY SINCE YOU FILLED THAT OUT]
Albert: oui on a reçu une lettre de de l'assurance	[YES WE GOT A LETTER FROM FROM THE INSURANCE]
Claude: oui	[YES]
Albert: pis comment ça se fait que c'est pas fait ben j'ai dit on l'a commandé mais on l'attend mais (pause) i commencent à faire je pense qu'on devrait aller chez Pascal pis s'acheter des cadenas des masters (laughs)	[AND HOW IS IT THAT IT'S NOT DONE WELL I SAID WE ORDERED IT BUT WE'RE WAITING FOR IT BUT (PAUSE) THEY'RE STARTING TO DO I THINK WE OUGHT TO GO TO PASCAL'S (a hardware store) AND BUY OURSELVES SOME LOCKS SOME MASTERS]
Claude: le problème avec ça c'est que pour avoir uh	[THE PROBLEM WITH THAT IS THAT TO HAVE UH]
Albert: non c'était (unint) c'est à cause du code	[NO IT WAS (UNINT) IT'S BECAUSE OF THE CODE]
Claude: en série en code il faut qu'ils mettent ça à l'ordinateur après qu'ils cédulent ça sur la production pis	[IN A SERIES IN CODE THEY HAVE TO PUT THAT ON COMPUTER AFTER THEY SCHEDULE IT ON PRODUC- TION AND]
Albert: oui mais	[YES BUT]
Claude: i sont pas pressés i aiment pas ça les accidents	[THEY'RE NOT IN A HURRY THEY DON'T LIKE THAT, ACCIDENTS]
Bob: you're going to have a problem with the sprinklers in the garage I'm putting nine heads in each of the spray booths	
Claude: yup	
Bob: and each head has to be covered with a brown paper bag and changed every two weeks	
(pause)	
Albert: why did you bring that up, Bob?	
Bob: I just wanted to give Claude a miserable weekend	
Claude: well	
(laughter)	

Bob and Claude discuss the sprinkler bags in English for a while (nine turns in all), and then Albert brings the conversation back to what he had felt was the subject at hand:

```
Claude (to Bob): we're lucky they
              put the paint on the
              trucks oh well
Albert: que Pierre s'i voudrait    [THAT PIERRE IF HE
        que si aussitôt que tu      WOULD WANT IF AS
        l'entends dire qu'y a des   SOON AS YOU HEAR IT
        cadenas qui rentrent dis    THAT THERE ARE LOCKS
        le à moi ou à George        COMING IN TELL ME
        c'est à mon nom             OR GEORGE IT'S IN MY
                                    NAME]
Claude: oui oui                     [YES YES]


102. Claude:...eleven elevator we had
             to repair the safeties on
             e elevator it's like the
             planes because of the
             condensation water in the
             shaft they seize all it
             means that the elevator
             would have drop it wouldn't
             have stop all right Bob?
             number eleven brewhouse
             ça c'est vous avez         [THAT IT'S YOU ALWAYS
             toujours des problèmes     HAVE PROBLEMS IN THAT
             dans ça (unint) c'est la   (UNINT) IT'S THE (UNINT)
             (unint) brewhouse des      BREWHOUSE SOMETIMES
             fois ils lavent les        THEY WASH THE FLOORS
             planchers l'eau descend    THE WATER GOES DOWN
             dedans pis l'hiver t'as    INSIDE AND IN WINTER
             des portes qui sort        YOU HAVE DOORS WHICH
             dehors alors la condensa-  GOES OUTSIDE SO THE
             tion (unint) l'eau qui     CONDENSATION (UNINT)
             coule là-dedans           THE WATER WHICH FLOWS
                                        INSIDE IT]


Claude and Albert then have a conversation about these
problems which ends thus:
      Claude:...t'as toutes les      [YOU HAVE ALL THE
             conditions que tu        CONDITIONS WHICH
             devrais pas avoir number  YOU SHOULDN'T HAVE...]
             nine elevator we did some
             repairs to some of the
             bi-parting doors I said
             I told Germain to spend
             the least amount of money
             because those doors are
             gonna be replace eh?
      Bob:   well now that Boileau's
             back from vacation and you're
             back on vacation you still
             have to settle the controls
```

And Bob and Claude have a conversation in English about controlling decisions regarding replacement of the elevators.

It is also worth noting that by now, indeed very shortly after the beginning of the meeting, Albert has switched from the formal vous to the intimate tu:

103. Albert (about ten minutes into the meeting):
        tu n'as pas sondé   [YOU DIDN'T FIND OUT
        quand-même s'y a des   ANYWAY IF THERE WERE
        applications pour   ANY APPLICATIONS FOR]

Albert uses English to read from English reports or memos, to bring Bob into the conversation, or to participate in a conversation involving Bob.

104. Albert:...il va falloir condamner [IT'S GOING TO BE
        ça à fin d'août parce   NECESSARY TO CONDEMN
        que la date limite pour THAT TO THE END OF
        le ESR c'est le dix-huit AUGUST BECAUSE THE
        sep dix-huit août   DEADLINE FOR THE ESR
                          IS THE EIGHTEENTH OF SEP
                          EIGHTEENTH OF AUGUST]
    Claude: pour les capacités?   [FOR THE CAPACITIES?]
    (Albert looks for a paper in his files)
    Albert: all ESRs for capacity items
        have to be in by the
        eighteenth of August
        (pause) fait que   [SO THAT]

105. Claude: they have to decide
    Bob: yes
    Claude: I can help him to but
        he can look at thirteen
    Bob: that's why you're going
        to be there Claude
    (Albert laughs)
    Bob: clear?
    Claude: yeah I don't
    Albert: you can be very influential
        like you did yesterday at

```
                    the meeting (unint) as soon
                    as Blouin started talking about
                    the chef de groupe        [THE GROUP CHIEF]
        Claude:  uh huh
        Albert:  he didn't have and then one
                    of them foremen got up to
                    say something didn't let
                    Blouin say anything didn't
                    let anybody say there there's
                    only one chef de groupe and
                    the man there said there's
                    going to be only one so ev
                    (laughs)
        Claude:  I said "no"
        Albert:  everything ended there
        Claude:  that was the end of that one
```

```
106.  Bob:     got a question Claude
                    number eleven elevator
        Claude:  yup
        Bob:     the main floor first floor
        Claude:  yup
        Bob:     the frame the steel frame
                    around the entrance to it
        Claude:  yeah it's ordered a year
                    ago but they're on strike
        Bob:     oh okay
        Albert:  Bob I'm sorry I forgot to
                    go through the ah figures
                    just (unint) very much
                    (unint) l'échantillon     [THE SAMPLE IT SEEMS
                    i me semble que j'ai vu   TO ME THAT I SAW THE
                    l'autre jour que qu'on    OTHER DAY THAT THAT WE
                    a perdu deux ou trois     LOST TWO OR THREE
                    fois la                   TIMES THE]
        Claude:  sur la couverture de la   [ON THE COVER OF THE
                    filtration de vingt-cinq  FILTRATION OF TWENTY-
                    mille?                    FIVE THOUSAND?]
```

Albert and Claude continue to speak to each other in French. At the end

of Claude's report Albert turns to Bob and gives him the floor in a

neutral form (i.e. neither English nor French):

```
107.  Claude:  ceux-là i ont été fait    [THOSE THERE WERE
                    de la peinture je pense   DONE SOME PAINTING I
                    il vient de Montréal      THINK HE COMES FROM
                    de (unint)                (UNINT)]
        Albert:  du côté (unint) se        [FROM THE SIDE
```

```
           débarrasser de't ça        (UNINT) GET RID OF IT
           George                     GEORGE]
      Claude (coughs): right
      Albert: okay Bob
      Bob:    okay good we have personnel...
```

108. In the following example Albert's switch during
     his own report opens the floor for Bob:

```
      Albert: meeting de mardi brassage [TUESDAY'S MEETING
              ont six brasses de moins  BREWING HAVE SIX
              que prévu les up-to-dates BREWS LESS THAN
              sont moins huit point     FORESEEN THE UP-TO-
              deux pour cent en bas du  DATES ARE LESS EIGHT
              budget (pause) eight      POINT TWO PERCENT
              point two percent over    BELOW BUDGET (PAUSE)]
              budget
      (phone rings)
              up-to-date
      Bob:    eight percent
      Albert: eight point two
```

Albert then begins a long discussion in English about filtration, in
which both Claude and Bob participate.

Albert also uses English to begin talk in a general way about a
criticism he has of Claude's reports.

