The role of language in the popular discursive construction of belonging in
Quebec:
A corpus assisted discourse study of the Bouchard-Taylor Commission briefs

By
Rachelle C. Freake

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
In Partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

School of Linguistics and Language Studies
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

© Rachelle C. Freake, 2009

Library and
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-52013-0
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-52013-0

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

This corpus-assisted discourse study (CADS) investigates how identity is constructed in relation to language in Quebec popular discourse. Two corpora were compiled using 741 French and English briefs submitted to the Bouchard Taylor Commission on religious and cultural accommodation. These corpora were analysed using bottom-up corpus frequency, concordance, and keyword tools as well as the top-down Critical Discourse Analysis approach to the discursive construction of national identity (Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, & Liebhart, 1999). Collocation and cluster patterns reveal categories of reference that represent Quebec in terms of both civic and ethnocultural nationalism. The majority of participants construct their identity in relation with Quebec civic society, drawing on the “modernizing” French Canadian identity discourse (Heller, 2001). This discourse blends civic and ethnocultural elements, and emphasizes language as an identity pillar and a key sign of membership.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, Guillaume Gentil, whose support and guidance throughout the past year (indeed, longer!) have been instrumental in the progress of my thesis. I realize that this was largely a joint effort, and it is with much gratitude that I recognize the work we both invested in this project.

I would also like to thank a number of SLALS faculty members. I would like to thank Ellen Cray for her inspirational suggestions concerning language planning and policy in Canada. Also, thank you to Lynne Young, Natasha Artemeva, and Janna Fox for being thought-provoking professors, a huge support throughout my time at Carleton, and motivating role models.

I was most fortunate to fall into the capable hands of the SLALS department, and I would like to thank Devon Woods and Joan Grant for all of their help and support throughout the past two years. I would also like to recognize the generous support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada through the J. Armand Bombardier Canada Graduate Scholarship. I would also like to thank Carleton University for graduate funding and for the opportunity to be a teacher's assistant, which was an invaluable experience.

I am incredibly indebted to David Cooper, Lin Chen, and Kristine Gawne, members of the "Thesis Support Group," whose time and effort were invested in the bi-weekly editing and discussion of my thesis. I also would like to thank the representatives from the Applied Language Studies Graduate Student Association (ALSGSA), Kristine, David, and Tara, for all the continuous effort they put into organizing events over the past year.

Thank you to my supportive and encouraging friends who were always able to lend an ear, especially Ashley, Louise, Nelson, and Teri. Thank you to my roommates, who have seen the best and the worst of times. Thank you to my wonderful family, especially my mum, who spent hours upon hours proofreading chapters and listening to my woes. Finally, thank you to Lee, for keeping me grounded and for going above and beyond all the time.

Translations¹

<i>Accommodements:</i>	Accommodation
<i>Accueil:</i>	Host (<i>société d'accueil</i> : host society)
<i>Accueillante:</i>	Welcoming
<i>Allophone:</i>	An individual whose mother tongue is neither English nor French
<i>Anglais</i>	English
<i>Anglophone:</i>	An individual whose mother tongue is English
<i>Apprendre:</i>	To learn
<i>Apprentissage:</i>	Learning
<i>Avons:</i>	The verb <i>avoir</i> ("to have") conjugated with first person plural <i>nous</i> ("we")
<i>Charte:</i>	Charter
<i>Citoyen:</i>	Citizen
<i>Conseil:</i>	Council
<i>État:</i>	State
<i>Étranger:</i>	Foreigner
<i>Foi:</i>	Faith
<i>Français:</i>	French
<i>Francisation:</i>	The process of making individuals French-speaking
<i>Francophone:</i>	An individual whose mother tongue is French
<i>Francophonie:</i>	An international organization of French-speakers
<i>Identité:</i>	Identity
<i>Immigrants:</i>	Immigrants
<i>Laïque:</i>	Secular
<i>Langue:</i>	Language
<i>Leur:</i>	Their
<i>Nos:</i>	Our (plural form)
<i>Notre:</i>	Our (singular form)
<i>Nous:</i>	We/Us
<i>Ouvert:</i>	Open
<i>Pays:</i>	Country
<i>Plurielle:</i>	Plural/pluralist
<i>Québec:</i>	Quebec
<i>Québécois(e):</i>	Quebecois or Quebecker (see Appendix VI)
<i>Québécois de souche:</i>	"Old stock" Quebecois
<i>Québécois pure laine:</i>	"Pure wool" Quebecois
<i>Révolution tranquille:</i>	Quiet Revolution
<i>Société:</i>	Society
<i>Société d'accueil:</i>	Host society
<i>Sommes:</i>	The verb <i>être</i> ("to be") conjugated with first person plural <i>nous</i> ("we")

¹ These are my own translations of important words for the purpose of this thesis only.

Glossary²

Anglophone:	An individual whose mother tongue is English .
Cluster:	WordSmith, by default, considers “clusters” three words that frequently cluster together in the same form and order.
Collocate:	According to WordSmith, by default: words that occur within five words to the left or the right of a search term.
Concordance:	A concordance is a search term presented in its “co-text,” or the context of words in which it originally occurs, which is usually a few words to the left and right of the search term.
Concordance line:	A specific sample taken from a concordance list, where a search term is presented within its original “co-text”.
Corpus:	A body of electronically-stored, naturally occurring texts.
EnglishBT corpus:	A specialized corpus of English briefs submitted to the Bouchard Taylor Commission.
Discourse prosody:	Repeated collocates that suggest a speaker’s or writer’s attitude towards the topic, or even a discourse.
Francophone:	An individual whose mother tongue is French
Francophonie:	An international organization of French-speakers
FrenchBT corpus:	A specialized corpus of French briefs submitted to the Bouchard Taylor Commission.
French comparator corpus:	A corpus compiled for comparison with the FrenchBT corpus (in place of a reference corpus)
Grammatical word (or function word)	Pronouns, determiners, conjunctions or prepositions that are usually of high frequency within the corpus.
Keyness:	An indicator of a word’s significance within a corpus.
Keyword:	A word of statistically significant higher frequency in a specialized corpus in comparison with another corpus.
Lexical collocate:	A non-grammatical collocate
Reference corpus:	A large corpus of millions of words from a variety of text genres that is representative of a particular language variety.
Semantic preference:	The semantics of words that tend to collocate with an individual search term.
Specialized corpus:	A corpus concerning a specific topic, built by a researcher, to study certain phenomena in the language.
TOKEN (comparator) corpus:	A comparator corpus compiled with the aim of having a similar size as the EnglishBT corpus (the same number of “tokens,” or running words).
TYPE (comparator) corpus:	A comparator corpus compiled with the aim of having a similar number of word “types,” or distinct words, as the EnglishBT corpus. This is the same rationale used in the compilation of the French comparator corpus.

² These are my own definitions for the purpose of this thesis only.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	II
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	III
TRANSLATIONS.....	IV
GLOSSARY	V
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VI
LIST OF TABLES.....	IX
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	XI
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
A SHORT HISTORY OF LANGUAGE AND IDENTITY.....	2
METHODOLOGY: COMBINING CORPUS AND DISCOURSE ANALYSIS.....	5
OBJECTIVES.....	5
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	6
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	8
BELONGING AND IDENTITY.....	8
DISCOURSE	9
THE NATION.....	11
<i>National identity: civic and ethnocultural</i>	15
<i>The daily discourse of national identity</i>	16
A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE ON QUEBEC	18
<i>Quebec today</i>	21
<i>Quebec and globalization</i>	23
DISCOURSES, NATIONALISM, AND IDEOLOGIES IN QUEBEC	27
<i>French language ideologies</i>	27
<i>French Canadian identity discourses</i>	31
<i>Discursive resources</i>	35
COMMISSIONS AND DISCOURSE FORMATION	36
<i>The Bouchard Taylor Commission</i>	39
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	41
CORPUS LINGUISTICS	41
<i>Corpus building</i>	42
<i>Corpus tools</i>	43
<i>Advantages of corpus analysis tools</i>	48
<i>Limitations of corpus linguistics</i>	49
CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS.....	50
<i>Social power</i>	51
<i>History</i>	51
<i>Ideology</i>	52
<i>Intertextuality and interdiscursivity</i>	52
<i>Critiques of CDA</i>	53
COMBINATION OF TWO METHODS: CORPUS ASSISTED DISCOURSE STUDIES	54
<i>Three ways of using corpora for discourse analysis</i>	55
<i>Benefits and limitations of CADS</i>	55
PROCEDURE.....	57
<i>Step 1: Compilation of corpora</i>	57
<i>Step 2: Compilation of frequency lists</i>	58
<i>Step 3: Establishment of FrenchBT corpus keyword list</i>	58

<i>Step 4: Compilation of a French Comparator Corpus</i>	59
<i>Step 5: Establishment of EnglishBT corpus keyword list</i>	61
<i>Step 6: Compilation of English Comparator Corpora</i>	63
<i>Step 7: Analysis of keywords and collocates</i>	67
<i>Step 8: Analysis of dispersion plots and downsampling</i>	67
<i>Step 9: Analysis using discourse-historical CDA</i>	67
CHAPTER 4: FRENCHBT CORPUS ANALYSIS	69
QUÉBEC	70
SOCIÉTÉ	73
IMMIGRANTS	77
QUÉBÉCOIS(E)	79
<i>Québécois as an adjective: civic and ethnocultural nationalism</i>	80
<i>Categories of “québécois”</i>	82
NOUS	85
<i>Sommes</i>	87
<i>Avons</i>	91
<i>Notre and Nos: possessive personal pronouns</i>	92
<i>Nous + verbs</i>	94
IDENTITÉ	96
LEUR	98
LANGUE	103
<i>Kind of language</i>	104
<i>Social domains associated with language</i>	105
<i>Language education</i>	105
<i>Ownership of language</i>	106
FRANÇAIS	107
SUMMARY	109
CHAPTER 5: ENGLISHBT CORPUS ANALYSIS	110
QUEBEC	112
<i>Quebec as a polity</i>	113
<i>Groups in Quebec</i>	115
<i>Core values</i>	115
<i>Integration and diversity</i>	117
SOCIETY	118
IMMIGRANTS	119
<i>Their</i>	120
WE	122
<i>Our</i>	123
COMMUNITY	125
FRENCH	125
<i>The French language</i>	126
<i>Linguistic groups</i>	128
<i>Language of education</i>	129
LANGUAGE	130
QUEBECERS	130
QUÉBÉCOIS	132
ENGLISH	133
CANADA	135
SUMMARY	136
CHAPTER 6: CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS	137
AFFIRMATION ET OUVERTURE	137
<i>Contents/Topics</i>	138
<i>Strategies</i>	143

<i>Summary</i>	155
L'ACCOMMODEMENT RAISONNABLE, QU'EN EST-IL?	155
<i>Strategies</i>	157
<i>Contents/Topics</i>	157
<i>Summary</i>	166
BRIEF SUBMITTED TO: COMMISSION DE CONSULTATION SUR LES PRATIQUES D'ACCOMMODEMENT RELIEES AUX DIFFERENCES CULTURELLES.....	166
<i>Strategies</i>	167
<i>Summary</i>	168
CHAPTER 7: DISCUSSION.....	169
QUEBEC: ETHNOCULTURAL AND CIVIC CONSTRUCTIONS.....	169
BELONGING IN QUEBEC: IN-GROUP MEMBERSHIP.....	171
LANGUAGE AS A CRITERION OF MEMBERSHIP: THE MODERNIZING DISCOURSE.....	171
<i>Whose language?</i>	173
<i>Why identity labels matter</i>	173
INSIGHTS FROM CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS.....	174
SUMMARY	176
CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSION	177
CONTRIBUTIONS OF THIS STUDY.....	179
METHODOLOGICAL ADVANTAGES AND LIMITATIONS.....	180
<i>Context in corpus analysis</i>	183
<i>Comparing corpora of different languages</i>	185
IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	186
REFERENCES.....	189