109. Claude: when you talk with uh at the meeting with
             Michel you gonna set the meeting?
     Albert: yes I'm gonna tell you (unint) we'll come
             back uh it's too bad René's not here or
             Dickie that I have a complaint to make
             (laughs) uh I would like that your
             reports would be more geared towards uh
             the problems we had the week before and
             miscellaneous information on uh manpower
             and overhaul or uh

Claude has a difficult time getting the floor in this discussion; when
he does he talks about specific examples of problems which Albert has
raised.

```
Claude: mhm
Albert: budget parts I mean you can do your report
        as you're doing now for your information
        to keep a record okay but to me
Claude: okay look
Albert: what is more meaningful when I go in that
        meeting
Claude: yeah
Albert: is the trouble-shooting it's what problems
        we had last week and you have
(Claude coughs)
        two or three pages that you gave me last
        week like this
Claude: that's two problems
Albert: and trouble-shooting is is is that at the
        bottom of the page
Claude: okay
Albert: and I have problems sometimes (laughs)
Claude: that's the last thing I
Albert: so I'd like more details and better laid
        out better number one number two number
        three
Claude: right
Albert: and we had a breakdown on this on that we
        checked this we checked that what's the
        what could be the cause if we had a solution
        if we repaired it with how much time we
        lost that kind of information cause it
        seems that we lost packaging lost uh
        half an hour last Friday because of a
        sprinkler test or something
Claude: yeah that
Albert: which I didn't have information on
Claude: awright
Albert: and packaging had the breakdown they had
        they missed the biggest one three hours
        for the sights filler right holder they
        had lost three hours I don't have that on
        the sheet so uh I need that information
Claude: okay that was the problem on the Friday
        when I should have told you that on
        Tuesday morning
Albert: yes things that happen after Friday the
        other department still take that into
        account not on Monday or what happens
        on the Friday we have our our meeting on
        Friday morning
Claude: right now if you're lucky you get everything
        that has happened up to let's say nine
        o'clock this morning if I have been
        informed so you're today you're missing
Albert: I'm missing if something important happened
        I should know about it (pause) anyway what
        I'm saying is that there I have nothing
```

                    against the rest of the information I
                    want to see it but that's not what I take
                    to the meeting
        Claude: right
        Albert: I need the breakdown that means what inter-
                    reaction we had with the other department
                    okay I want it well laid out on the sheet
                    and what's happened this week the activities
                    that we had

Finally, Claude switches to French.

        Claude: okay ça ça ça va être   [OKAY THAT THAT
                    la chose là   THAT WILL BE THE
                                                  THING THERE]
        Albert: │like
                    like if you if you're half
                    through on the overhaul of
                    the ammonia compressor
                    number seven well you know
                    that's okay I know that that's
                    not that's not important to
                    go there I don't want to
                    know about │that (unint)
        Claude: │okay fait que   [OKAY SO THAT THAT
                    que l'information comme   THE INFORMATION THAT
                    ça je mettrai pas ça   WAY I WON'T PUT IT
                    là-dessus parce que   ON IT BECAUSE YOU
                    t'en as t'en as pas   YOU DON'T NEED IT]
                    besoin
        Albert: │je le lirai oui si tu   [I'LL READ IT YES IF
                    veux le mettre pour toi   YOU WANT TO PUT IT
                    pis tu te sens d'accord   FOR YOURSELF AND YOU
                                                 FEEL YOURSELF IN
                                                 AGREEMENT]

Having followed Claude into French, Albert goes over essentially the
same points again. The conversation between Claude and Albert goes on
for quite some time, without really getting anywhere. Then Albert
decides to bring Bob into the discussion:

        Albert:...si on prend trois   [IF WE TAKE
                    heures à passer juste   THREE HOURS TO
                    à travers   JUST GO THROUGH]
        Claude: la routine   [ROUTINE THINGS]

```
Albert:       |la routine il nous   [ROUTINE THINGS
          reste plus de temps       THERE'S NO TIME
          après ça pour discuter    LEFT FOR US AFTER
          les problèmes majeures    THAT TO DISCUSS
          t'sais les les choses     MAJOR PROBLEMS YOU
          qu'i vraiment qu'i faut    KNOW THE THE THINGS
          you understand that Bob?   THAT IT'S REALLY THAT
          I say if we lose less      IT'S NECESSARY]
          time in going over the
          routine we have more time
          to discuss the important uh
Bob:      yeah I understand that completely
          but I must uh register that I'm
          greatly upset and rather dis-
          appointed because I look forward
          every Friday to listening to
          Claude for an
(Albert laughs)
          hour and a half and now I'm going
          to be down to fifteen minutes
          Claude I'll have to have another
          meeting with you (laughs)
Claude:   it's okay I always have fifty
          jobs on the go every week
Bob:      no je sais no no the       [I KNOW]
          point I think is um
Albert:   personnel I need to know who's
          on vacation it's okay but you
          know uh
Claude:   you know if you want to call
          a meeting next week with George
          Kovacs and he's not here
Albert:   but uh I don't know uh there
          are some things you can mention
          them but...
```

Bob tries to lighten the atmosphere with a joke. His switch to French
can be seen as part of his attempt here to act as a middleman and break
up the fight (especially since his joke seems to have fallen rather
flat, at least as far as Claude is concerned). The argument, however,
goes on, this time in English (again), and eventually Bob steps in of
his own accord.

```
Albert:...so we're gonna see how it works
          if if if after a few months I feel
          that now I don't have enough
```

```
                      information well we'll see what we
                      have to do okay?
          Claude: ça marche                 [lit. IT GOES; FINE]
          Bob:    I'd just like to finish
                  this off you know how I
                  like just to tell you the
                  space Claude's coming from
                  and that I tend to come from...
```

Bob and Albert then talk for a while about the different way things have been done in the past, and the implications of Albert's request for practical purposes for Claude and Bob. The discussion ends thus:

```
          Bob:    okay good but I think I'm
                  just not too sure if Claude
                  I got the complete message
                  clearly as I understand it
                  Albert will look for from
                  you in the hand-written form
                  the one you'll pass over
                  to him will have the break-
                  downs as opposed to your full
                  sheet going to him
          Claude: no I don't need to prepare
                  that because I already got it
          Bob:                         okay good
          Claude: I'm only summarizing
          Bob:    mm fine fini?           [FINISHED?]
          Claude: vendu                   [SOLD]
          (pause)
          Albert: do you see did you see
                  that? Gaz Naturel? increase
                  in price?
```

Again, code-switching serves to legitimate Bob's role, to allow him to play mediator. Bob's use of French here is more than situational: he is using code-switching to create a climate of negotiation. Following this episode, Bob continues to use French, but again only when the bulk of the conversation is in English.

110. Albert: oh Monday afternoon we have
                a meeting with Daniel Vincent
      Bob: what time is it?
      Albert: uh
      Claude: right signs
      Albert: douze heures signs   [TWELVE O'CLOCK...]
      Bob: quelle place?   [WHAT PLACE?]
      Albert: I think it's in my office

111. Albert: the work for the façade
                of uh Notre-Dame?   [nɔ tʀə daem]
      Bob: oui uh I've got the   [YES...]
                design

112. Albert: uh it's like passing the
                buck to somebody but uh
                (laughs) can you spend
                some time some time
                with Pierre (unint)
                Monday it could be a
                good thing
      Bob: avec plaisir   [WITH PLEASURE]
      Albert: it's not that I don't
                want to do it I'm still
                familiarizing myself
                with it I know it but
                I think you can give
                more details than I can
                okay
      Bob: okay avec plaisir   [WITH PLEASURE]
      Albert: and uh we got the ESR
                number and the FP cost
                centre things like that
      Bob: okay I'll do that uh I
                charge Anne rien but   [...NOTHING...
                spécial pour toi forty   SPECIAL FOR YOU...]
                five dollars an hour
                that's a special I'll
                let you know (unint) I
                have no time today but
                I'll make time next week

This use of French by Bob, again, is on one level a symbolic
gesture towards the Frenchness of the situation, and on the other a
statement of his position: it legitimates his presence and his
participation in the meeting. The same may be said of Albert's and
Claude's switching, in that it permits them to define the situation as

French. Albert must do this to legitimate his position: his promotion was, after all, due to the fact that he is francophone. Claude must accept Albert's promotion, just as Bob must, only more so, since Claude is francophone himself. Claude may never profit directly from francisation himself since he is too old for promotions, but he can, and does, use French to establish solidarity with and support for the new boss. It also gives him an advantage in meetings such as these, where he can almost monopolize the boss' ear. Also, Claude and Albert must simultaneously preserve face in front of Daniel, especially since Daniel's position, like Albert's, is a direct product of francisation (in fact more so, since Albert's predecessor transferred to Ontario -- a reflection of the economic underpinnings of francisation -- while Daniel's predecessor twice failed the Quebec government French test). They must also preserve face in front of Bob, whom they genuinely like and respect, and who has put himself in a relatively vulnerable position. Albert's and Claude's switching is therefore a reflection of the tension between the necessity of using French to symbolically define the situation as French, and to use English to (a) not alienate Bob and (b) preserve Claude's face, given that he is unable to write his reports in French.

Between themselves, Claude and Albert use a fair number of English loanwords. <u>Right</u> as a phatic response is used regularly:

113. Albert:...pour que la semaine   [SO THAT NEXT WEEK
             prochaine y a pas   THERE'S NO OVER-
             d'overtime   TIME]
     Claude: right ça a tout été   [RIGHT THAT WAS ALL
             discuté lundi matin..   DISCUSSED MONDAY
                                             MORNING]

```
114. Claude: i a deux fois plus à        [HE HAS TWICE AS MUCH
             faire que les autres         TO DO AS THE OTHERS]
      Albert: right si i a fait ces       [RIGHT IF HE'S DONE
             deux                         THESE TWO]


115. Claude: okay c'est celui-là que     [OKAY IT'S THAT ONE
             j'attends l'autre parce       I'M WAITING FOR THE
             que ça prend le US tout       OTHER BECAUSE IT TAKES
             de celui-là                   THE WHOLE US OF THAT
                                          ONE]
      Albert: right ça c'est Québec       [RIGHT THAT IT'S QUEBEC
             ça mais US on l'aura pas      THAT ONE BUT US WE
             non plus...                   WON'T HAVE THAT EITHER]
```

Most of the other loanwords are technical or semi-technical terms, some of which vary within and across utterances.

— Claude: après ça c'est les bailings [AFTER THAT IT'S THE BAILINGS];

— Claude: il faut qu'il mette ça à l'ordinateur [HE HAS TO PUT THAT ON COMPUTER];

— Claude: c'était pas le rapport du computer [IT WASN'T THE COMPUTER REPORT];

— Albert: mais le hardware la quincaillerie [THE HARDWARE];

— Albert: les slurry pompes [THE SLURRY PUMPS];

— Albert: sauve des thermostats heaters uh contrôles de chauffage [THERMOSTATS];

— Albert: ça a pas été shippé [IT WASN'T SHIPPED].

It is interesting that Albert, more than Claude, tends to correct himself in mid-phrase to substitute a French term for an English one. However, Claude and Albert generally use the same terms, especially in heated discussion:

```
— Claude: cinquante pour cent de      [FIFTY PERCENT OF
          notre ouvrage c'est est      OUR WORK IT'S IS ON
          sur changer des filters      CHANGING FILTERS]
```

Albert: des filters mais   [FILTERS BUT]

(But: Albert (elsewhere):   les gars changent les filtres [THE GUYS CHANGE THE FILTERS]).

— Claude: non on a des pompes de   [NO WE HAVE SPARE
         spare là-dessus   PUMPS ON IT]
  Albert: pour les pompes c'est de   [FOR THE SPARE
         spare   PUMPS]

— Claude: c'est dans le switch-room   [IT'S IN SWITCH
         numéro cinq   ROOM NUMBER FIVE]
  Albert: dans le switch-room   [IN THE ELECTRICAL
         électrique   SWITCH-ROOM]

Daniel also varies in his usage:

— Daniel: le système de <u>haut-parleurs</u> [THE LOUDSPEAKER SYSTEM
         dont vous parlez là c'est   YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT
         le système que le télé-   THERE IT'S THE SYSTEM
         phone on signale mettons   THAT THE TELEPHONE YOU
         cinq pis on parle sur le   YOU DIAL SAY FIVE AND
         <u>loudspeaker</u>   YOU TALK ON THE
                                     LOUDSPEAKER]

Again, terminology appears to be socially significant, and Albert and Daniel are both seemingly more sensitive to that significance than is Claude, probably as part of the overall legitimation of their rise. As far as other forms go, Albert and Claude differ in some respects but not in others. Claude tends to use more general loanwirds than does Albert (<u>settler, cheap, breakdown, anyway, typer</u>). Claude uses:

1) <u>epenthetic</u> [t]: j'ai discuté de'<u>t</u> ça à Huguette [I TALKED TO HUGUETTE ABOUT THAT]; moi je suis <u>t</u> arrivé [ME I ARRIVED];

2) [tUt] and [twe]: à toutes les [twe] fois [EVERY TIME]; à tous les [twez] ans [EVERY YEAR]; ça prend le US tout [tUt] de celui-là [IT TAKES THE WHOLE US OF THAT ONE];

3) aspirated [h]: y a une porte qui va dehors [dǝhɔʁ] [THERE'S A DOOR THAT GOES OUTSIDE];

4) velarized [s]: c'était supposé [xypoze] éliminer les problèmes de la brasserie mais ils sont pas tous [tUt] éliminés [IT WAS SUPPOSED TO ELIMINATE ALL THE PROBLEMS OF THE BREWERY BUT THEY HAVEN'T ALL BEEN ELIMINATED];

5) kossé: les breakdowns là tout kossé que te dire réellement [THE BREAKDOWNS THERE ALL WHAT THAT THERE IS TO TELL YOU REALLY]; i voulait avoir plus que kossé que moi je pensais de faire avec ça [HE WANTED TO HAVE MORE THAT WHAT THAT I WAS THINKING TO DO WITH THAT];

6) qu'est-ce que/ce que: qu'est-ce qu'on a fait avec le Lawn tu sais c'est le plus cheap à quinze piasses [WHAT WE DID WITH THE LAWN YOU KNOW IT'S THE CHEAPEST AT FIFTEEN DOLLARS]; ça c'est ce qu'on a de majeur ça [THAT'S WHAT WE HAVE THAT'S MAJOR];

7) a ma/ je vas future: a ma travailler sur le budget la semaine prochaine [I'M GOING TO WORK ON THE BUDGET NEXT WEEK]; je vas le régler [I'LL SETTLE IT];

Albert and Claude share the use of the following variable features:

1) [fe]/[fɛt]: (Albert) vous avez fait [fe] ça en fin de semaine? [YOU DID THAT OVER THE WEEKEND?]; mais comment ça se fait [fe] que c'est pas fait [fɛt]? [BUT HOW IS IT THAT IT'S NOT DONE?]; (Claude) c'est lui qui a fait [fɛt] le follow-up [IT WAS HIM WHO DID THE FOLLOW-UP]; a fait [fe]/[fɛt] pétaque [BROKE DOWN]; and a hypercorrection: (Claude) la peinture... avait pas été bien fait [fe] (should be [fɛt], feminine).

2) Q-forms: (Albert) comprends-tu? [DO YOU UNDERSTAND?]; c'est-tu un quatre mois? [IS HE A FOUR MONTH?]; combien est-ce qu'y en a? [HOW MANY ARE THERE?]; (Claude) sur la couverture de la filtration de vingt-cinq mille? [ON THE COVER OF THE FILTRATION OF TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND?]

3) complementizer + que: (Albert) comment qu'on trouve les [HOW DO WE FIND THE]; quand qu'on va démolir ici [WHEN WE DEMOLISH HERE]; (Claude) quand qu'ils lavent le plancher [WHEN THEY WASH THE FLOORS].

Albert and Claude also use fait que, rien que and elide [l]. Albert variably uses [tu] and [tUt]:

— on commence à tout [tUt] couvrir tout [tu] le monde [WE START TO COMPLETELY COVER EVERYONE]; and a possible hypercorrection: toutes [tu] les activités vraiment [ALL THE ACTIVITIES REALLY; should be feminine [tut] or [tUt]].

Albert always uses ce que: qu'ils fassent tout ce qu'ils peuvent faire [LET THEM DO EVERYTHING THEY CAN]; alors uh l'enveloppe c'est tout ce qu'on a [SO UH THE CASE IS ALL WE HAVE]; ce que j'ai vu de réfection [WHAT I'VE SEEN OF REPAIRS]; tu sais pas ce que tu vas faire [YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT YOU'RE GOING TO DO]; faut que ce soit clairement idenitifiable ce que j'ai besoin de rapporter là [IT MUST BE CLEARLY IDENTIFIABLE THAT WHICH I NEED TO REPORT THERE]; and a levelling, or analogy: tu commences par faire une liste de ce que t'as besoin [YOU START BY MAKING A LIST OF THAT WHICH YOU NEED; EF ce dont t'as besoin, THAT OF WHICH YOU HAVE NEED].

On the whole, then, Albert is using many QF forms in what is traditionally considered a formal setting, and in which he does make such gestures towards formality as his initial use of vous and title + last name with Claude. However, the establishment of solidarity seems to be the dominating force, a need which seems particularly pressing especially when one considers Albert's lack of seniority both in terms of age and in terms of experience. Added to that, of course, is the issue of ethnic relations.

The whole meeting seems to be a parable of francisation, both in the way in which the participants gained access to the meeting, and in what happens during the meeting. It is revealing that Albert and Claude can talk and joke either with Bob or with Daniel, but all four cannot seem to get together to discuss anything, whether serious or light-hearted. This is a historically transitional situation, and the patterns of language use in it reveal the strategies the participants

have developed to create equilibrium in the midst of change.

One other phenomenon of language choice should be mentioned here, even though the data come from interactions outside the brewery and do not involve brewery personnel. All the following examples fall into the category of stylistic uses of code-switching in intra-ethnic interaction, but are in fact only partial code-switches, since they borrow only either accent (phonology) or lexicon from the other language; that is, this code-switching involves speaking English with a French accent or speaking French with an English accent.

The first instance occurred in a French conversation between me and an ex-academic administrator at l'Office de la Langue Française for whom I had worked in the past and who knew me quite well. We were chatting about various things, both personal and work-related, and began talking about a paper he was going to present at a conference and how he was having a hard time writing it. After talking about this for a while in French, he said, with an English accent: "C'est très très difficile [sej t̪ej t̪ej difisij∧l]" [IT'S VERY VERY DIFFICULT]. In my first persona as an anglophone I found this somewhat upsetting, and yet couldn't believe that, after years of acquaintance, he would suddenly start making fun of me. Upon further reflection it occurred to me that perhaps he was treating me as a member of his in-group, and was using this strategy partly to emphasize his point, and partly to distance himself from his role as an academic, that is, to show that he wasn't taking the whole thing too seriously.

The second instance concerns a member of my family who categorizes himself as anglophone, and who uses expressions such as "il faut manger" [YOU HAVE TO EAT] with an English accent [il fow mandʒej]. Another family member uses English expressions with a French accent.

The point is that these partial switches are a way of speaking in the voice of the other, and of making fun of oneself, both of which serve as role-distancing. However, at the same time, that strategy can only be successful if both speaker and interlocutor share the same definition of who the "other" is, and so this strategy simultaneously establishes shared membership in a group, which is the basis for shared assumptions about many other things and for the definition of a certain role relationship between participants.

5.2 Conclusion

The situations described in this chapter reveal something basic about the francisation of industry: while the situations themselves haven't changed (there have been coffee breaks, department meetings, foremen's booths, dispatchers and so on at least since the period following the Second World War), the kinds of people who have access to those situations have changed, as the criteria of access have also changed.

As a result the old conventions of behaviour can no longer apply to what have become, in essence, situations of a new type. So that even if the activity remains unchanged, conventions of behaviour regarding

participation in the activity are intimately related to the ethnolinguistic identity of the participants and to the role relations between them.