List of Tables

Table 1: FrenchBT corpus and Comparator corpus statistics compared	60
Table 2: English comparator TYPE and comparator TOKEN compared with French comparator corpus	63
Table 3: Corpus size and type/token ratios compared between corpora	64
Table 4: Grammatical words compared in keyword lists	64
Table 5: English and French comparator corpora keyness scores compared	65
Table 6: English and French comparator corpora keyness range compared	66
Table 7: English lexical keywords: Keyword lists compiled with the BNC, comparator TOKEN and comparator TYPE	68
Table 8: FrenchBT corpus collocates with Québec: Categories*	70
Table 9: FrenchBT corpus clusters with Québec: Categories	71
Table 10: FrenchBT corpus clusters with Québec: Categories	72
Table 11: FrenchBT corpus concordance lines with société in R4 position in relation with Québec	73
Table 12: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest with société(s)	74
Table 13: FrenchBT corpus concordance lines with leur in L4 position with société	76
Table 14: FrenchBT corpus sample concordance lines quantifying immigrant(e)(s)	77
Table 15: FrenchBT corpus clusters with immigrant(e)(s): Categories of immigrants	78
Table 16: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest with immigrant(e)(s)	79
Table 17: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest with Québécois(e): positions	80
Table 18: FrenchBT corpus sample concordance lines with Franco/Francophone Québécois(e)(s)	83
Table 19: FrenchBT corpus clusters of interest with québécois(e), nominalized	85
Table 20: FrenchBT corpus patterns with nous: Verbs in R1 location	86
Table 21: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest with sommes: positions	87
Table 22: FrenchBT corpus selected concordance lines with nous sommes and société	89
Table 23: FrenchBT corpus concordance lines with Québec in L2 position with société	89
Table 24: FrenchBT corpus concordance lines with sommes and immigrants	90
Table 25: French concordances with sommes	91
Table 26: French clusters with avons	92
Table 27: FrenchBT corpus collocates with notre: in R1 position	92
Table 28: FrenchBT corpus collocates with notre and nos: categories	93
Table 29: Comparison of FrenchBT corpus collocates of québécois(e) and notre/nos	94
Table 30: FrenchBT corpus modals and periphrastic modality	95
Table 31: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest with devons in R1 and R2 position	95
Table 32: FrenchBT corpus clusters of interest involving identité	97
Table 33: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest in R1 position with identité	97
Table 34: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest with leur(s)	99
Table 35: FrenchBT corpus R1 collocates with leur, notre and nos, in order	101
Table 36: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest with langue	103
Table 37: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest in L1 position with langue(s)	106
Table 38: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest with français(e)(s)	107
Table 39: FrenchBT corpus collocates with Français(e)(s): Canadien(ne)(s)	108
Table 40: Comparison of English and French corpora words of interest	111
Table 41: EnglishBT corpus collocates of interest with Quebec	112
Table 42: EnglishBT corpus collocates of interest with Quebec: Categories	113
Table 43: EnglishBT corpus clusters with society and Quebec	113
Table 44: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines, Canada in L2 position with Quebec	114
Table 45: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with Quebec nation	116
Table 46: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with French and English in relation to Quebec	117
Table 47: EnglishBT corpus collocates with society	118
Table 48: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with integration and society	119
Table 49: EnglishBT corpus collocates with immigrants	120
Table 50: EnglishBT corpus collocates with their	121
Table 51: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with their children	122

<i>Table 52: EnglishBT corpus: Collocates of interest with We</i>	123
<i>Table 53: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with values in R2 position with our</i>	124
<i>Table 54: EnglishBT corpus lexical collocates with our in R1 and R2 positions</i>	124
<i>Table 55: EnglishBT corpus collocates with French: positions</i>	126
<i>Table 56: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with French and Quebec</i>	127
<i>Table 57: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with French language institutions</i>	127
<i>Table 58: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with primacy of the French language</i>	127
<i>Table 59: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines: French language, culture and religion</i>	128
<i>Table 60: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with immigrants and French</i>	129
<i>Table 61: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines: Learning/using French language</i>	129
<i>Table 62: EnglishBT corpus collocates with language</i>	130
<i>Table 63: EnglishBT corpus collocates with Quebecers: positions</i>	131
<i>Table 64: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with immigrants or Canadians and Quebecers</i>	132
<i>Table 65: EnglishBT corpus collocates with Quebecois</i>	132
<i>Table 66: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with Quebecois nation</i>	133
<i>Table 67: EnglishBT corpus collocates with English</i>	134
<i>Table 70: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with nation in relation with Canada</i>	135

List of Appendices

APPENDIX I: GUIDE TO COLLOCATIONAL ANALYSIS	198
APPENDIX II: CATEGORIES AND SECTIONS FOR ANALYSIS OF THE DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION OF NATIONAL IDENTITY.....	199
APPENDIX III: TOOLS IN DISCOURSE-HISTORICAL CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS.....	200
APPENDIX IV: FRENCH CORPUS FREQUENCY LIST (TOP 100 WORDS).....	201
APPENDIX V: FRENCH CORPUS KEYWORD LIST (TOP 125 WORDS)	204
APPENDIX VI: IDENTITY LABELS IN CURRENT USE IN QUEBEC.....	207
APPENDIX VII: FRENCH CORPUS R1 COLLOCATES WITH LEUR AND NOTRE/NOS: CATEGORIES OF UNIQUE COLLOCATES	208
APPENDIX VIII: ENGLISH CORPUS FREQUENCY LIST (TOP 100 WORDS)	209
APPENDIX IX: ENGLISH CORPUS (TYPE) KEYWORD LIST (TOP 125 WORDS).....	212
APPENDIX X: AFFIRMATION ET OUVERTURE	215
APPENDIX XI: L'ACCOMMODEMENT RAISONNABLE, QU'EN EST-IL?	219
APPENDIX XII: BRIEF SUBMITTED TO: COMMISSION DE CONSULTATION SUR LES PRATIQUES D'ACCOMMODEMENT RELIEES AUX DIFFERENCES CULTURELLES	221
APPENDIX XIII: UNDERSTANDING COLLOCATE TABLES.....	223

Chapter 1: Introduction

Être nous-mêmes, c'est essentiellement de maintenir et de développer une personnalité qui dure depuis trois siècles et demi. Au coeur de cette personnalité se trouve le fait que nous parlons français. Tout le reste est accroché à cet élément essentiel, en découle ou nous y ramène infailliblement. (René Lévesque, 1968)

“Québécois” signifie toute personne qui vit au Québec, quelle que soit son origine, sa langue, sa religion, sa culture (René Lévesque, 1980).

In 1968, René Lévesque – who would later become Premier of Quebec – clearly defined Quebec identity in terms of the French language. Years later, he defined Québécois identity to include, more globally, all of those living in the province. Nearly a quarter century after Lévesque’s death, the disjunction between his renditions of belonging remains, perhaps, the fault line within the bedrock of Quebec identity. Today, at a time of unprecedented ethnolinguistic diversity and reasonable accommodation debates, to what extent do people “living in the province” consider the French language a fundamental part of their identity?

In this thesis, I will investigate the ways in which belonging is constructed in and connected to language through popular discourse in Quebec. I will investigate this through texts submitted to the Consultation Commission on Accommodation Practices Related to Cultural Differences (more commonly known as the Bouchard Taylor Commission). These data collected by the Commission provide a rare glimpse at popular constructions of identity in Quebec today. This study uses the methodological framework “corpus-assisted discourse studies” to analyse briefs submitted to the Commission and investigate if and how

participants construct a link between language and their sense of belonging to Quebec.

A short history of language and identity

Since the rise of nationalism in the 18th century, there has been a more or less explicit equation cementing individual nations with single languages (Anderson, 1983; Blommaert, 2006; Djite, 2006; Lo Bianco, 2005; Patrick, 2007; Patrick, 2007; Wright, 2004). This is the “one nation equals one language” equation, and generally speaking, belonging to a nation necessitates loyalty to and use of the national language. Since languages are so central to belonging in certain nations, some languages have become highly politicized and idealized. The French language was the central unifying element in the creation of the modern French nation state, and has been politicized and idealized in its standardization and its fundamental role in identity (Ager, 1996; Ager, 1999; Boudreau & Dubois, 2007; Kasuya, 2001; Moïse, 2007; Wright, 2004). Nowadays, these beliefs about the French language are held internationally, throughout Francophone countries. Indeed in Quebec, an understanding of French language ideologies is key to understanding the complicated versions of belonging in the province.

In Canada, the French language has been part of French Canadian heritage and culture for centuries. Attachment to French was further fuelled in the past fifty years in the province of Quebec, where French Canadians form a majority. During the Quiet Revolution (1960-1966), French Canadians took action against the minority ruling Anglophones to gain power in the province. A decade later, the Quebec Charter of the French language was passed, the French language

gained status, and the French Canadians in the province adopted a new name for their identity: *Québécois* (Heller & Labrie, 2003; Labelle, 2004; Oakes & Warren, 2007).

Since the rebirth of the province during the Quiet Revolution, Quebec has found itself in the midst of debate as to how to adapt the distinct culture and language of the older yet newly empowered French Canadian culture to today's multicultural contexts (Heller, 1999a; Heller, 1999b; Oakes & Warren, 2007). The debate continues to this day, and in 2006-2007, the media highlighted a repeated concern across the province: to what degree should the Francophone majority accommodate or embrace the practices and values brought along by newcomers (Consultation Commission, 2007a; McAndrew, 2008)? The continued debate led Québec Premier Jean Charest to establish the Consultation Commission on Accommodation Practices Related to Cultural Differences. The Commission is more commonly known as the Bouchard Taylor Commission, after the two chairs of the Commission: sociologist and historian Gérard Bouchard, and philosopher Charles Taylor. The purpose of the Commission was to make recommendations to the Premier in May 2008; these recommendations have been based on public consultations held in various locations across Quebec. Individuals could participate by testifying before the Commission, or they could submit their opinion in a "brief." The submitted briefs are available on the Commission's website, and these serve as the data for my study.

The briefs provide an invaluable source of information about the opinions held by people living in Quebec. Participants were given full flexibility to include

in their briefs their opinions on the Commission themes, their personal experience of cultural differences, or any other aspects of questions “they deem to be relevant” (Consultation Commission, 2007b, p. 7). With the scope and breadth of the consultations, the data from the Commission serve as a rich compendium of discursive examples from across the province of Quebec; more importantly, the briefs may include deliberate or inadvertent passages concerning what it means to be Québécois today.

The Commission briefs are unsolicited for the purpose of this study. They allow for key insight into the discourses of belonging in circulation not only in Montreal (too often the focus of study and mistakenly used as a “typical” example of Quebec), but across the entire province of Quebec (Anctil, 2007). They also allow for insight into identity discourses in circulation within the general population of Quebec. Quebec is too often portrayed through the media lens and political rhetoric; this study investigates representations of Quebec as constructed by the general population. Although some studies have investigated the popular discursive construction of identity in Quebec (Labelle, 2004; Labelle & Salée, 2001; Heller & Labrie, 2003), to my knowledge, no study has used an approach as large-scale and as systematic as CADS. Therefore, the Commission briefs provide two invaluable opportunities. First, they present unique insight into Quebec identity as voiced in popular (as opposed to political or media) discourse. Second, they lend themselves to a new and innovative approach, “corpus assisted discourse studies” (CADS).

Methodology: Combining corpus and discourse analysis

Following Baker, Gabrielatos, Khosravini, Krzyżanowski, McEnery and Wodak (2008) and Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl and Liebhart (1999), I have adopted an “eclectic approach” (Baker, 2006, p. 16) to my research that encompasses both top-down and bottom-up angles on the Commission briefs. The bottom-up angle entails the large-scale and multifunctional tools of corpus analysis, which infer broad discursive patterns from the data. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), on the other hand, is capable of considering data in sociopolitical and historical context that provides a more top-down interpretation of the findings.