This chapter has brought the effects of large-scale processes down to the level of verbal behaviour in face-to-face interaction. The patterns that emerge can be seen to fall into the matrix described at the beginning of the chapter. They will therefore be described cell-by-cell.

	Intra-ethnic	Interethnic
QF/EF	* French: self- * correction; * correction; * overt stratifica- * tion of lexicon; * covert significance * of non-lexical * features	* Marginals: * correction
Eng/Fr	* Metaphorical * switches (usually * formulas and * routines)	* Situational and * metaphorical * switches; * ambiguity

In intra-ethnic interaction among francophones several patterns emerge:

1) The use of English as an expressive device, largely through formulaic expressions, and routines of opening and closing and phatic responses. Here code-switching itself, as an act, seems to serve as a strategy for conveying emphasis, finality, or any other form of verbal quotation marks, capital letters or underlining. Use of the other language

conveys a message of solidarity with another in-group member. This message is entailed by the success of the discourse strategy which is based on shared knowledge of the interlocutors' similar relationships to speakers of the language of the other group. Simultaneously, it mutually reinforces prestige by conferring reciprocal bilingualism (a good thing in a world where English is necessary to advancement). The final message that code-switching in an intra-ethnic situation can convey is a distancing of the speaker from his or her utterance, or, more generally, from the role which restricts how he or she may speak. This latter is also a principal message in partial code-switching, i.e. the borrowing of only one set of features of the other language. This can only be carried off in intra-ethnic interaction since it is predicated upon a shared interpretation of the device being the voice of the "other". Conversely, to do so indicates an assumption on the part of the speaker that the interlocutor is indeed a member of his or her own group, otherwise the interpretation would either be impossible or an indication of hostility.

It appears that this borrowing pattern, with the exception perhaps of partial switching and closure routines, is declining (if one uses age as apparent time), indicating perhaps the decreasing contact with and importance of English and anglophones in everyday life.

2) The predominant use of Quebec French in all situations described (by francophones of all ages, hierarchical statuses and both sexes).

a) While some forms (notably fait que, pis and elided [1]) are almost

categorical (Michel is the only one with a high rate of variation for everything but _pis_), other forms are more variable. The two most variable features are ce que/qu'est-ce que/qu'osque and question-forms. In each case some kind of prestige stratification seems to be going on. For ce que it is clear that the EF ce que form is used almost categorically by Michel and Albert, and favoured by some of the young upwardly mobile francophones who take explicit interest in the quality of language (such as Denis). For Michel and Linda stratification corresponds to style-shifting: Michel uses the QF form when talking to the sales representatives, and Linda uses it when talking to me or to the engineering apprentice. Qu'osque occurs rarely, generally in the speech of older francophones. For everyone else ce que and qu'est-ce que vary. For question forms, it is notable that, again, est-ce que and -tu seem stratified in much the same way as ce que and qu'est-ce que, e.g., with respect to Linda's style-shifting, and the absence of the QF form in Michel's speech. However, the third variant, inversion, seems to be used very rarely. Again, for people like Denis and Jimmy, variation between the two commonly used forms seems unstratified. Thus certain QF forms seem to have been covertly "de-stigmatized" and are varying with the EF forms one might otherwise have expected in daily usage. Other forms are acquiring some form of social value, in the form of an appropriateness rating, and are stratified not only socially in that they are used less often by the young, upwardly mobile and educated francophones than they are by, say, older foremen, but also in the usage of those young francophones, so that they are considered appropriate for informal face-to-face conversation, but not for formal or official occasions.

b) A stratification of lexical items, notably of technical terms, many of which have QF variants that are in fact English loanwords, so that the code repertoire boundaries become fuzzy at this point. Here the stratification again corresponds to careful vs. informal speech, but only among francophones who are explicitly concerned with the quality of the French language, that is, most young francophones from the level of foreman up.

c) explicit correction of one francophone by another (always accepted, or at least never rejected), usually of technical terms, but occasionally also of morphology (e.g. substituting "correct" irregular forms for regularized forms) and syntax (mainly substituting French noun + adjective word order for calques on the English adjective + noun order). Also explicit discussion of appropriate terminology sometimes in the context of English-to-French translation efforts. This last forms a final pattern:

d) self-initiated translation efforts by young francophones at both foreman and management level, including secretaries.

The splitting in significance of QF features, in which some features show little social differentiation and others stratification is a product of an interest in certain aspects of language by upwardly mobile young francophones for whom language is a symbol and a tool of advancement; it is also ultimately the product of the entry of the French language into new domains. It is a covert aspect of a general re-evaluation and re-definition of Quebec French, the overt aspect of

which is seen in explicit corrections and discussions of lexical items.
One of the most important aspects of this upgrading of Quebec French is
its rejection of any form of English influence on French. More
importantly, however, the process of upgrading can be seen as a part of
a process of social mobilization and advancement, in which the symbolic
and real aspects of power concentrated in the hands of the language
brokers is hard to disentangle. Rather, both aspects seem to derive
from the role these people play in defining social reality through the
definition of appropriate conventions of verbal behaviour.

In intra-ethnic interaction among anglophones the following pattern
emerges:

1) an increase (from zero, by all accounts) in the use of French
formulaic expressions, especially phatic responses and routines of
opening and closing by all anglophones who have decided to stay in or
come to Quebec, and who therefore have a stake in participation in
francisized work situations (these are, at Harper's, mainly supervisors
newly outnumbered and outranked by francophones, and marginal
anglophones). Again, as with the same phenomenon among francophones,
this appears to be move towards both in-group solidarity and in-group
strength, the meaning of which is based on a shared understanding of the
contact situation. This understanding is based on the recognition of
the power of French and of the anglophones' new need to demonstrate
their ability to speak French, while not relinquishing their identity as
anglophones (reflected in their continued use of English for the
substance of the conversation, and based in the continued importance of

English in national and international affairs). This is, of course, intermixed with the generally limited knowledge of French that most anglophones have, which is the reverse of the same coin, but it is nonetheless also true of even the most bilingual marginals when no francophones are present. The kind of French the anglophones use (in intra-ethnic and interethnic interaction) is generally a reflection of where they learned it (i.e. in school and/or on the job), but tends towards the EF end of the scale for older anglophones of higher rank (who were not really exposed to daily interactions in French until recently) and towards the QF end for younger ones and those of lower rank (whose exposure to French may have begun in their neighbourhoods in childhood, or at least on the job). Still, people like Charles, who is probably the most marginal of the lot, while speaking QF nonetheless manifest the same concern regarding the quality of the language as do his francophone colleagues.

Among the anglophones, then, there appears to be an increased awareness of the French presence and of the subsequent change in the status of anglophones in the workplace. Nonetheless, a real tension is present between the need to speak French and the need to retain English identity. This tension is the obverse of the tension formerly (and to some extent still) felt by francophones. Both groups have resolved the conflict in the same way: through the use of borrowed formulas and routines, which are easily acquired, and convey the appropriate symbolic message without entailing any real changes in one's beliefs and behaviour.

In interethnic interaction the following patterns emerge:

1) a pattern of situational code-switching in which English is used primarily by francophones to talk to older anglophones who, whether or not they attempt to speak French, are (due to their age) considered exempt from new expectations that everyone at work should speak French. This separation breaks down in the following circumstances:

.

2) metaphorical switching by anglophones, who use French formulas to symbolically refer to the Frenchness of the situation, which then leaves them free to speak in English for the rest of the interaction;

3) the same kind of switching by francophones in mixed groups, where French is used to open and close the group interaction, thus defining it as French, and enabling participants to use English during the course of the interaction without losing face;

4) with marginal anglophones, whose ambiguous status makes language choice difficult in interactions in which they are involved. Thus marginals are sometimes spoken to and sometimes speak French and sometimes English, sometimes their usage is corrected (in much the same way that francophones correct each other, or else to encourage them to use French rather than English) and sometimes their usage is remarked upon as almost too native-like. They call into question the ethnic definition of the situations in which they participate, and this is revealed in the ambiguity of meaning attached to language use in those situations.

The consequences of these patterns for both participation and impression formation are evident. Strategies such as code-switching permit participation, but on a very restricted basis, a basis, furthermore, controlled by francophones. Categorical language choice (for people like Jack, for instance) entails lack of access to activities altogether. For QF/EF code choice, the consequences for participation have most to do with francophone access to important tasks, such as translation, which an impact on the individual's chances at positions of power and control.

With respect to impressions, categorical language choice generates a rigid categorization of people as members of mutually exclusive groups. An anglophone who speaks only English is a "tête dure" to francophones, and a potential hero of the cause to other anglophones. An anglophone who speaks only French is a sell-out to other anglophones, and "normal", a flexible and realistic person, to francophones. A francophone who speaks only French is "normal" to other francophones, and "péquiste" to anglophones. A francophone who speaks only English is a "vendu" to francophones, and normal to anglophones.

European French spoken by francophones is judged as "snobbish" by other francophones; on the other hand, exclusive use of QF (especially with English loans) is stigmatized. Quebec French spoken by anglophones causes them to be judged as "assimilé"; on the other hand, although francophones appreciate the use of French by anglophones, many of them switch to English when they hear European French spoken, since most of the people in Quebec who speak European French are, in fact,

anglophones.

Thus categorical language choice, whatever the actual choice, causes classification into mutually exclusive groups, and entails certain expectations of behaviour, which, at the very least, is assumed will be different from that of the evaluator. While code-switching does not necessarily do away with these categories, it at least limits the extent of their impact on possibilities of interaction.