Recent research has shown how corpus work (previously understood as purely quantitative) and discourse analysis (previously understood as purely qualitative) can be combined to demonstrate how a large body of texts can exhibit common discursive tendencies (Baker, 2006; Baker et al., 2008; Lee, 2008; Seale, 2003; Stubbs, 1996, 1997, 2003, 2007). The results of a study with this combined approach can demonstrate common trends across populations as large as the corpus sample, whereas in the past, discourse analysis would have studied such phenomena with primarily small-scale samples. Since briefs were submitted to the Commission from across Quebec, the data for my study may be representative of popular discourse across the province.

Objectives

My thesis aims to contribute to academic and social research by applying the latest innovative approach to discourse analysis, CADS, which bridges the gap between corpus and discourse analysis. Also, my study raises a number of

questions concerning the future of belonging in Quebec and how it continues to be linked to, and constructed through, language.

Research Questions

When examining the Commission briefs, I will investigate the following overarching research question: How is identity constructed in relation to language in Quebec popular discourse? To answer this question, I first need to answer a number of smaller, operable questions: How is Quebec constructed through public discourse in Quebec? How do different constructions of Quebec involve different versions of membership? And finally, how does language figure in each construction of membership? To answer these questions, my thesis will take the following design.

In Chapter two, the Literature Review, I explore key terms that are used throughout my study, namely, belonging, identity, discourse, and the nation. I show how and why these terms are important in my research, and how they relate to Quebec both historically and contemporarily. I then explore research on French Canadian identity discourses, and the discursive resources on which people draw in order to construct their identity. Finally, I review the role of commissions in discourses formation, and I end the chapter by presenting the context surrounding the Bouchard Taylor Commission.

In Chapter three, Methodology, I show how the CADS approach is well suited for the exploration of the Bouchard Taylor Commission briefs. To present the CADS combined approach, I first overview corpus analysis tools, especially tools available in the program WordSmith (version 4.0). I then discuss the

advantages and limitations of corpus linguistics methodology, and how these can be largely remedied in conjunction with discourse analysis. Next, I outline my approach to discourse analysis and the specific framework that I will use to analyze the discursive construction of identity. Finally, I show how corpus and critical discourse analysis can be combined, and the specific procedures I used in the analysis of my data.

Chapter four begins my corpus analysis. I begin with the analysis of the Commission briefs written in French, and explore keywords that pertain to discussions of belonging and language in Quebec. In Chapter five, I analyse the English language Commission briefs, and explore similar keywords as in the French corpus analysis. Chapter six is my discourse analysis, and here I provide a close analysis of three individual briefs. I explore the topics of each brief and the strategies adopted in each one in the discursive construction of identity.

Finally, in Chapter seven, I discuss the findings of the three analysis chapters. I compare and contrast the findings from each analysis chapter, and I evaluate the overall success and validity of my research. The success and validity is largely the result of the methodology I use, and therefore I discuss some of the strengths and weaknesses of the CADS approach, suggesting research that remains to be done to fine tune the methodology and further explore language and identity in Quebec.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The history of Quebec is interlaced with questions of language, discourses, and belonging. This chapter will serve to introduce these themes as they have been explored in past research and illustrate how they pertain to the focus of this research. First, I will explore key terms such as *belonging*, *identity*, *nation* and *discourse*; then I will show how each has played a role in the history and development of Quebec. This chapter contextualizes the current identity situation in Quebec by providing a historical perspective on language and identity in French Canada; this contextualization will serve to enrich the understanding of the role of language in belonging in Quebec as identified in the corpus.

Belonging and identity

Identity is a complex phenomenon, particularly in today's context of globalization and immigration. For the purposes of this study, I consider identity as the way in which an individual defines him/herself. Specifically, identity is how an individual *perceives* him/herself in a group context, that is, if he or she has a sense of *belonging* to (being part of) a group. Henderson (2007) explains that this sense of belonging "is a function of both personal belief and the expected reception of claims of membership" (p. 182). Identity is a self-ascribed and negotiated label, subject to change and modifications under different circumstances or contexts.

I have decided to refer to identity in relation to "belonging" because this study investigates the ways in which national identity is constructed by the general public in Quebec; that is, the ways in which the people of Quebec perceive themselves to belong in the province. Their construction will inevitably

be linked to, among other things, their perception of their positions in (or out) of the Québécois nation.³ It is important to study the popular constructions of identity because, I argue, politics and the media often influence and even dominate the public understanding of Quebec identity. de Cillia et al. (1999) explain, “There are systematic relations of transfer and contradiction between models of identity offered by the political elite or the media and that of everyday discourse” (p. 214). While the study of media discourse is important, it often overshadows the importance of popular discourse. Therefore, this study focuses on this relatively unexplored area of the popular construction of belonging in Quebec. Constructions of belonging are achieved, at least in part, through discourse.

Discourse

Broadly speaking, discourses are ways of “constructing reality” (Baker, 2006, p. 1), a way of “understanding the social world” (Heller, 2001, p. 120). Discourses are both socially constituted and socially constitutive (Bishop & Jaworski, 2003; de Cillia et al., 1999). Some researchers argue that discourses are not necessarily verbal (see Baker, 2006; Ivanic, 1998); indeed, discourse can be understood more broadly as “any semiotic mode of signification – spoken, written, visual, and so on, or as a form of social practice” (Bishop & Jaworski, 2003, p. 246). Discourses manifest themselves both in lexical choice and lexical avoidance; the “absence of explicit references” can effectively normalize or problematize issues or concepts

³ I use the term “Québécois nation” rather than “Quebec nation” for the sake of simplicity. The Québécois (and not Quebec) were declared “a nation within a united Canada” by Prime Minister Stephen Harper (Office of the Prime Minister, 2006). This will be explored in more detail later in this chapter.

(Baker, 2006, p. 5). Lexical choices are part of language use; Biber, Conrad and Leech (2002) explain that “Every time we write or speak, we are faced with a large array of choices: not only choices of what to say but how to say it” (p. 2). Contextual factors influence the linguistic choices we make, and these choices accumulate to “create discourse in different situations” (Biber et al., 2002, p. 2).

For the purposes of this study, discourse will be understood as socially constituted and socially constitutive linguistic choices. Thus, discourses are not only indicative of inner individual workings such as beliefs, opinions, identity or personality; they are also linked to social practices and structures and are in a constant state of evolution with that society (Baker, 2006). Heller (2001) explains that discourse can be seen as part of the production and reproduction of social interaction processes, and thus, social hierarchies:

Language practices in Canada are primarily about struggles ... to produce discourses and to impose them, and to deal with discourses produced by others... Language practices are also about discourses informed by interests, interests related to controlling access to the production and distribution of symbolic and material resources. (p. 120)

In Canada, and particularly French Canada, discourses concerning the French language and identity are connected to power struggles related to Quebec nationalism.

The nation

My use of the term “nation” draws on de Cillia et al.’s (1999) conceptualization, which is built on five basic assumptions. First, nations are understood as mental constructs, as “imagined communities.” This assumption comes from Benedict Anderson’s (1983) work on nationalism. According to Anderson, nations exist only insofar as they are constructed by populations, given that individuals within these populations rarely meet each other. Populations believe themselves to be cohesive and even homogenous groups largely because of language. Since the age of the printing press, groups of people have come to find that they could understand and relate to each other despite geographic expanse and perhaps localized differences. Still today, national populations are convinced they belong to a unique national community largely because they read, listen to, and watch the same material. The emergence of communities imagining themselves along national lines heralds the wave of nationalism across Europe, notably during the French Revolution. Indeed, French was the first language to have clearly been a defining factor in the creation of a nation state; it was followed by other languages that were employed to legitimize power and dominance (Kasuya, 2001). Thus, a “nation” can be understood as a body of people sharing the same mental representation of the national language and believing themselves connected due to this shared language. Still, language is not the sole defining element of a nation, and essentializing the connection between nation and language is unrealistic and theoretically problematic (see May, 2008). Avoiding essentialization should not, however, undermine the fact that in the majority of cases language and nationalism remain strongly connected.

de Cillia et al.'s (1999) second assumption is that national identities are discursively (i.e. through language and semiotic systems) produced, reproduced, transformed and “deconstructed” (see also Ricento, 2003). That is, the nation exists insofar as the population continues to reproduce the discourses that construct it. The reproduction of discourses is not only an act of nationalism, but also an act of communication and belonging. This assumption relies on a social constructionist view of identity. Identity is socially constructed in that it is the result of “affiliation to particular beliefs and possibilities which are available to them in their social context” (Ivanic, 1998, p.12). As explained above, discourse is both socially constituted and socially constitutive; the link between discourse and society is such that identity, as socially constructed, is a process that reveals itself through our ways of speaking or writing (Meinhof & Galasiński, 2005). Ivanic (1998) explains, “Writing is an act of identity” (p. 32); writers create a “discoursal self” through discursive choices that align them with socially available positions. Individuals may be more favourably predisposed to embrace certain discourses according to their social resources. Indeed, according to Heller (2001), people “choose” discourses that legitimize their interests in the struggle for material or symbolic resources. These choices are constrained by socio-political and historical contexts that give rise to discourses and new possibilities of selfhood (Ivanic, 1998). Discursive choices construct individual and group identity; these choices are socially constitutive in that “they play a decisive role in the genesis, production and construction of certain social conditions. Thus, discourses may serve to construct national identities” (de Cillia et al., 1999, p. 157). Discourses

can also serve to perpetuate, reproduce or justify the established version of national identity. However, they may also be instrumental in transforming it – and, they may have an effect on the dismantling or destructing of national identity. Nationalist discourses often originate “top-down” from politicians, intellectuals, and the media; they are disseminated through education, mass communication, militarization, and public gatherings, and it is through these means that discourses are often adopted and reproduced by the general public. Then, through the public reproduction of discourses, nationalist discourses are constructed, perpetuated, and transformed through a “bottom-up” process.

de Cillia et al.’s (1999) third assumption is drawn from Pierre Bourdieu’s notion of *habitus*. The researchers explain that national identity is “a complex of common ideas, concepts or perception schemes” of related emotional attitudes and similar behavioural dispositions that are internalized through national socialization (p. 153). As individuals produce, reproduce and spread national discourses (bottom-up forces), they connect membership in the political state with identification with the national culture. As a result, these discourses become commonplace and are instituted across society by government and political elites (top-down forces). With the adoption of these discourses, culture and state become identical: the result of these top-down and bottom-up forces is that of Bourdieu’s (1998) *habitus*. Through socialization, individuals acquire predispositions into certain discourses (“opus operatum,” de Cillia et al., p. 156) and predispositions to embrace certain discourses at the expense of others (“modus operandi,” de Cillia et al., p. 156). Létourneau and Moisan (2004) found

convincing evidence of national *habitus* in their examination of youth's acquisition of Québécois "melancholy" historical memory. Despite never having been explicitly taught a melancholic version of Quebec history through educational material, youth from Quebec City tend to recount Québécois history in a tragic narrative. Létourneau and Moisan (2004) find that the production of this narrative is the result of assimilation into Quebec national culture through discourse acquired socially both in the home setting (bottom-up) and through larger state-controlled institutional settings (top-down), including that of school.

The fourth assumption in de Cillia et al.'s (1999) conceptualization of the nation involves the discursive construction of difference, distinctiveness and uniqueness. This is in keeping with much recent research, dating back to the work of Saïd's (1978) *Orientalism*. Nationalist discourses often imply a homogenous "in-group" and a somehow different "out-group" (de Cillia et al., 1999). Like languages, in fact, nations are conceptualized as bounded entities, and thereby different and cut off from other nations (Jaffe, 2007). In Canada, Brady (2007) argues that French Canadians largely rely on Anglophone Canadians to serve as the "out-group" against which they define themselves homogeneously. Erfurt (1999) has demonstrated how a Franco-Ontarian identity depends on both Québécois and Anglophone Canadian identities for its distinction. Salée (2007) argues that Quebec's self perception is still that of an "inferiorized and marginalized national minority within the Canadian political context" (p. 134): being marginalized by Anglophone Canadians has been key to its distinction as a nation. Henderson (2007) reinforces this point, explaining that, in Quebec,

“identity has less to do with pillars of collective association and more to do with a profound sense of distance within the Canadian federation ... That the population is French and Catholic matters less than the fact that it is not English” (p. 111). Indeed, Létourneau and Ruel (1994) have also found that Francophone Québécois label “anglophones, néo-québécois, étrangers ou immigrants de fraîche date” as “others” (p. 284).

de Cillia et al.’s (1999) final and fifth assumption is that there is no such thing as one singular national identity; “national identities are not completely consistent, stable and immutable” (p. 154). Indeed, the construction of national identity is subject to the construction of the nation, particularly whether the nation is constructed as civic or ethnocultural.