Thus, on the frontier of change, in management and especially with marginals, but also with people like Bob MacDonald who need French to work, language choice is problematic, and ambiguous between political/social and discourse/ stylistic meanings. It is not clear to what extent code-switching for disambiguation is even used in intra-ethnic interaction, thus the potential for social interpretation in interethnic interaction may be that much higher. That ambiguity, however, resolves the conflict underlying interethnic interaction, a conflict produced not only by the struggle for power between ethnic groups, but by a contradiction inherent in having to speak English and French at literally the same time in order to accomplish work. Since the meanings of categorical choice of English and French are contradictory, code-switching provides the ambiguity necessary for the suppression of that conflict in the interests of immediate goals.

Finally, at the same time as conventions of behaviour in interethnic interaction are being re-defined, the conventions of behaviour in intra-ethnic interaction are also changing. Through verbal

interaction the meaning of language use is being altered, so that the social value of languages and of linguistic features is redefined as part of the overall process of social change affecting daily life at Harper's.

In the following chapter I will reverse the top-down direction which the analysis has so far taken in order to interpret these categories of communicative behaviour in their social context. Given the (albeit limited) information about former conventions that we have, either from reported usage or from comparing the behaviour of older people to that of younger ones, we can trace the direction of change in conventions of behaviour, and thereby arrive at an understanding not only of the direction of change (with all the implications that has for ethnic relations) but also of its mechanism.

Notes

1. For example, the following is a conversation between me and the middle-aged francophone personnel officer in charge of benefits. Mme. Grégoire has worked at Harper's for over twenty-five years.

Monica:	bonjour Mme. Grégoire comment allez-vous?	[HELLO...HOW ARE YOU?]
Mme. G.:	très bien merci et vous?	[VERY WELL THANK YOU AND YOU?]
Monica:	très bien merci	[VERY WELL THANK YOU]
Mme. G.:	good	
Monica:	bonjour	[GOODBYE]
Mme. G.:	bonjour	[GOODBYE]

2. For a more detailed discussion of the conventionalization of the "bling" greeting formula as a way of avoiding unwanted political interpretations of language choice, or as a way of showing deference to one's interlocutor by allowing him or her to choose the language of the interaction, especially in anonymous service encounters, see Heller (1982).

3. This enlistment is both formal, in that he asks his colleagues (especially Paul) to help with certain specific translation tasks, and informal, in that he will just call out for help with a term or phrase, e.g.:

Gilles:	un expériment eh un expériment pour une expérience pour dire c'est quoi experimenta-tion?	[AN EXPERIMENT HEY AN EXPERIMENT FOR AN EXPERIMENT TO SAY WHAT IS IT EXPERIMENT-ATION [ɛkspeɹimɛntejʃʌn]]
Hélène:	je pense c'est exper-iment hein Pierre ça pourra venir ça pourra dire si tu le dis dans le sens pour une expér-ience	[I THINK IT'S EXPER-IMENT [ɛkspeɹimɛn] EH PIERRE THAT CAN GO THAT CAN SAY IF YOU SAY IT IN THE SENSE FOR AN EXPER-IMENT]
Gilles:	de laboratoire	[OF A LABORATORY]
Hélène:	oui mais pour an experimentation	[YES BUT FOR...]
Gilles:	(unint) expérience	[EXPERIMENT]
Hélène:	expérience	[EXPERIMENT]

Part of the problem here is the existence of English experiment and experimentation, and French expérience, which translates both English

<u>experiment</u> and <u>experience</u>.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

The aim of this study has been to show that language use not only reflects the impact of large-scale social, economic and political processes on everyday life, but also serves to redefine social roles and social organization in the light of changes brought about by those large-scale processes. As a result, social situations take on new meaning, and so do the linguistic forms symbolic of them.

The ways in which these processes work can be clearly revealed in a multilingual community such as Montreal, where language is a symbol of ethnic identity, and language choice is a symbol of ethnic relations as well as a means of communication. Class divisions within each ethno-linguistic community further produce variation internal to each language, with concomitant social and stylistic significance attached to the use of variables in given kinds of situations. When social organization involving both ethnic and class divisions changes, as it is doing in Montreal, the pattern of language choice and code choice -- and the significance of those choices -- also necessarily change.

This study has been about those changes and how they affect each other; or, more precisely, it has up to now been about the way underlying social, economic and political changes affect the organization and meaning of everyday life in an institution which was

chosen precisely because it was in the centre of change. Further, it has been about the way people use language as a strategy to accomplish social ends. It is therefore time to interpret these changing patterns of language use in the light of their historical and ethnographic context, and to determine in what way this interpretation sheds light on the future development of ethnic relations, and therefore of social change, in Quebec.

At Harper's, changes in the criteria of access to work situations are part of changes in the relationship between ethnic groups in the wider community. Changes in life chances for members of these groups are reflected in changes in conventions of social interaction. As an example, the patterns of code choice in everyday interaction reveal a process of negotiation of ethnic identity, both in terms of inter-group relations and in terms of social roles and behaviour within groups. What we have witnessed here is the process of negotiating the meaning of ethnicity for Montrealers, a process which also applies to most forms of social organization undergoing change.

To begin with intra-ethnic interaction, it seems evident that both francophone and anglophone groups are working on a new image of themselves as they struggle to retain or acquire access to key situations, to positions of power and control. The new image is a reflection of what it is considered necessary for an individual to be able to do, of how it is necessary to act, in order to be judged as a legitimate participant in such key situations as, for example, business decision-making. It is also a reflection of the extent to which

individuals are to be judged as members of the in-group or as members of the out-group. For the francophones, preoccupation with the lexicon and expanded use of Quebec French indicate a process of legitimation of the use of some form of Quebec French in the business world. The lexicon, especially technical terminology, is important just because it is symbolic of past English dominance in industry and business, a dominance which was responsible for their power and prestige in society at large. The francisation of the lexicon is therefore a measure of francophone control over this social domain. It is equally important that this translates into increased status, and in some cases increased power, for individual francophones in their daily lives. This concern for the quality of language is partly an index of their ability to use language as a means of gaining control of their work experience. For foremen, the concern for language, as a reflection of their image of themselves as being in control, is an important means of differentiating their status from that of the workers. For office workers, concern for language is part of an opportunity to create, translate and modify important documents. This concern is a means of accruing power and status: francophones who manifest it are investing heavily in the upgrading of the social value of tne French language and therefore of francophone identity. They thereby become core members of the group, because they are doing the work of redefining the social value of being French.

It is also important that the linguistic objects of upgrading are chosen and re-evaluated through interaction, and that it is through the conversational process that the new conventions of verbal behaviour are

worked out. These objects are chosen mainly in reaction against English influence (and it is mainly the lexicon that reflects that influence), and partly also in reaction against European French. It is Quebec French that is the only legitimate symbol of the new francophone power since it is not only a reaction against English but also against the former class stratification which the francophones have overcome. Nonetheless, its former stigmatization with respect to both English and European French has necessitated a redefinition of Quebec French. That redefinition is not only a matter of social necessity, but also a product of the entry of Quebec French speakers into new social domains where new social realities are encountered. The effect of higher and more widespread education has been in part to bridge the class gulf between low-status Québécois and the local élite. With that bridge, social mobility, the old diglossia is breaking down. The distinction is being redefined as a matter of in-group vs. out-group rather than of low vs. high status. At the same time, Quebec French itself is changing, due to the kinds of negotiating done at places such as Harper's by people who work on the language to make it a satisfactory tool for use in new and higher-status social domains, and who need a higher-prestige version of it as a symbol of their own advancement. This means a decline in the use of both English (and English loans and calques) and European French.

Just the same, within both groups the "other" language is used for discourse and stylistic effects, for emphasis, closure, and a role-distancing that, because it is understood as being based on a notion of "us versus them", is also an index of in-group solidarity.

The fact that these switches are conversationally successful (indeed interpretable) only within groups is a measure of the distance still remaining between the French and the English. Among anglophones, the appearance and expansion of use of all sorts of French routines and formulas are revealing of the redefinition of anglophone identity in an increasingly francophone world. As a symbolic gesture towards the Frenchness of a given situation, and simultaneously a statement of one's own ability to function in it, the use of these routines and formulas permits anglophones to resolve the potential conflict between English identity and the French fact, between the necessity of speaking French while not abdicating membership in one's own group (and/or while not being able to speak French fluently). There is no perceptible advantage, in fact, for the English in passing: English continues to be necessary at the top, it is the language of continent-wide mobility, it still brings more advantages than disadvantages, especially when one considers the difficulty (both emotional and material) of passing, of giving up English identity. It is also important that the people working on defining their new minority status are people who have chosen to stay in Quebec and marginals from outside of Quebec who have less of an emotional and material stake in local affairs and struggles. The use of French for all these people legitimates their presence and their participation in the world of work. Their continued use of English at the same time (and their continued participation in exclusively English networks outside of strictly work-related situations) preserves their English identity and the continued advantage for mobility and good relations with those outside Quebec that this identity brings.