National identity: civic and ethnocultural

Belonging to a nation is complex; it involves notions of membership to the state, the national culture, and historical tradition; each version of membership yields a different account of inclusion and exclusion (de Cillia, Reisigl, & Wodak, 1999). Bleich (1999) explains that nations draw different boundaries to define membership: “there are both formal legal criteria of citizenship and symbolic and sociological dimensions of belonging such as class, religion, ethnicity and race” (p. 61). Here, Bleich (1999) is drawing on the traditional binary conceptualization of civic and ethnocultural nationalism (Heller, 2001; Henderson, 2007; Oakes & Warren, 2007; Wright, 2004).⁴ de Cillia et al. (1999) refer to this as the difference

⁴ Traditionally, researchers have considered nations as either “civic” or “ethnic”; since I do not find that both terms fully encompass the understanding of Quebec nationalism, I use the terms “civic” and “ethnocultural.”

between the civic, democratic nation (*Staatsnation*) and the traditional ethnocultural understanding of nation (*Kulturnation*) (p. 169). Overall, then, the perception of “belonging” to a nation can mean belonging to a predominantly civic or ethnocultural nation – or both. Also, belonging to a nation is sometimes different from formal membership to that nation (i.e. citizenship); the boundaries of the national community are not necessarily the same as the territorial borders of the state (Crowley, 1999). Henderson (2007) explains that a nation can have two potential boundaries that do not necessarily coincide: first is the physical border around the geography of the nation; the other is the sociological boundary drawn around the population of the nation. In the case of Quebec, while individuals might be citizens or residents in the province of Quebec, they still might not feel they belong to the Québécois nation: identity constructions are relative to the situation of each individual and dependant on the discourses available to that person.

The daily discourse of national identity

As explained above, I consider identities to be both socially and discursively constructed. As society changes, so do the discourses prevalent in that society, and as a result, identity evolves too. According to Renan (1896), a nation exists insofar as its members will it into existence. Billig (1995) argues that this would-be tenuous construction of the nation is solidified and fortified as it is produced and reproduced by quotidian language. Billig (1995) refers to this as “banal nationalism”; this is the way in which national identity is routinely “flagged” in discourse. Billig (2002) argues that nationalism is “near the surface of

contemporary life” since it occurs in “prosaic, routine words” (p. 59). He explains how even the smallest words (‘we’, ‘here’, ‘this’) embody banal nationalism, as “we” embodies “the nation” and vice versa. The nation is not “magically” reproduced with each successive generation, nor is it reproduced through conscious decisions made by its citizens: “Just as a language will die rather for want of regular users, so a nation must be put to daily use” (2002, p. 61). Politicians, too, are representations of the nation to itself; they stand for and speak for the nation, as well as embody it on the international scene. The media is another area where national identity is fostered through discourse, particularly in sports (Billig, 2002; Bishop & Jaworski, 2003). As discussed above, these representations also include exclusions of the “other,” and often fall upon familiar stereotypes. These stereotypes are strengthened as, daily, nationalist discourse is produced and reproduced.

The production and reproduction of identity discourses are precisely that which fuel and sustain a people’s identity throughout history. When national identity continues to be discursively constructed by a population, it becomes part of that culture, and part of that history. The nation’s “collective memory” (c.f. Halbwachs, 1985, cited in de Cillia et al., 1999, p. 154) allows a population to *selectively* collect historical events in order to construct a common national history that will be told by a nation’s citizens (de Cillia et al., 1999). Citizens can draw on what Létourneau (2006) calls “lieux de memoire”: these compose a referential system common to the group, and identity is inscribed therein. The “lieux de memoire” chiefly involve language and ways of using language; when

interlocutors employ these “lieux de memoire” and use language in a way that is specific to the group, they become members of a culture and a history. That is to say that identity exists, to a certain extent, in the way in which it is articulated; this articulation involves ascribing to a culture and a history as understood through available social discourses.

Thus, as discussed above, language is key to identity in several different ways. First, language is historically linked to group identity in that it allows large groups to communicate across geographic spaces and imagine themselves to be a cohesive and homogenous group despite localized differences. Second, language use indicates group membership, particularly because participation in group activities through the common language allows individuals to become part of the national culture. Being part of the national culture means, to a certain extent, reproducing, perpetuating, shaping or dismantling discourses that construct that nation. Where a singular discourse may indicate a common understanding of national identity, multiple discourses may indicate a complex of forces acting upon the people within a group. In the following section, I explain how Quebec’s history may have given rise to different identity discourses.

A historical perspective on Quebec

In Quebec, the relationship between language and identity is complex. The first European settlers in the territory of Quebec were French; the British Conquest of 1759 forced the French to cede the territory to the British, who were given domain over this substantial population of settlers of French descent. French lineage brought with it, among other things, traditions, a religion, and the French

language: from the beginning, French Canadians had a culture unique to themselves and different from that of the British settlers. Although there were attempts to assimilate French Canadians into Anglophone culture, the Quebec Act of 1774 served to protect the Catholic Church, the French language, the legal system, and the seigneurial (feudal) system of land tenure. These institutions were largely responsible for maintaining what would become a Québécois identity (Henderson, 2007).

The Quebec Act of 1774 did more than simply preserve the way of life of the French settlers; it also served to create a hierarchical culture that was largely responsible for segregating French Canadians from the rest of the country until the twentieth century. The clergy of the Catholic Church held power over the French Canadian population, and encouraged it to maintain distance from the rest of the country. As a result of Church power, French Canadian identity was primarily religious prior to the 1960s; language served only to maintain the French Canadian status quo by buffering the French Canadian hierarchy from Anglophone influence (Henderson, 2007). As Heller (1999b) explains, the French Canadian nation was not tied to specific geographical territory; rather, the nation was ideological and social: “It survived by virtue of socioeconomic and political marginalization, supported by its own institutions, the most important of which was the Catholic Church” (p. 9).

It was during the years of the 1950s and 1960s that Quebec evolved in the sense that it exists today. During this period of time, known as *la Révolution tranquille* (or “the Quiet Revolution”), the French Canadian majority gained

power in the province and turned to emphasize their linguistic and territorial, rather than religious, identity.⁵ Emphasizing territorial identity allowed Quebec to be recognized as a geographical entity where French Canadians were the majority, even if they were a minority elsewhere in the country (Oakes & Warren, 2007). Heller (1999b) explains, “French Canadian spiritual nationalism was re-invented as Québécois state nationalism” (p. 154). It is precisely because Quebec became territorially-based that the rest of French Canada fractured into geolinguistic (Cartwright, 2006) identities: *Fransaskois*, *francomanitobain*, *Franco-Ontarien* (Oakes & Warren, 2007).

During the years of the Quiet Revolution, the Liberal government emphasized the rights and privileges of a new Francophone middle class; however, it was still apparent that an Anglophone minority was still maintaining power within the province. In 1977, the new Parti Québécois provincial government passed controversial language legislation in the form of the Charter of the French language. This legislation had the overall goal of righting the wrongs of linguistic privilege in Quebec (Heller, 1999b). This Charter made French the language of the government, public administration, the legislature and courts in Quebec. French was also made the “normal and everyday language” in semi-public agencies and the workplace in the province (Oakes & Warren, 2007, p. 86-7). The Charter aimed to allow French speakers to access the same benefits using their mother tongue as English speakers in their mother tongue. It allowed

⁵ See Heller, 1999a, for a detailed explanation of the causes and consequences of the Quiet Revolution, p. 152-156

for French speakers to gain linguistic capital both within the province and the country (Henderson, 2007).

Therefore, from a segregated minority of low economic status, French Canadian identity within Quebec was re-evaluated to be a positive symbol of economic worth and social status under the new geolinguistic and national identity term, *Québécois*.⁶

Quebec today

Today, Quebec remains unique largely because of the ways in which the French language separates it from the rest of Anglophone North America. Henderson (2007) explains that Quebec has greater control over its self-definition as a result of being bounded by its official language: “In Quebec language acts as a barrier to global communication networks operating in English” (p. 36). The uniqueness of Quebec culminated in the 2006 declaration of Prime Minister Stephen Harper that the *Québécois* are a “nation within a united Canada.” This recent declaration is interesting because while linguistic and religious differences have existed throughout these past centuries, “it was only in the latter half of the twentieth century that provincial borders began to dictate identity labels” (Henderson, 2007, p. 87).

Historically, collective French Canadian identity was linked to two key pillars: language and religion; however, it is only since these pillars have been mobilized by nationalists, the media, and political parties that identity claims have become hot topics in public discourse (Henderson, 2007). When the identity label

⁶ Appendix VI contains a comparative chart exploring the use of this and other identity labels in Quebec.

was changed from “French Canadian” to “Québécois,” politics started taking on a stronger role “not only with respect to social and economic provisions but also as a guarantor of Québécois culture and identity” (Henderson, 2007, p. 121). It is only since the recent change in the value of French language capital (the “commodification” of the French language, c.f. Heller, 2003b) that competition over membership in Quebec began (Oakes & Warren, 2007, chapter 4). In other words, the debate over *Québécois* identity dates from the recent re-evaluation of Quebec’s linguistic resources. As competition grows to achieve valuable membership in Quebec, the debate grows over whether this membership involves adhesion to Quebec’s geopolitical (civic) territory or belonging to the Quebec (ethnocultural) nation.

Historically, Quebec has been recognized as an historic, ethnocultural, religious and linguistic entity. Oakes and Warren (2007) explain that “the ‘territorialisation’ of identity was to set in motion the gradual ‘de-ethnicisation’ of the Quebec nation” (Oakes & Warren, 2007, p. 27). Nowadays, the Quebec state is in the process of promoting a civic version of membership in the nation in order to avoid the negative connotations associated with the idea of the ethnocultural nation (May, 2008; Oakes, 2006; Oakes & Warren, 2007). The idea is that citizenship can exist independently of nationality, and that citizenship can attest to an individual’s attachment to the institutions of the state. In this way, identity can be linked to an inclusive, civic society that “encourages the ethnic identities of indigenous and immigrant minorities, but also one which combines this with the respect for the ethnicity of the majority French Canadian population”

(Oakes & Warren, 2007, p. 61). This civic Quebec identity remains dependent on the use of the French language.

Beauchemin (2006) explains that as “Catholicisme, ruralisme et messianisme” disappeared from French-Québécois historical consciousness, the French language took their place and became the strongest distinguishing symbol of Quebec society: “La langue est ... au centre de toutes les passions identitaires québécoises” (p. 132). The vitality of the French language is symbolic of the destiny of the French Québécois people. Today, as Quebec moves toward a civic version of nationalism, less emphasis is placed on the ethnocultural heritage of the French language, and more is placed on French as the common denominator among the majority of Québécois. The French language is “the main medium that allows Quebecers of all origins to learn about each other, interact, cooperate and participate in the development of Québec society” (Consultation Commission, 2007a, p. 14). Therefore, the French language is being de-ethnicized to make it the property not only of the “old stock” French Canadian Québécois (*Québécois de souche*), but to all of those who live within the province of Quebec (Oakes & Warren, 2007; Oakes, 2006; Pagé, 2006).

Quebec and globalization

The very need to differentiate between the civic and ethnocultural nation arises due to the globalizing context in which Quebec, like most areas of the world, finds itself today. With the birth rate falling and the need for immigration rising, defining a common collective has become an increasingly delicate issue. Since 1977, French language legislation has promoted the French language to the extent

that nowadays, French speakers are able to live and work in their mother tongue without transferring to the English language or culture. However, given the increasing globalization of Quebec and the diversification of its demographics, language policies may no longer be sufficient to ensure coherence in Quebec; instead, immigration and integration policy will need to take centre stage (Oakes & Warren, 2007).