The same is true of code-switching in interethnic interaction. For francophones, the use of French is necessary at work, since it is French that is legitimating their rapid rise. It is also necessary for anglophones, since the new power of francophones enables them to control the situation through their language, and if anglophones want to legitimately participate, they must speak French. But anglophones, as we have seen, do not necessarily want to give up English, nor are they always able to carry on a fluent conversation in French. Not only that, but francophones at the top must be able to speak English. Thus English is necessary for the saving of face: categorical use of French would alienate anglophones, and would be counterproductive by preventing effective (and necessary) anglophone participation. Categorical choice of one language or another is therefore not the best solution for these mixed encounters where French and English roles are changing (i.e., at the management level). At lower levels, e.g., among the mechanics and other skilled workmen in maintenance, the solution is still the separation of anglophones and francophones, and concomitant situational switching on the part of bilingual intermediaries, the dispatchers. In the frontier situations of management code-switching not only provides points of entry into the conversation for anglophones who would otherwise find it difficult to participate, but also creates an ambiguity of context in which it is not clear whether social or discourse significance pertains to the switch, and therefore both are appropriate and one can pay attention to whichever one one chooses, or both, or neither. It enables participants to get work done by allowing two contradictory things to be said at once, namely that the situation is French but one can still speak English. Code-switching neutralizes

the tension produced by underlying conflict through the creation of ambiguity.

This ambiguity can, of course, create problems, especially for marginals like Henry who, being unsure of their own status, are unsure of which interpretation to pay attention to, but expect that only one of the two is valid. Further, they expect categorical language choice, and therefore the social meaning of language choice dominates for them. In contrast, older native anglophones prefer code-switching, since that allows them to have it both ways at once (to be seen to speak French and keep speaking English). For Albert, Bob and Claude code-switching works because they are sure of their roles (even if conventions of behaviour have not quite all been worked out yet); for Henry, the social roles and ethnic identity are as yet unresolved, and until that is worked out communication will remain problematic. If one has to worry about what is meant by language choice and language switching, it is hard to pay attention to what is being said at the level of reference.

The problem also derives from the relationship of language choice to control over conversational turn-taking. It is quite clear that bilinguals (like Charles) have the advantage, both in everyday inter-action and in life chances, but the question of who gets to be bilingual has yet to be resolved. For francophones, the less English they speak at work the less likely they are to have that bilingual advantage which will make the difference at the top (and along the way to the top, in terms of access to translating tasks and English documentation), although many francophones can learn some English at university, and

Harper's still has the option of sending them to branches outside Quebec for training. Still, many francophones want to speak English at work, partly as a sign of respect to their anglophone colleagues (or as a part of a desire not to appear over-dominant), and partly to get a chance to practice and demonstrate English-language skills. Most anglophones, however, seem up to now to have had little opportunity (or desire) to learn French before entering the workplace, and, knowing they need to speak French to survive, find that the tendency of francophones to speak English to them is at best frustrating and at worst humiliating.

If we look at patterns of language use in their ethnographic context what we see is not a breakdown of ethnic boundaries, but rather their redefinition. The two groups have very separate networks which intersect only during work and at ever higher levels of management. The English network is getting smaller, due to lack of recruitment of new members, while that of the francophones is expanding. The English who are left are negotiating for access to situations now controlled by francophones, and that access is dependent upon the very creation of entry points by the francophones. The English see their advantage being served by retaining their English identity and by learning French, while the French are in a parallel position. The young and upwardly mobile French are clearly engaged in a process of legitimating French and making it an appropriate language of business (thus legitimating their presence there). The question that Harper's raises is one regarding the outcome of this process for equity of access to jobs in Quebec for francophones and non-francophones alike. It is clear that Harper's has tried to solve the problem by separating its branches: the Montreal

branch is becoming French, and the anglophones within that branch recognize that they must change their idea of what to expect from everyday life there if they expect to be able to continue to work there. The problem is that they have not found a way to hold on to their English identity and simultaneously master French to the point that they cease to be dependent upon others to create openings for them to take a turn in conversations. Nor has been solved the problem of conventions of evaluation for people of different backgrounds in the same situation; in order to acquire the kind of informal knowledge about French that you need to be fully at ease in situations like the lab coffee break, you need a kind of contact with the French that Montreal society by and large does not provide for anglophones. Nor, it would seem, is it able to provide such contact within the context of the preservation of ethnic boundaries which remains so important to francophones and non-francophones alike. It is possible that code-switching is the beginning of a new convention of interethnic interaction, but if so, then we have to look elsewhere besides Harper's for an idea as to what kinds of social institutions will continue to provide an arena for interethnic encounters.

Harper's shows the process of redefinition of old boundaries. From situations like the dispatcher's office, and from people like Jack, where English and French occupied separate spheres joined by a buffer group of French bilinguals, and where English dominated, the brewery has passed to a stage where the engineering department is a forum for the working out of the conditions of change, and where the labs show what the brewery will be like in a few years' time: a French social

institution where those who not only are bilingual but who are able to effectively use their own language and to influence the assignment of social value to it will dominate the key situations where decisions are made.

So the people at Harper's are accomplishing change, and are contributing to the new definition of what it means in this society to be French and to be English. Further, they are working out new criteria of access to positions of power and control based on knowledge of languages -- knowledge which is acquired as a result of ethnic group membership and social organization. While macro-level change has affected the organizational aspects of everyday life, it is face-to-face interaction which is giving the new order meaning and negotiating the new form that ethnicity is taking in Quebec.

Bibliography

Arnopoulos, S.
1982   Hors du Québec: Point de Salut?
            Montreal: Editions Libre Expression.

Ashby, W.
1976   "The Loss of the Negative Morpheme ne in
            Parisian French", Lingua 39: 119-137.

Barth, F.
1969   "Introduction", in: F. Barth (ed.), Ethnic
            Groups and Boundaries, Boston: Little,
            Brown and Co., pp. 9-38.

            "Pathan Identity and its Maintenance", in:
            F. Barth (ed.), Ethnic Groups and Boundaries,
            Boston: Little, Brown and Co., pp.117-134.

Béguin, L.-P.
1977   Un homme et son langage,
            Montreal: Editions de l'Aurore.

Bergeron, L.
1974   Petit manuel d'histoire du Québec,
            Montreal: Editions Québecoises.

Birdwhistell, R.
1972   "A Kinesic-Linguistic Exercise: The Cigarette
            Scene", in: J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.),
            Directions in Sociolinguistics: the Ethno-
            graphy of Communication, New York: Holt,
            Rinehart and Winston, pp.384-404.

Blom, J.-P. and J. Gumperz
1972   "Social Meaning in Linguistic Structures: Code-
            Switching in Norway", in: J. Gumperz and D. Hymes
            (eds.), Directions in Sociolinguistics: the
            Ethnography of Communication,
            New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp.407-434.

Boudreault, M.
1968   Rhythme et mélodie de la phrase parlée en
            France et au Québec, Québec:
            Les Presses de l'Unoversité Laval.

Bouthillier, G.
1981a   "Aux origines de la planification linguistique
             québécoise", in: A. Martin (ed.), L'Etat
             et la planification linguistique, vol. II,
             Québec: l'Editeur Officiel, pp.7-23.

1981b   "Eléments d'une chronologie politique de
             l'action linguistique du Québec pour la
             décennie 1960-1969, précédée d'un aperçu
             sur la période 1930-1960", in: A. Martin (ed.),
             L'Etat et la planification linguistique, vol.
             II, Quebec: l'Editeur Officiel, pp.24-42.

Bouthillier, G. and J. Meynaud
1972   Le choc des langues au Québec 1760-1960,
             Montreal: Les Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Brent, E.
1971   Canadian French: A Synthesis,
             Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation,
             Department of Linguistics, Cornell University.

Breton, R. and G. Grant
1981   La langue de travail au Québec, Montreal:
             The Institute for Research on Public Policy.

Brown, P. and S. Levinson
1978   "Universals in Language Use: Politeness Phenomena",
             in: E. Goody (ed.), Questions and Politeness:
             Strategies in Social Interaction, Cambridge:
             Cambridge University Press, pp. 56-324.

Brown, R. and A. Gilman
1960   "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity", in:
             T. Sebeok (ed.), Style in Language,
             Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, pp.253-276.

Castonguay, C.
1977   "Les transferts linguistiques au foyer",
             Recherches Sociographiques 18(3): 431-450.

Chafe, W.
1976   "Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness,
             Subjects, Topics and Points of View", in:
             C. Li (ed.), Subject and Topic,
             New York: Academic Press, pp.25-56.

Chantefort, P.
1976   "Diglossie au Québec: limites et tendances
actuelles", in: J.-C. Corbeil and L. Guilbert
(eds.), "La langue française au Québec",
Langue française 31: 91-104.

Charbonneau, R.
1957   "La spirantisation du j", Revue de l'Associ-
ation Canadienne de Linguistique 3.

Cicourel, A.
1982   "Language and Belief in a Medical Setting",
paper presented at the Thirty-Third Round
Table on Language and Linguistics,
Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

Clermont, J. and H. Cedergren
1979   "Les 'R' de ma mère sont perdus dans l'air",
in: P. Thibault (ed.), Le français parlé:
études sociolinguistiques,
Edmonton: Linguistic Research, pp.13-28.

Clift, D. and S. Arnopoulos
1979   Le fait anglais au Québec,
Montreal: Editions Libre Expression.

Colpron, G.
1970   Les anglicismes au Québec,
Montreal: Beauchemin.

Connors, K.
1972   Calquing in Canadian French,
Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation,
Department of Linguistics, University
of California, Berkeley.

Cook-Gumperz, J.
1981   "Communication, Language and Social Inequality
in Urban Life", paper presented at the 80th
Annual Conference of the American
Anthropological Association, Los Angeles.

Corbeil, J.-C.
1974   Notes sur le français québécois et le
français de France, Quebec: l'Editeur Officiel.

1976   "Origine historique de la situation linguistique québécoise", in: J.-C. Corbeil and L. Guilbert (eds.), "La langue française au Québec", Langue Française 31: 6-19.

Corbeil, J.-C. and L. Guilbert (eds.)
1976   "La langue française au Québec", Langue française 31.

d'Anglejan, A. and R. Tucker
1973   "Sociolinguistic correlates of speech style in Québec", in: R. Shuy and R.W. Fasold (eds.), Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, pp. 1-27.

Daoust-Blais, D.
1975   L'influence de la négation sur certains indéfinis en français québécois, Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Département de linguistique, Université de Montréal.

1979   "Corpus and Status Language Planning in Quebec: A Look at Linguistic Legislation", paper presented at the National Conference on Progress in Language Planning, William Paterson College, New Jersey.

Daoust-Blais, D. and M. Lemieux-Niéger
1979   "tUt en français du Québec", Cahier de linguistique 9, Montreal: Les Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Daoust-Blais, D. and A. Martin
1981   "La planification linguistique au Québec: aménagement du corpus linguistique et promotion du statut du français", in: A. Martin (ed.), L'Etat et la planification linguistique, vol. II, Quebec: l'Editeur Officiel, pp.43-70.

Darbelnet, J.
1976   Le français en contact avec l'anglais en Amérique du Nord, Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Debrie-Maury, N.
1968   "Les archiphonèmes I U Y en français canadien

et dans le parler normand", in: Léon, P. (ed.),
"Recherches sur la structure phonique du
français canadien", Studia phonetica 1,
Montreal: Didier, pp.210-233.

Deshaies, D., C. Martin and D. Noel
1982   "Régularisation at analogie dans le système
            verbal en français parlé dans la ville de
            Québec", in: D. Sankoff and H. Cedergren (eds.),
            Variation Omnibus, Edmonton:
            Linguistic Research, pp.411-418.

Dessureault-Dober, D.
1975   Ca fait que: marqueur d'interaction et
            coordonnant logique,
            unpublished M.A. thesis, Département de
            Linguistique, Université du Québec à
            Montréal.

DeVos, G. and L. Romanucci-Ross
1975   Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuities and Change,
            Palo Alto: Mayfield.

Dulong, G.
1966   Bibliographie linguistique du Canada français,
            Quebec: les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Dunn, O.
1880   Glossaire franco-canadien et vocabulaire de
            locutions vicieuses usitées au Canada,
            Quebec: A. Côté et Cie.

Erickson, F.
1976a   "Gate-Keeping Encounters: a Social Selection
            Process", in: P. Sanday, (ed.), Anthropology
            and the Public Interest, New York: Academic
            Press, pp.111-145.

1976b   "Talking Down and Giving Reasons: Hyper-explana-
            tion and Listening Behaviour in Inter-racial
            Interviews", paper presented at the International
            Conference on Non-Verbal Behaviour, Toronto,
            Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Ferguson, C.
1964   "Diglossia", in: D. Hymes, (ed.), Language
            in Culture and Society, New York: Harper

and Row, pp.429-439.

Fishman, J.A.
1967   "Bilingualism with and without diglossia;
            diglossia with and without bilingualism",
            Journal of Social Issues 23(2).

1972   "Domains and the Relationship between Micro-
            and Macro-Sociolinguistics", in: J. Gumperz
            and D. Hymes (eds.), Directions in Socio-
            linguistics: the Ethnography of Communication,
            New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp.435-453.

Friedrich, P.
1972   "Social Context and Semantic Feature: The
            Russian Pronominal Usage", in: J. Gumperz
            and D. Hymes (eds.), Directions in Socio-
            linguistics: the Ethnography of Communication,
            New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp.270-300.

Gal, S.
1979   Language Shift: Social Determinants of
            Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria,
            New York: Academic Press.

Gendron, J.-D.
1966   Tendances phonétiques du français parlé
            au Canada, Paris: Klincksieck.

1967   "Le phonétisme du français canadien du
            Québec face à l'adstrat anglo-américain",
            Etudes de linguistique franco-canadienne,
            pp.15-67.

1974   "La définition d'une norme de langue parlée
            au Québec: une approche sociologique",
            Revue de linguistique romane 38: 198-209.

Goffman, E.
1959   The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life,
            New York: Doubleday.

1964   Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled
            Identity, Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs,
            New Jersey.

1967   "On Face Work", in: E. Goffman, Interaction
            Ritual, New York: Anchor Books, pp.5-45.

1972 "The Neglected Situation", in: P.P. Giglioli (ed.),
Language and Social Context, Harmondsworth:
Penguin Books, Ltd., pp.61-66.

1974 Frame Analysis, New York: Harper and Row.

Govaert-Gauthier, S.
1979 "Attitudes de vingt-huit Montréalais sur
le français parlé au Québec", in:
P. Thibault (ed.), Le français parlé:
études sociolinguistiques, Edmonton:
Linguistic Research, pp.145-152.

Government of Canada
1968-1970 Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism
and Biculturalism,
Ottawa: The Queen's Printer.

Government of Quebec
1972 Rapport de la commission d'enquête sur
la situation de la langue française et sur
les droits linguistiques au Québec,
Quebec: l'Editeur Officiel.

1977 La charte de la langue française,
Quebec: l'Editeur Officiel.

Guilbert, L.
1976 "Problématique d'un dictionnaire du français
québécois", in: J.-C. Corbeil and L. Guilbert
(eds.), "La langue française au Québec",
Langue française 31: 40-54.

Guindon, H.
1978 "Modernization of Quebec and the Legitimacy of
the Canadian State", Canadian Review of
Sociology and Anthropology 15(2):227-245.

Guiraud, C.
1965 Le français populaire,
Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Gumperz, J.
1968 "Types of Linguistic Communities", in:
J. Fishman (ed.), Readings in the Sociology
of Language, The Hague: Mouton, pp.460-472.

1972   "The Speech Community",
          in: P. Giglioli, (ed.), Language in Social
          Context, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books,
          pp.381-386.

1977   "Sociocultural Knowledge in Conversational
          Inference", in: M. Saville-Troike (ed.),
          Linguistics and Anthropology, Washington, D.C.:
          Georgetown University Press, pp.191-211.

1978   "The Conversational Analysis of Interethnic
          Communication", in: L.E. Ross (ed.), Interethnic
          Communication, Athens, Ga.:
          Southern Anthropological Society Proceedings, no. 12.

Gumperz, J., G. Aulakh and H. Kaltman
1982   "Thematic Structure and Progression in Discourse",
          in: J. Gumperz and J. Cook-Gumperz (eds.),
          Language and Social Identity,
          Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. and C. Roberts
1978   Developing Awareness Skills for Interethnic
          Communication, Special Project Reports, Southall,
          Middlesex, National Centre for Industrial
          Language Training.

Gumperz, J. and J. Cook-Gumperz
1982   "Language and the Communication of Social
          Identity", in: J. Gumperz (ed.),
          Language and Social Identity,
          Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hechter, M.
n.d.   "The Cultural Division of Labor",
          m.s., University of Washington.

Heller, M.
1979   "How to Ask for Wiper Fluid in Montreal:
          Struggling with Car-Part Terminology in
          Québécois", in: Proceedings of the Fifth
          Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society,
          Berkeley, pp.567-580.

1982   "'Bonjour, hello?': Negotiations of Language
          Choice in Montreal", in: J. Gumperz and
          J. Cook-Gumperz (eds.), Language
          and Social Identity, Cambridge:
          Cambridge University Press.

Heller, M., J.-P. Bartholomot, L. Lévy and L. Ostiguy
1982 Le processus de francisation dans une entreprise
   montréalaise: une analyse sociolinguistique,
   Quebec: l"Editeur Officiel.

Hughes, E.
1943 French Canada in Transition,
   Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hull, A.
1966 "The Structure of the Canadian French Consonant
   System", La linguistique 1: 103-110.

Irvine, J.
1974 "Strategies of Status Manipulation in the
   Wolof Greeting", in: R. Bauman and J. Sherzer
   (eds.), Explorations in the Ethnography of
   Speaking, Cambridge: Cambridge University
   Press, pp.167-191.

Jefferson, G.
1973 "Error correction as an interactional resource",
   Language in Society 2: 181-199.

Joy, R.
1972 Languages in Conflict: The Canadian Experience,
   Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, Ltd.

Juneau, M.
1972 Contribution à l'histoire de la prononciation
   française au Québec, Québec: Les Presses
   de l'Université Laval.

Juneau, M. and G. Straka (eds.)
1975 Travaux de linguistique québécoise 1,
   Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Keenan, E.
1974 "Norm-makers and Norm-breakers: Uses of Speech
   by Men and Women in a Malagasy Community",
   in: R. Bauman and J. Sherzer (eds.),
   Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking,
   Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 125-143.

Kemp, W.

1979   "L'histoire récente de ce que, qu'est-ce
            que et qu'osque à Montréal: trois
            variantes en interaction", in: P. Thibault (ed.),
            Le français parlé: études sociolinguistiques,
            Edmonton: Linguistic Research, pp.53-74.

1982   "Major Sociolinguistic Patterns in Montreal French",
            in: D. Sankoff and H. Cedergren (eds.), Variation
            Omnibus, Edmonton: Linguistic Research, pp. 3-16.

Kempton, W.
1977   "The Rhythmic Basis of Interactional Micro-Synchrony",
            ms., Berkeley: Language Behavior Research Laboratory,
            University of California.

Keyfitz, N.
1960   "Some Demographic Aspects of French-English
            Relations", in: M. Wade (ed.), Canadian Dualism:
            Studies of French-English Relations, Toronto:
            University of Toronto Press, pp.129-148.

Labelle, G.
1976   "La langue des enfants de Montréal et de Paris",
            in: J.-C. Corbeil and L. Guilbert (eds.), "La langue
            française au Québec", Langue française 31: 55-73.