Historically, immigrants to Quebec migrated toward the economically attractive English language, and were thus viewed as a threat to the French language (Ancil, 2007). Since language legislation was put into place (and undoubtedly due to Quebec's hand in immigration policy facilitating the immigration of Francophones), immigrants have been able to live and work successfully in French: there is no longer a need to choose English over French. Furthermore, the *francisation* of immigrants was part of Quebec's "civic nation" strategy to make French the language for all of those living in Quebec, irrespective of their ethnocultural origins. With the adoption of the Charter of the French Language, the Francophone population finally decided to define itself as a "host society" and to be responsible for the integration of immigrants. This required, for the first time in the history of Quebec, the French language to be the "common language" of all those living in the province (Ancil, 2007). This was perhaps the first step in the creation of the civic nation of Quebec.

One problem with the civic version of Quebec is that it turns a blind eye to the ethnocultural heritage that comes hand-in-hand with Quebec's linguistic heritage. While language continues to be emphasized in all areas of Quebec

public (if not private) life, the importance of ethnicity and culture is less explicit. As mentioned earlier, religion, too, figures less in contemporary conceptualizations of Quebec, particularly in the civic conceptualization of the province. Despite the faded religious overtones of Quebec identity, Henderson (2007) reports that 80% of Québécois identify themselves as Catholic even though many no longer attend church; thus, the arrival of immigrants has brought to the forefront the phenomenon of the changing role of religion in social life. Henderson (2007) explains, “immigrants to Quebec are integrated into the dominant language, a pattern not necessarily mirrored with religion” (p. 31), or, I would add, culture. There is a concern, particularly exacerbated by the English language media in Canada (Oakes & Warren, 2007), that the Québécois nation includes only French Catholic people descendant from the original settlers of New France. Henderson (2007) explains, “The implicit assumption ... is that Quebec is a white nation, inhospitable to newcomers” (p. 74). The question remains as to who belongs in Quebec, and why.

The subject of belonging is complicated due to the two conflicting ethnocultural and civic versions of nationalism available in the province, and language is key to both. As Henderson (2007) argues: “Seen as something attached to birth and ancestry, language acquires ethnic properties. Seen as something acquired or learned, language can become a civic pillar” (p. 112). The French language is, at the same time, a tool of communication, a symbol of civic participation, and an identity marker. The interpretation of the importance of

language in Quebec may therefore lead to an inclusive or exclusive version of Quebec identity.

As explained above, if identity depends on the way in which it is articulated, then the terms used to denote members of Quebec matter (Labelle & Salée, 2001; Labelle, 2004; Oakes & Warren, 2007). Is one a *Quebecker* (*Quebecer*) if he or she lives within the territory of Quebec? Or does this English-based term imply not only geographic origins, but also the linguistic and cultural heritage of the individual? Still more complicated, in both English and French, does the term *Québécois* refer to people of French-Canadian heritage, and thus, their ethnicity, language, religion? Or, is *Québécois* simply a French term used to denote a person living within Quebec? Because of the implications of identity terminology in Quebec, various new identity labels have arisen, including “hyphenated” identities and identity labels. Key among these subcategories are the ethnic labels *Québécois de souche* and *Québécois pure laine* (“Old stock” or “pure wool” Québécois of French Canadian descent). These labels remain contentious and illustrate the complicated and divergent versions of belonging in the province (Labelle & Salée, 2001). Outsiders to the ethnocultural version of Québécois identity are also given a variety of names, such as *New Quebec(k)ers* / *Nouveaux Québécois*, *Néo-Québécois*, and *Newcomers/Nouveaux arrivants*.⁷ These identity labels show how the various forms of belonging to Quebec are evident in language; these labels also form part of identity discourses in the province.

⁷ See Appendix VI for a comparison of these and other Quebec identity labels.

Discourses, nationalism, and ideologies in Quebec

Discourses are important because they are linked to dominant societal ideologies. Ideologies are “a multiplicity of mechanisms,” involving shared beliefs, attitudes, values, categories and representations, that combine to make “people oblivious to the fact that their world has been constructed” (Bishop & Jaworski, 2003, p. 247). It is because of ideologies that ideas, concepts, values, and assumptions become so naturalized in society that they are taken as “given” by society members. Bishop and Jaworski (2003) explain that the link between discourses and ideologies is that “it is through discourse that ideologies are forged, reinforced and reproduced” (p. 246). The authors assert that nations are based on a common history and a collective future; nationalism is, in fact, an ideology by which “the world of nations and ‘our’ place within it has come to be seen as inevitable and natural” (Bishop & Jaworski, 2003, p. 247).⁸ In Quebec, nationalism is closely linked to ideologies centring on language.

French language ideologies

A language ideology is the way a population has come to understand what language is. Boudreau and Dubois (2007) explain:

Language ideologies are usually defined as a set of beliefs on language or a particular language shared by members of a community ... These beliefs come to be so well established that their origin is often forgotten by speakers and are therefore socially

⁸ See also Létourneau 2000, 2001a, 2001b, 2006, and Létourneau, Arnoff and Scott, 2004, for discussions of the importance of history and future in national coherence in Canada and Quebec.

reproduced and end up being “naturalized,” or perceived as natural or as commonsense, thereby masking the social construction processes at work. (p. 104)

The product of a powerful language ideology, French is one of the most standardized and “unified” languages in the world; it is seen as an essentialized object, a rigid and unchanging system. Some even argue that “international French” is a myth and simply masks the dominant and unchanging role that French from France plays on the international scene (Boudreau & Dubois, 2007; Heller, 1999b). Boudreau and Dubois (2007) explain that standardized French forms part of the “linguistic imagination” of Francophones across the world: as all French speakers aspire to access the economic and social capital associated with the prestige of standardized French, “those who speak vernacular varieties most often accept the symbolic dominance of ‘legitimate speakers’” (p. 105).

This is important to understand, because Quebec’s view of the importance of the French language in society and identity is inextricably linked to the economic and social value placed on the French language internationally. Canada, and more specifically Quebec, fought to raise the linguistic value of French, and particularly, the Canadian version of French. However, Canadian French is facing dilemmas with its “commodification.” According to Heller (2003b), language commodification is the revaluation and measure of linguistic abilities as a valuable skill, as opposed to a talent or characteristic of group members. While revaluating the importance of French skills, Canadian French and “International” French are at odds with one another concerning the legitimate – and more

valuable – version (Heller, 1999b). That is, since competition over belonging in Quebec concerns competition over linguistic and social resources, players participate in the international process of language commodification. The re-evaluation of French language and identity can be seen in Francophone countries around the world, not least of which, France (Boudreau & Dubois, 2007; Moïse, 2007).

Kasuya (2001) explains that French language ideology dates back to the French Revolution with the myth of the “clarté française” and French as the language of civilization. France historically enjoyed economic dominance at the height of its power in the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries. Because of its prestige, the French language was widely used and thought to be one of the most expressive languages in the world. Wright (2004), however, argues that languages have in fact no intrinsic qualities that make them suited to particular domains; these linguistic qualities arise “because the language is used in a wide variety of domains by a large number of speakers. Any language used extensively in these same domains would eventually acquire the same vocabulary and range” (p. 121). After the 19th century, France was eclipsed by English-dominated London and New York, and English became the language of economic power internationally (Wright, 2004). Since this time, much concern has been expressed concerning the future of the French language. In both Quebec and France, the largest perceived threat facing the French language is English as a *lingua franca*.

Wright (2004) argues that, contrary to popular opinion, the French language is not “under attack” by the English language; English has simply “taken

its place” in international settings and networks (p. 132). Borrowings, particularly from English, are natural and not endangering the French language; Wright (2004) argues that the perceived threat posed by the English language relates to the “pain” felt in elite circles of France because English as a *lingua franca* represents France’s fall from political and economic power. Wright (2004) explains, “If the factors for *lingua franca* are present, the language will spread. If not, there is no political action that can replicate them” (p. 134). Language use and spread is only reflective of the power and status of the users of that language (Edwards, 2004).

In Canada, French language legislation has done much to right power imbalances caused by the language rights and privileges. However, there continues to be a great deal of debate as to the status of French in Canada. While some, including Statistics Canada, continue to shed positive light on the use and growth of French in Canada (Anctil, 2007; Létourneau, 2004), others continue to see how census data can be misconstrued or, worse, how particularly on the island of Montréal, French language use seems to be declining (see Cardinal, 2004; Cardinal, 2005; Williams, 2003). Even if some languages are said to be declining, Wright (2004) explains that languages can “do” nothing on their own; it is only the speakers of a language and those who control the speakers’ social conditions who can determine whether or not the language will survive (see also Edwards, 2004; Muehlmann, 2007). In Canada, despite legislative efforts and positive governmental reports, a large number of Francophone observers, including renowned journalists and spokesmen of important lobbying groups, continue to

perceive signs of French language vulnerability in Montreal (Ancil, 2007). More recent Census results will confirm the status of French in Quebec.

For the purposes of this research, the important point is that beliefs about and concerns over the French language abound not just in Quebec, but also internationally (Moïse, 2007). These beliefs form part of French language ideologies, which take shape in discourses.

French Canadian identity discourses

Identity discourses in French Canada (including Quebec) are based, at least in part, on specific understandings of and values ascribed to the French language. As explained previously, Heller (1999b; 1999c; 1999a; 2001; 2003b) and Heller and Labrie (2003) have argued that language has been “commodified,” and present-day identity debates in Canada are based, at least in part, on competition over valuable linguistic and identity resources. Language has become a symbol of authenticity and thus a key to privilege. Since the Quiet Revolution, the Québécois have been able to “accede to internationally recognized power and status, as Francophones” because of the redefined “value of the linguistic capital to which they themselves had privileged access” (Heller, 1999, p. 156). Today, realizing that access to resources can be achieved through linguistic means, those not of ethnic French Canadian descent aim to succeed through their linguistic abilities (Heller, 2003b). Thus, while identity remains a “self-ascribed label” (Henderson, 2007, p. 116), the social value of an identity causes some competition over who is permitted to “self-ascribe” and use certain identity labels.

To review, the debate about identity in Quebec includes debate over the most valued language variety (Canadian French or international French), the distribution of linguistic resources (particularly education), and who is accepted into the community with which identity label. Heller (2003b) explains that today, since neither the state nor the community is in full control of who learns a language, there is no longer a clear connection between language and community membership. This has resulted in competition over who belongs to communities, and why. Therefore, nowadays the understanding of language as a “stand-alone” commodity competes with constructions of language as an either civic or ethnocultural identifier. Heller (2001) has found that specific discourses have emerged in French Canada as a result of the revaluation of linguistic and identity resources.

Heller (2001) and Heller and Labrie (2003) examine discourses of identity, language and nation in French Canada.⁹ Specifically, they have investigated the role played by language in the construction of identities and belonging. They propose three dominant historically and socially-situated identity discourses in French Canada: traditionalist discourse, modernizing discourse, and globalizing discourse.

Traditionalist discourse

The traditionalist identity discourse focuses on a French Canadian identity based on a homogeneous culture and ethnicity centred around the Catholic Church. This

⁹ While the authors focus primarily on the situation in French Ontario and Acadia, they assert that the situation of Quebec, which has strongly invested in the discourse of language-based state nationalism, was the starting point for other areas of French Canada (Heller & Labrie, 2003, p. 14).

discourse conceptualizes French Canadians as a “race,” emphasizing French origins (historical lineage), religious and moral values, linguistic conservatism, and the maintenance of a society distinct from that of the Anglophones (Heller & Labrie, 2003). This discourse emerged after the British conquest of 1763 when the Catholic Church maintained authority over French Canadian society. As Heller (1999a) explains, “The Church felt that one important way to preserve and propagate the faith among the French was to preserve the language and culture; the motto was “*la foi, la race, la langue*” (‘faith, race, language’)” (p. 148). A homogeneous French Canadian culture was fostered in its segregation, and its citizens were resigned towards an oppressed status, dependent not only on the powerhouse Anglophone community (who controlled most of the economy, including in Quebec, until the mid-twentieth century), but also on the bilingual Francophone elite who enjoyed access to the wealth provided by the mediating position between the Anglophones and Francophones (Heller, 1999a; Heller & Labrie, 2003). In other words, the traditionalist discourse served the interests of the Church and the French Canadian elite, when power resided in the collusion with the English and required the submission of the French-speaking masses. This discourse constructs an ethnocultural pan-Canadian French nation.

Modernizing discourse

Modernizing discourse emerged in the wake of the Quiet Revolution in the 1960s with the overall rejection of the Catholic Church. Modernizing discourse emphasized access to modernity associated with a service-based economy, consumer society, and emancipation from traditional moral and religious values

by joining society together through language. No longer dependant on the Catholic Church, French Canadians found themselves empowered with access to a variety of resources that had previously been monopolized by the Church and the Francophone elite. Since the Catholic Church had previously been instrumental in the maintenance of a pan-Canadian French nation, the fall of the Church went hand-in-hand with the division of French Canada into regions; the identity label *French Canadian* began to decline. Quebec, home of the discourse, was (and is) the territory in which French speakers form a majority; as a result, it became the hub of French Canadian identity and its name became synonymous with an empowered identity label: *Québécois*. Although ethnicity was still important to French Canadian identity, it was not central to discussions of belonging to French Canada. In this discourse, French Canadian identity is no longer purely ethnocultural; increasing emphasis is placed on participation in the civic institutions through language.

Globalizing discourse

Nowadays, Heller and Labrie (2003) assert that a new globalizing discourse is emerging; this discourse highlights the role individuals and corporations (rather than nation states) with multiple linguistic and cultural resources will play in the globalizing economy. This discourse draws on the strength of international *Francophonie* with standardized Canadian French, racial and ethnic inclusion, and communication competence.

Heller and Labrie (2003) insist that each discourse (traditionalist, modernizing, and globalizing) privileges similar forms of linguistic and/or

cultural capital, but for different reasons. All of the discourses are further fed by an underlying nationalist ideology centring on language; language remains central in all French Canadian identity discourses, but takes on different social values or meanings. Indeed, the common thread in these three discourses is a social collectivity defined by its “Frenchness” (Heller & Labrie, 2003, p. 16).

Discursive resources

Although the three identity discourses explained above are not necessarily the only ones used by the people of Quebec, they do form part of a “referential system” (Létourneau, 2006) from which individuals can draw to discursively construct their relation with Quebec. Indeed, these discourses could be considered “hegemonic” in that they encompass and perhaps dominate understandings of French Canadian identity. Meinhof and Galasinski (2005) argue that many individuals simply draw on dominant discourses to construct their identity. Létourneau and Ruel (1994) call this “les contours d’un dicible, sinon d’un pensable hégémonique tenant lieu de matrice référentielle pour les interlocuteurs et les participants d’une communauté de communication” (p. 286). Therefore, it may be that these discourses create a sort of referential matrix, restricting and shaping individual conceptualizations of identity. In other words, this may be what Meinhof and Galasiński (2005) call a “grammar of identity,” socially available resources that construct or constrain individuals’ perception of their belonging in society. Stubbs (1996), too, has asserted that “it is highly plausible that if these [language] resources are constantly exploited in recurrent codings, then such ‘semantic orientations’ become salient, and habits of language can

mediate and support thought” (p. 235). Therefore, the power of discourse is such that socially available and hegemonic discourses can affect the ways in which individuals perceive themselves to belong to a group. van Dijk (2003) has gone so far as to say that discursive control can result in mind control, particularly if the available discourses originate from “credible” authoritative sources.

Commissions and discourse formation

Commissions can serve as an authoritative source in the creation of discourse. Commissions are created at times of crisis: Jenson (1994) indicates that commissions are created at moments when “established intellectual and policy paradigms are being challenged or seem no longer to work” (p. 46); Ashforth (1990) finds that commissions are created “during a crisis of legitimacy for State power” (p. 4). For example, Létourneau and Ruel (1994) found that the Bélanger-Campeau Commission on the Political and Constitutional Future of Quebec (1990-1991) was created in part because of social restructuring, identity anxiety, and a fractionalization of understandings of belonging in Quebec. They explain that the historical “grand récit collectif” of Quebec did not include all members of society, and led to problematic perceptions of membership (p. 284). Commissions are created for the purpose of (re)establishing social harmony; that harmony is achieved, at least in part, through the establishment of a common discourse (Ashforth, 1990). A crisis is precisely that which occurred in Quebec during 2006-2007. The Charest government formed the Bouchard Taylor Commission in response to growing discontent, both highlighted and fuelled by the media, concerning the “reasonable accommodation” of minority and immigrant groups in

the province. I argue that this discontent was largely caused by conflicting versions of belonging in the province, as articulated in different discourses.

Jenson (1994) explains that, since the nineteenth century, governments have used commissions as a way to conduct inquiries into major questions of controversy, and to provide policy recommendations based on the inquiry. The means of inquiry have traditionally been public hearings and legal expertise, and the breadth of inquiry has come to mean that royal commissions have become major supporters and funders of research. In the case of the Bouchard Taylor Commission, the research is the investigation of public opinion concerning reasonable accommodation in Quebec. However, underlying this specific topic of reasonable accommodation are the “norms” of Quebec society: the question is whose “norms” belong in Quebec and whose do not, and therefore, who belongs in Quebec, because those who do not belong require accommodation.

According to Ashforth (1990), commissions not only inform the government of public opinion, they also shape public opinion: they serve to educate and inform on both sides of the public-politic dichotomy. The question of education and information is key, because Jenson (1994) argues that there is no “one” answer or approach to any given problem, and “neither the intervenors at public hearings nor the research studies can present ‘the answer’” (p. 42). Commissions, as public institutions, are key in providing and shaping public understanding and representations and have an important impact on the development and promotion of ideas about possible policies, interests, and identities (Jenson, 1994). Commissions are also created to indicate that the

government is in tune with public discourse. Through the commission process, official political discourse is replenished by public input; this replenishment is essential for the continuing vitality of official discourse. Nevertheless, Ashforth (1990) emphasizes that this replenishing of official discourse is not as important as a commission's role in the *constitution of a whole new form of discourse* that celebrates a "marriage of truth and power in the modern state" (p. 4). This is a discourse, perhaps, that unites the public under the umbrella of a new, common discourse that works toward social harmony.

According to Ashforth (1990), commission institutional processes usually take place in three phases: the investigative, the persuasive, and the archival. The first phase is the investigation, where the commission performs the inquiry into public opinion. The investigation is where the commission acts as a theatre in which the public "truth" is played out before an audience. The second phase, the persuasive, is the report that seeks to persuade the public of its truth. The truth is the creation of a new (or privileging of a single) discourse within the commission report. The third phase, the archival, is the "product of a search for the truth" (Ashforth, 1990, p. 9), where the "facts" uncovered by the commission enter into history as a reference, or a referential system. As a result, a discursive framework is created for State power "allowing 'the State' to sit above 'Society' as the embodiment of the 'common good'" (Ashforth, 1990, p. 12). It is thus through a commission that a new discourse can be formed with two primary effects: 1) the new discourse promotes social harmony by integrating the perspectives of the commission participants; and 2) the state maintains its power in society from

having been legitimated by the commission process and because the powerful new discourse comes from the government, as informed by the people through the vein of the commission.

The Bouchard Taylor Commission

On February 8, 2007, Quebec Premier Jean Charest announced the establishment of the Consultation Commission on Accommodation Practices Related to Cultural Differences, more commonly known as the Bouchard Taylor Commission (Consultation Commission, 2007a, p. 14). This Commission was established in response to public discontent concerning reasonable accommodation in Quebec, particularly the religious and cultural accommodation of immigrant and minority groups. The Commission had the task of performing public consultations across Quebec and soliciting public opinion on reasonable accommodation. Institutions, groups, and individuals from all regions of Quebec could participate in the Commission in either English or French through three different methods: they could testify before the Commission during a public hearing, participate in informal a regional citizens' forum, or write a "brief."

The form and content of briefs were open to interpretation. According to the Participant Guide (Consultation Commission, 2007b), the briefs could express opinions or concerns about the themes listed in the Consultation Document (2007a), or the participant's personal experience of cultural differences. Participants could also examine other themes that they deemed relevant. The Guide explains that briefs must not exceed 15 pages, and "generally speaking" must include a title, a presentation of the individual or group presenting the brief,

an explanation of interest in the consultation topic, the presentation of “viewpoints pertaining to themes examined in the consultation document,” and “any other comment related to the topic” (p. 6). Despite the flexibility of the requirements, the few criteria were not strictly followed, as briefs ranged in length, and many briefs were not submitted in the required Microsoft Word, Excel, Powerpoint, or PDF format.

The Commission submitted its final report in May 2008. The report contained recommendations to the Premier, and these recommendations were based in part on the over 900 briefs submitted to the Bouchard Taylor Commission. These briefs are used as data for this thesis’ investigation of the role of language in the discursive construction of belonging in Quebec.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The objective of this thesis is to see how identity is discursively constructed and linked to language in Quebec. The Bouchard Taylor Commission briefs are used as data in this study; they are analysed using corpus analysis tools and discourse analysis in an approach called a *corpus-assisted discourse study*. This chapter first outlines the tools and benefits of corpus linguistics; then it introduces the specific critical discourse analysis approach adopted to complement the corpus analysis. Following this, I explain the ways in which the two forms of analysis can be complementary. Finally, I present the specific procedure undertaken for the analysis of my data.

Corpus Linguistics

One of the most important steps in the analysis of the Commission briefs is the ability to look for commonalities across large amounts of data. For this, the tools of corpus linguistics are invaluable. Corpus linguistics refers to a branch of linguistics that deals with large bodies of “electronically-stored, naturally occurring texts” (Baker et al., 2008, p. 274) and “computational procedures which manipulate this data in various ways” (Baker, 2006, p. 1). Indeed, some argue that corpus linguistics is not a branch of linguistics, but a “methodology that might be used in all branches of linguistics” (Bauer & Aarts, 2000, p. 25).¹⁰ Corpus analysis is valuable because it reveals trends in language that may not be apparent through any other means.

¹⁰ See also McEnery and Wilson, 2001.

In corpus linguistics, a “text” is “any stretch of naturally occurring language in use, spoken or written, which has been produced, independently of the analyst, for some real communicative purpose” (Stubbs, 2003, p. 305). When compiled into a collection that is computer readable, these texts become a corpus. Corpora can range in size, but they are generally large, containing up to hundreds of millions of running words, or “tokens” (Stubbs, 2003, p. 305). Due to the potential size of the corpora, a common misconception is that corpus linguistics relies on primarily quantitative techniques; however, new research (Baker et al., 2008; Lee, 2008) has shown that corpus linguistics in fact relies on both quantitative and qualitative procedures.

Corpus building

Some critics have argued that corpus linguistics fails to contextualize its data and that, due to the size of most corpora, researchers are unfamiliar with their own data (see Baker, 2006; Baker et al., 2008; Stubbs, 2001). Baker (2006) counters this critique with the recommendation that researchers build their own corpora. Through the process of finding and selecting which texts will go into the corpus, the researcher may familiarize him or herself with the context and the data (Baker, 2006). In other words, in the construction of the corpus, a researcher normally must delve into the situation in which the texts were produced; in this search for texts, the researcher will become familiarized with the data. Baker (2006) further explains that corpus building can allow the researcher to create *specialized corpora* in order to study certain phenomena in the language. This can be done, he explains, by selectively “only choosing texts which refer to a certain topic”

(Baker, 2006, p. 26) in order to increase the quality or content of the data in the corpus. In contrast, a *reference corpus* is a large corpus of millions of words from a variety of text genres that is “representative of a particular language variety” (Baker, 2006, p. 30).