Laberge, S.
1977   Etude de la variation des pronoms sujets définis
            et indéfinis dans la français parlé à Montréal,
            Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Département
            d'anthropologie, Université de Montréal.

Laberge, S. and M. Chiasson-Lavoie
1971   "Attitudes face au français parlé à Montréal
            et degrés de conscience de variables linguistiques",
            in: R. Darnell (ed.), Linguistic Diversity in
            Canadian Society, Edmonton: Linguistic Research,
            pp.89-129.

Laberge, S. and G. Sankoff
1980   "Anything You Can Do",
            in: G. Sankoff, The Social Life of Language,
            Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania
            Press, pp.271-293.

Labov, W.
1966   The Social Stratification of English in New

York City, Washington, D.C.: Center for
Applied Linguistics.

1972   Sociolinguistic Patterns,
        Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lachapelle, R. and J. Henripin
1980   La situation démolinguistique au Canada,
        Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy.

Lambert, W.
1972a   "Evaluational Reactions to Spoken Language",
        in: W. Lambert, Language, Psychology and Culture,
        Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp.80-96.

1972b   "Psychological Approaches to the Study of Language",
        in: W. Lambert, Language, Psychology and Culture,
        Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp.160-196.

Lambert, W., R. Gardner, R. Olton and K. Tunstall
1972   "A Study of the Roles of Attitudes and Motivation
        in Second Language Learning", in: J. Fishman (ed.),
        Readings in the Sociology of Language,
        The Hague: Mouton, pp.473-491.

Lemieux-Niéger, M., L. Leblanc and S. Paquin
1982   "La variation dans l'emploi de /tu/ et de /tUt/
        dans le français parlé à Montréal", in:
        D. Sankoff and H. Cedergren (eds.), Variation
        Omnibus, Edmonton: Linguistic Research, pp.313-319.

Lennig, M.
1979   "Changement dans le système vocalique parisien",
        in: P. Thibault (ed.), Le français parlé:
        études sociolinguistiques, Edmonton: Linguistic
        Research, pp.29-39.

Léon, P. (ed.)
1968   "Recherches sur la structure phonique du français
        canadien", Studia phonetica 1, Montreal: Didier.

Léon, P., E. James and G. Sévigny
1968   "Observation sur une forme progressive en français
        canadien", in: P. Léon (ed.), "Recherches sur
        la structure phonique du français canadien",
        Studia phonetica 1, Montreal: Didier, pp.36-41.

Lieberson, S.
1972   "Bilingualism in Montreal: a Demographic Analysis",
            in: J. Fishman (ed.), Advances in the Sociology
            of Language, The Hague: Mouton, vol.II, pp.231-254.

MacLennan, H.
1945   Two Solitudes,
            New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce.

Macnamara, J.
1971   "Successes and Failures in the Movement for the
            Restoration of Irish", in: J. Rubin and B. Jernudd
            (eds.), Can Language Be Planned?: Sociolinguistic
            Theory and Practice for Developing Nations,
            University of Hawaii Press, pp.65-94.

Martin, A.
1980   "Diglossie, situation linguistique et politique
            linguistique: le cas du Québec"", in: B. Gardin,
            J.-B. Marcellesi et G.R.E.C.O. (eds.),
            Sociolinguistique: approches, théories, pratiques,
            Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

1981   (ed.) L'Etat et la planification linguistique,
            Québec: l'Editeur Officiel.

McNaught, K.
1969   The Pelican History of Canada,
            Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Moerman, M.
1965   "Ethnic Identification in a Complex Civilization:
            Who Are the Lue?", American Anthropologist 67:
            1215-1230.

Naroll, R.
1964   "On Ethnic Unit Classification",
            Current Anthropology, 5: 283-291.

Noel, D.
1979   "Que peut bien être la langue pour de jeunes
            adolescents?", in: P. Thibault (ed.),
            Le français parlé: études sociolinguistiques,
            Edmonton: Linguistic Research, pp.131-143.

Nyrop, K.

1930   Grammaire historique de la langue française,
            Vol. 6, Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel
            Nordisk Forlag.

Offroy, G.
1975   "Contribution à l'étude de la syntaxe québécoise",
            in: M. Juneau and G. Straka (eds.), Travaux de
            linguistique québécoise 1, Québec:
            Les Presses de l'Université Laval, pp.257-321.

Orkin, M.
1971   Speaking Canadian French,
            New York: David McKay.

Poirier, C.
1978   "L'anglicisme au Québec et l'heritage française",
            in: L. Boisvert, M. Juneau and C. Poirier (eds.),
            Travaux de linguistique québécoise 2,
            Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval,
            pp.43-106.

Polanyi, L.
1978   "False starts can be true",
            Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of
            the Berkeley Linguistics Society, Berkeley,
            pp. 628-639.

Porter, J.
1965   The Vertical Mosaic,
            Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Pupier, P. and L. Légaré
1973   "L'effacement de [l] dans les articles définis
            et les clitiques en français de Montréal",
            Glossa 7: 63-80.

Roy, J.
1877   "The French Language in Canada",
            The Canadian Illustrated News,
            Montreal, 16(17): 258.

Sacks, H., E. Schegloff and G. Jefferson
1974   "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of
            Turn-Taking in Conversation", Language 50: 696-735.

Sankoff, D. (ed.)
1978   Linguistic Variation: Models and Methods,
            New York: Academic Press.

Sankoff, D. and H. Cedergren (eds.)
1982   Variation Omnibus,
            Edmonton: Linguistic Research.

Sankoff, G.
1980   The Social Life of Language,
            Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Sankoff, G. and H. Cedergren
1976   "Les contraintes linguistiques et sociales de
            l'elision du L chez les Montréalais",
            in: M. Boudreault and F. Moehren (eds.),
            Actes du XIIIe Congrès International de
            Linguistique et de Philologie Romane, Québec:
            Les Presses de l'Université Laval, pp.1101-1116.

Sankoff, G. and P. Thibault
1980   "The Alternation Between the Auxiliaries avoir
            and être in Montreal French", in: G. Sankoff,
            The Social Life of Language, Philadelphia:
            University of Pennsylvania Press, pp.311-345.

Sankoff, G. and D. Vincent
1980   "The Productive Use of ne in Spoken Montreal
            French", in: G. Sankoff, The Social Life of Language,
            Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press,
            pp.295-310.

Santerre, L., D. Noiseux and L. Ostiguy
1978   "La chute du [l] dans les articles et les pronoms
            clitiques en français québécois", The Fourth
            LACUS Forum 1977, Columbia, S.C.: Hornbeam Press,
            pp.530-538.

Schegloff, E.
1972   "Sequencing in Conversational Openings",
            in: J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), Directions
            in Sociolinguistics: the Ethnography of
            Communication, New York: Holt, Rinehart and
            Winston, pp.346-380.

Schegloff, E., G. Jefferson and H. Sacks

1977 "The Preference for Self-Correction in the
    Organization of Repair in Conversation",
    Language 53: 361-382.

Schogt, H.
1968 "Une 'case vide': la phonologie diachronique du
    français canadien", in: P. Léon (ed.), "Recherches
    sur la structure du français canadien",
    Studia phonetica 1, Montreal: Didier, pp.1-8.

Société du parler français au Canada
1930 Glossaire du parler français au Canada,
    Quebec: Société du parler français au Canada.

Tannen, D.
1979 "What's in a Frame: Surface Evidence for Underlying
    Expectations", in: R. Freedle (ed.), New Directions in
    Discourse Processing, Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, pp.137-181.

Tardivel, A.
1880 L'Anglicisme, voilà l'ennemi!,
    Quebec: Le Canadien.

Taylor, D. and R. Clément
1974 "Normative Reactions to Styles of Quebec French",
    Anthropological Linguistics 16: 202-217.

Thibault, J.
1979 "L'expressivité comme source de changement
    linguistique", in: P. Thibault (ed.),
    Le français parlé: études sociolinguistiques,
    Edmonton: Linguistic Research, pp.95-110.

Thibault, P. (ed.)
1979 Le français parlé: études sociolinguistiques,
    Edmonton: Linguistic Research.

Tousignant, C. and D. Sankoff
1979 "Aspects de la compétence productive et receptive:
    la liaison à Montréal", in: P. Thibault (ed.),
    Le français parlé: études sociolinguistiques,
    Edmonton: Linguistic Research, pp.41-51.

Tremblay, M.
1972 Les belles-soeurs,

Montreal: Leméac.

Trudgill. P.
1972   "Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in the
           urban British English of Norwich", Language in
           Society 1: 179-195.

Valdes, G.
1981   "Code-switching as Deliberate Verbal Strategy: A
           Microanalysis of Direct and Indirect Requests among
           Bilingual Chicano Speakers", in: R. Duran (ed.),
           Latino Language and Communicative Behavior,
           Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, pp.95-107.

Vallières, P.
1969   Les nègres blancs d'Amérique,
           Paris: F. Maspero.

Van Ameringen, A. and H. Cedergren
1982   "Observation sur la liaison en français de Montréal",
           in: D. Sankoff and H. Cedergren (eds.), Variation
           Omnibus, Edmonton: Linguistic Research, pp.141-149.

Veltman, C.
1976   "Les incidences du revenu sur les transferts linguis-
           tiques dans la région métropolitaine de Montréal",
           Recherches Sociographiques 17(3): 323-339.

Wade, M.
1968   The French Canadians 1760-1967,
           London: MacMillan.

Weber, M.
1946   "Class, Status, Party", in: H.H. Gerth and
           C. Wright Mills (eds.), From Max Weber: Essays
           in Sociology, New York: Oxford University Press,
           pp.180-195.