This study will be using specialized corpora (English and French). They are specialized because all of the texts can be found in the same location (on the Commission’s website) and, in principle, they were written for the same purpose and deal with the same topic as designated by the Commission’s Participant Guide (2007b). No sample was selected from among these texts, because the aim of this project is to examine a spectrum of voices across Quebec: elimination of any of the briefs could have meant distorting the data that the Commission had collected and thus the voices of the participants. The goal is, again, to uncover how language is linked to identity in Quebec popular discourse; to accomplish this goal, these fairly large and pan-Quebec corpora are necessary.

Corpus tools

Corpus analysis is useful because it allows for trends to be studied across large bodies of authentic language. These trends can be examined using the tools available within corpus database programs. This project will be focusing primarily on tools available through Mike Scott’s WordSmith program (version 4.0), a widely-used program among linguistic researchers. Central amongst WordSmith tools are frequency, dispersion plots, concordances, collocation, and keyness. Since these tools are critical to an understanding of my corpus-assisted analysis, they will be explained in the subsequent pages.

Frequency and dispersion

Words can be compiled in a list according to their frequency. Frequency lists show words that occur regularly (or irregularly) across a corpus. Frequent words indicate lexical choices that writers or speakers have made (or avoided) in their texts; therefore, they suggest the subject matter of the texts. Furthermore, if writers or speakers make unusual word choices, Baker (2006) explains, “then that reveals something about their intentions, whether conscious or not” (p. 48). Dispersion plots can determine where specific words are located, and whether they are clumped together in a passage or a section that may be rich in examples.

Frequency lists have led to the common misconception of corpus linguistics as being purely quantitative. They can oversimplify, reduce and generalize the data. The patterns that are “revealed” may be nothing more than probabilistic semantic patterns beyond the control of individual speakers or writers, or rules at the basis of all languages (Baker, 2006; Stubbs, 2001). Still, individuals retain a certain amount of freedom of choice in their language use. Biber et al. (2002) explain that linguistic patterns rely on choices, and these choices can only be understood through human interpretation:

Information about frequency needs to be explained by human interpreters. That is, a corpus grammar needs to present evidence of the corpus as a means of exploring *why* users of English make one choice in one situation, and a different choice in another.
(p. 3-4)

Therefore, frequency lists, when used properly and contextualized, can provide invaluable insight into the “sociological profile of a given word or phrase

enabling greater understanding of its use in particular contexts” (Baker, 2006, p. 47). Stubbs (2007) explains that many words are frequent because they occur in frequent phrases; phrases, in turn, are frequent because they are conventional ways of expressing common meaning. Frequent phrases express information that is essential for understanding connected discourse. Frequency can affect reader or listener interpretation, particularly when repeated over time (Stubbs, 2001).

The importance of repetition is central to my research. I am interested in uncovering how the repetition of specific terms and phrases may be indicative of identity discourses in the province. Meinhof and Galansinski (2005) explain that, “when negotiating their identities, social actors are prone to use certain linguistic clusters” (p. 51). It is my belief that identity-related linguistic clusters will be evident through corpus frequency patterns. Once frequent words are established, the context surrounding these words can be examined by analyzing their collocates and concordances.

Concordances, semantic preference and discourse prosody

Concordances are words in their original textual context. A concordance list includes all the occurrences of a particular search term in a corpus; these occurrences are presented within the “co-text,” or the context of words in which they occur, which is usually a few words to the left and right of the search term. This is useful for understanding how speakers or writers use certain words and phrases, and whether there are patterns across the corpus (Stubbs, 1996). Expanded concordances can also provide contextual elements that allow researchers to recreate the context of the word in question (Baker et al., 2008).

For my research, I will investigate certain identity and/or language-related words, and then examine the specific context of the word in the form of concordance lines.

The context surrounding a word may reveal the “semantic preference” of a given word. This refers to the relation between a word and a set of semantically related words (Stubbs, 2001). In principle, semantic preference is independent of a speaker’s or writer’s attitudes or opinions towards a subject; it simply refers to semantic categories. However, semantic preference is related to “discourse prosody,” which refers to where repeated co-text around a word is thought to suggest a speaker’s or writer’s attitude towards the topic, or even a discourse (Baker, 2006; Stubbs, 2003). Determining the difference between semantic preference and discourse prosody is a question of researcher judgment. In my study, interpreting discourse prosody will be part of determining the discursive construction of national identity.

Collocation

Collocation refers to two or more words that frequently co-occur. It can refer to a word that comes before or after a search term, and can occur frequently or infrequently. In WordSmith, by default, a “collocate” refers to words that occur within five words to the left or the right of a search term. Related to collocates are “clusters”; WordSmith, by default, considers “clusters” three words that frequently cluster together in the same form and order. Frequent patterns of collocation are important, since you can understand a great deal about a word “from the company it keeps” (Firth, 1957, cited in Baker, 2006, p. 96).

Researchers may find meaning not just in words that are obviously ideologically loaded, but also in combinations of very frequent words (Stubbs, 2003). Baker (2006) explains, “When two words frequently collocate, there is evidence that the discourses surrounding them are particularly powerful – the strength of collocation implies that these are two concepts which have been linked in the minds of people and have been used again and again” (p. 114). Collocations are invaluable to my study because I am interested in investigating how participants in the Bouchard Taylor Commission consciously or unconsciously associate topics (as determined by keywords), such as language and identity; this linking will be evident in linguistic collocations. To investigate these collocations, I will adapt Baker’s (2006) guide to collocational analysis (p. 119-120, see Appendix I).

Keyness and keywords

One of the most important tools in corpus analysis is keyness. WordSmith (version 4.0) determines keyness by comparing a specialized corpus with another corpus, usually a larger corpus. The corpus against which the specialized corpus is compared can be chosen in accordance with the researcher’s objectives: often, a reference corpus is chosen because it is supposed to be “representative” of a language dialect or subset. When the two corpora are compared, the “keywords” are the words of statistically significant higher frequency in the specialized corpus in comparison with the other corpus. WordSmith accomplishes the comparison by taking into account the size of each corpus and the frequencies of each word within it; then, WordSmith carries out statistical tests on each word (chi-squared or log-likelihood test) to determine a probability value for each word. This

probability (or p) value indicates the probability or likelihood that an individual word has occurred due to chance alone (Baker, 2006). The researcher establishes how low the p value must be for a word to be labelled as “key”; however, WordSmith uses a default $p < 0.000001$ (Baker, 2006). For the purposes of this thesis, the term “keyword” refers specifically to the words on the “keyword list” compiled by WordSmith on the basis of “keyness scores”: “keywords” are therefore statistically significant words.

When examining what meanings may underlie certain word choices, it is important to determine whether or not the given word is of statistical significance. If a word is frequent within a specialized corpus but *not* of statistical significance, then it would be hard to argue that the word is indicative of any underlying values or ideologies of the language user; perhaps the word is simply commonly used in that particular language. Baker (2006) explains, “the smaller the p value, the more likely that the word’s strong presence in [the corpus] isn’t due to chance but a result of the author’s (conscious or subconscious) choice to use that word repeatedly” (p. 125).

Advantages of corpus analysis tools

Corpora and corpus analysis tools present a number of advantages. First, corpora allow researchers to work with authentic, naturally-occurring language data, providing insight into how language is actually used by speakers and writers. Stubbs (2001) explains, “Long before corpus linguistics, we knew that people do not talk as they believe they do, and corpus linguistics now often point out how radically intuition and use may diverge” (p. 151). Second, keyword, collocation

and frequency tools help to identify underlying identity discourses in the Commission data. Third, corpus analysis tools help to reduce researcher bias and reveal phenomena that may not be initially evident to the researcher. Baker et al. (2008) argue that corpus methods allow the researcher a “reasonably high degree of objectivity”; they enable the researcher to approach texts relatively free “from any preconceived or existing notions regarding their linguistic or semantic/pragmatic content” (p. 277). Baker (2006) explains that, despite ourselves, we may be “biased in ways which have nothing to do with who we are but ... with the way that human beings process information” (p. 11). The tools of corpus linguistics provide access to huge amounts of information and may reveal trends and patterns invisible to the eye in small-scale. In my corpus, these tools may prove to be valuable in revealing patterns of linkage between Quebec identity and language that otherwise would have escaped notice.

Limitations of corpus linguistics

Corpus linguistics is largely misunderstood, particularly when it attempts to enter into the realm of discourse analysis. As previously mentioned, one of the frequent criticisms is that corpus linguistics disregards context (Widdowson, 2000; Baker, 2006; Baker et al., 2008; Stubbs, 2001; Stubbs 1997). However Stubbs (2001) refutes this, arguing that corpus linguistics is “essentially a theory of context: the essential tool is the concordance, where words are always studied in their contexts” (p. 157). Researchers continue to debate how much context is necessary to establish the meaning of a word in a text. Baker et al. (2008) argue: “During language communication, addressees do not need to take the full context into

account, as according to the principle of local interpretation, addressees need not construct a content more complex than that needed for interpretation” (p. 279). Indeed, the term “context” can be open to interpretation; Scott and Tribble (2006) differentiate between multiple layers, or “scopes,” of context that range from individual words to the context of culture in which the text was written (p. 9). For the purposes of this study, different “scopes” of context will be considered for different parts of the analysis; while the corpus analysis will consider the scope of words in their immediate collocation and concordance contexts, critical discourse analysis will examine entire texts within their sociopolitical and historical contexts.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a form of discourse analysis that developed in the 1970s as an interdisciplinary research area with a concern for issues of power as connected to language use. Nowadays, Baker et al. (2008) explain, “CDA provides a general framework for problem-oriented social research” (p. 279). In CDA, language is regarded as “social practice” and the context in which language is used is considered critical for understanding the way language is to be understood (Wodak, 2001b, p. 1). Context is important because discourses are considered “socially constituted and socially constitutive” (Bishop & Jaworski, 2003, p. 246). More specifically, context is considered in relation to three central areas: power, history, and ideology (Wodak, 2001b), each influences the ways in which texts are produced and received in society.

Social power

Social power refers to the ability to access socially valued resources; one of these resources is the tool of persuasion, such as the ability to impose a discourse.

Ricento (2003) explains, “one of the major functions of dominant discourse ... is to manufacture consensus about and acceptance of their dominance” (p. 615). In other words, to have power is to impose discourses that legitimize and propagate that power; as Wodak (2001b) explains, “discourse is structured by dominance” (p. 3). For example, Chapter 2, the Literature Review, explained how three different French Canadian identity discourses can be associated with three different power structures in Quebec. The traditionalist discourse dominated pre-1960s, when the clergy held power and maintained that discourse. Subsequently, a new group rose to power during the Quiet Revolution, producing a modernizing discourse. Finally, a new elite has been created in Quebec as a result of commodified linguistic and culture resources. This group has promoted the new globalizing discourse (Heller, 2003b; Heller, 2001).

History

Historical context is of interest to a vein of CDA called the *Discourse-Historical* approach (Wodak, 2001a). This approach highlights the historical context surrounding texts, because historical context is considered to be central in the construction of discourses. As shown in the past section, each period in Quebec’s history appears to be dominated by an identity discourse that reflects the interests of the dominant group at the time. As I investigate the Commission briefs, I will

attempt to reveal how Quebec's history may have given rise to discourses in the briefs.

Ideology

In CDA, ideologies are “a set of shared beliefs, attitudes, values, categories and representations which combine to make the social world appear, to those who inhabit it (and consequently reproduce it), natural and unproblematic” (Bishop & Jaworski, 2003, p. 246-7). Ideologies mask societal power structures, making them appear as a “given.” CDA considers that language use both reflects and produces ideologies in society (Baker et al., 2008).

Intertextuality and interdiscursivity

Contextual factors impacting language use include history, power and ideology; these can be manifest in texts. The ways in which an individual adopts the words, phrases, and even discourses surrounding him or her can show how context impacts language use. Thus, considering context requires considering the intertextual and interdiscursive relationships between words, texts and discourses (Wodak, 2001a).

Fairclough (2003) explains that intertextuality is the way in which texts inevitably draw upon each other:

texts draw upon, incorporate, recontextualize and dialogue with other texts. It is also partly a matter of the assumptions and presuppositions people make when they speak or write. (p. 17)

Investigating intertextuality involves determining which words and phrases reflect the impact of a power structure or specific ideologies acting upon a language user.

This requires the integration of social and political background knowledge into discourse analysis (Wodak, 2001a). This background is important because “text producers use allusions which readers can only understand if they know the objects or background which are referred to” (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p. 266). Thus, to uncover meaning in a text, it is necessary to understand that which it is drawing on intertextually.

Interdiscursivity refers to the various discourses consciously or unconsciously drawn upon within a single text (Baker et al., 2008).

Interdiscursivity in the Commission briefs may be of interest if the authors are found to be drawing on traditionalist, modernizing or globalizing French Canadian identity discourses, as identified by Heller (2001). Although each French Canadian identity discourse is anchored in specific socio-historical conditions, Heller (2001) explains, “all three are present today in francophone discursive space” (p. 123).

There are a variety of approaches to CDA. In this thesis, I adopt the discourse-historical approach to critical discourse analysis developed by Wodak et al. (1999) to investigate the discursive construction of national identity (see Appendix II). In addition, I draw on van Dijk’s (2001) “macropropositions” and Fairclough’s (2003) approach to interdiscursivity and intertextuality. These approaches will be explained in further detail as they are used in the analysis.

Critiques of CDA

Although CDA offers important contributions to the field of discourse analysis, there are many critiques. Stubbs (1997) explains that CDA has been criticized

because it largely searches out what it intends to find (p. 106); Baker et al. (2008) add that some CDA practitioners “could be accused of selecting texts which they either incorrectly believe to be representative or have been chosen in order to ‘prove a point’” (p. 283). Stubbs (1997) also finds that CDA methods of data collection and text analysis are implicit, its data are often restricted to text fragments, and that it is conceptually circular. He argues, “CDA has no theory as to how frequency and repetition relate to the naturalization of ideas” (p. 105). Although CDA scholars have responded to these criticisms (see for example Toolan, 1997), it has still been suggested that CDA “could benefit from a closer integration with new developments” (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000, p. 447). Stubbs (1997) argues that CDA studies could be strengthened by, among other things, comparative and quantitative methods, in particular the use of corpora. Indeed, it seems that the lingering criticisms could be addressed by corpus-assisted discourse studies (CADS), using corpus linguistics and the discourse-historical approach to CDA.

Combination of two methods: corpus assisted discourse studies

I have followed Baker et al. (2008) and de Cillia et al. (1999) for an “eclectic approach” (Baker, 2006, p. 16) to my research, where my results are triangulated through different methods (Baker, 2006). This approach combines the strengths of corpus linguistics with the strengths of discourse analysis, more specifically, the discourse-historical approach of CDA (Baker et al., 2008; de Cillia et al., 1999).

Recent research has shown how corpus analysis (previously understood as purely quantitative) and discourse analysis (previously understood as purely

qualitative) can be combined to demonstrate how a large body of texts can exhibit common discursive tendencies (Baker, 2006; Baker et al., 2008; Lee, 2008; Seale, 2003; Stubbs, 1996, 1997, 2003, 2007). Results of such research can demonstrate common traits across populations as large as the corpus sample, whereas in the past, discourse analysis would have studied such phenomena with only small-scale samples.

Three ways of using corpora for discourse analysis

Discourse analysis can draw on corpora in three core ways (Lee, 2008): mainly quantitative, mainly qualitative, and a middle-ground approach. Mainly quantitative corpus research uses corpus data as the basis for studies; Lee (2008) calls this *corpus-induced* (p. 88). Mainly qualitative corpus studies use corpus data (such as frequency) to complement qualitative findings; this type of research is called *corpus-informed*. Finally, between these two poles, *corpus-supported* research uses corpora to support “prior linguistic intuitions or theoretical frameworks” (Lee, 2008, p. 88). My project could be called “corpus-supported”; however, because I follow Baker et al.’s (2008) design so closely, I have adopted their term “corpus-assisted” discourse study, henceforth referred to as CADS.

Benefits and limitations of CADS

Combined corpus and discourse analysis techniques provide a number of benefits: namely, larger, more diverse and representative data types; verifiable results; quantitative and empirically-based information about frequency, typicality, and idiomaticity; easier computerized coding, retrieval and analysis; and “bolder, fresher, data-driven observations and hypotheses about language” (Lee, 2008,

pp. 92-3). Baker et al. (2008) explain that CADS offers researchers a “reasonably high degree of objectivity ... (relatively) free from any preconceived or existing notions regarding their linguistic or semantic/pragmatic content” (p. 277).

McEnery and Wilson (2001) explain, in corpus linguistics “Qualitative analysis can provide greater richness and precision, whereas quantitative analysis can provide statistically reliable and generalisable results” (p. 77).

Corpus analysis still requires considerable researcher input. For example, researchers must decide what texts should go in the corpus, and what is to be analysed. The researcher must then decide which corpus tools are to be applied to the data, and what the ‘cut-off’ points of statistical significance should be (Baker et al., 2008, p. 277). Baker et al. assert that a combination of CDA and corpus analysis in the form of CADS can help to exploit the strong points of each approach. Corpus analysis can perform large-scale data analysis using keyword, concordance, and cluster analysis; from dispersion plots, the researcher can downsample in order to select certain texts for close analysis; the texts may be selected for their high concentration of keywords (Baker et al., 2008, p. 284-5). All of these tools can be used to investigate “hegemonic discourses or majority ‘common-sense’ ways of viewing the world” (Baker, 2006, p. 14).

Using this CADS framework, I intend to examine which identity discourses exist, particularly those with reference to language, within my corpora of 703 French and 38 English briefs. CADS has already been used in identity research; for example, Seale (2003) used corpora and other computer-mediated tools to examine discursive identity construction in cancer patients (Seale, 2003);

also, Fägersten (2008) used corpora in her study of hip-hop identities as represented in online postings (Fägersten, 2008); finally, Baker et al.'s (2008) CADS study examines the representation of refugees and asylum-seekers in contrast with national homogeneity in the UK.

Now that I have summarized the tenets and benefits of my selected methodology, I will outline the specific procedure used to analyse the data from the Commission.

Procedure

This project draws on a French corpus of 703 briefs and an English corpus of 38 briefs. These briefs come from the over 900 briefs submitted to the Commission. In order to analyse the data, my procedure involves the compilation of corpora, the compilation of frequency lists, and the establishment of keyword lists (which required the compilation of comparator corpora). Once this was complete, I was able to analyse keywords and collocates; then I was able to analyse the dispersion plots and downsample in order to analyse the texts using critical discourse analysis. Each step is described below.

Step 1: Compilation of corpora

Although over 900 briefs were submitted to the Commission (Consultation Commission, 2008, p. 18), only 815 are available on the Documentation section of the Commission's website. Of these 815 briefs, many were hand-written, and therefore only 741 briefs were convertible into the required text-only (.txt) format: these are the briefs used as data for this study. They were downloaded in PDF format and then systematically converted into text-only (.txt) format. Since six

million mother tongue French speakers in Quebec outnumber the 575, 555 English mother tongue speakers (Statistics Canada 2006), the majority of briefs were submitted in French. The French corpus, named the “FrenchBT corpus,” consists of 703 texts with a total of 2 659 806 words. This corpus serves as the primary data for this study. English texts serve as a secondary corpus (henceforth referred to as the EnglishBT corpus), containing 38 texts and 102863 words.

Step 2: Compilation of frequency lists

After compiling the corpora, the next step was to use WordSmith to compute frequency lists for each corpus. Once the most frequent words were established, I could determine whether or not frequent words were of interest to my study. Words of interest were words related to the discursive construction of national identity and language; these were established by drawing on Wodak, de Cillia, Reisgl, and Leibhart’s (1999) approach. However, frequent words alone are inadequate for determining linguistic or discursive trends; it is important to determine if words of interest are statistically significant (“key”) in order to see if they are being used in discursive constructions.

Step 3: Establishment of FrenchBT corpus keyword list

In order to determine the significance of words within a corpus, it is necessary to compare the corpus in question with a different corpus, typically a *reference corpus*: a large sample of electronic language data that is representative of language use. In English, reference corpora include the British National Corpus (BNC), the American National Corpus, the Bank of English (BoE), the Brown corpus, the Lancaster/ Oslo/ Bergen (LOB) corpus, and the Freiberg-Brown

(FROWN) corpus (Baker, 2006). In French, there is no such large-scale reference corpus. Anderson (2006) lists various French-language corpora, such as the Aarhus Corpus of Contract Law (Danish, English and French), the Canadian Hansard Corpus (English and French), the CRATER corpus (French, English and Spanish), and the European Corpus Initiative corpus (French journalistic texts). For spoken corpora, there is the *Corpus d'Orléans*, the *Dictionnaire du français fondamental*, and the *Groupe Aixois de Recherches en Syntaxe* (GARS). The closest equivalent to a large-scale reference corpus is FRANTEXT, a full-text database of classical French writing including literature, non-fiction and technical writing (W. J. Anderson, 2006). Still, FRANTEXT primarily contains literature from France: it does not adequately serve the needs of my research project, because my corpus consists of non-literary texts from Canada.

To overcome the lack of a suitable French reference corpus, I followed Anderson's (2006) procedure: I compiled a "comparator" corpus in order to perform a keyword analysis of my FrenchBT corpus. A comparator corpus differs from a reference corpus in that it does not claim representation the way a reference corpus might. A comparator corpus serves only to "provide a point of reference" (W. J. Anderson, 2006, p. 92) beyond the register and genre of my specialized (French) corpus. In this way, I was able to compare the FrenchBT corpus to a broader sample of language use taken from a variety of sources.

Step 4: Compilation of a French Comparator Corpus

The comparator corpus I designed consists of 1 741 299 words. This is approximately two-thirds the size of the FrenchBT corpus. Ideally, a comparator

corpus would be of equal size or larger than the specialized corpus; however, given the size of the FrenchBT corpus and the restraints placed upon this project, a larger corpus could not be compiled. For the purposes of this project, the importance is that the comparator corpus contains a similar number of word *types*, or distinct words, as the FrenchBT corpus. The FrenchBT corpus consists of 55 733-word types, compared to 56 819 in the comparator corpus (as seen in Table 1). Thus, while the FrenchBT corpus is 1.5 times larger than the comparator corpus, the FrenchBT corpus contains more repetition of a certain number of word *types*.

Comparator corpus		FrenchBT corpus	
text file	Overall	text file	Overall
file size	10382881	file size	16099835
tokens used for word list	1679551	tokens used for word list	2612450
types (distinct words)	56819	types (distinct words)	55733
type/token ratio (TTR)	3.382	type/token ratio (TTR)	2
standardised TTR	30.639	standardised TTR	41.82
standardised TTR std.dev.	69.756	standardised TTR std.dev.	57.41
mean word length (in characters)	4.805	mean word length (in characters)	5
word length std.dev.	2.766	word length std.dev.	3.22

Table 1: FrenchBT corpus and Comparator corpus statistics compared

The comparator corpus is two-thirds the size of the FrenchBT corpus in tokens, but of a similar size in word types. As Baker (2006) explains, “as the size of a corpus grows, the type/token ratio will almost always shrink, because high frequency grammatical words like *the* and *to* tend to be repeated no matter what the size of the corpus is. Because of this, large corpora almost always have very low type/token ratios” (p. 52).

The comparator corpus consists of written texts; written texts alone were selected because of the written nature of the briefs that constitute the FrenchBT

corpus. It was desirable to compare written texts with written texts in order to obtain the most meaningful keyness scores. The sources for the comparator corpus come from five principal areas: academic writing, literature, online blogs, news media, and political sources. For academic writing, texts were taken from academic journals, university websites, and alumni magazines. Literature sources were extracted from the FRANTEXT database. A random selection of online blogs was found from internet searches, and includes a variety of sources including “livejournal”-style blogging, Youtube commentary, and newspaper commentary. News media texts were taken from a variety of French Canadian newspapers over the past year. Finally, political texts were extracted from political websites, and include party updates, political speeches, and election campaigning. The resulting corpus is one that provides a broad sample of the way the French language is used in writing, principally in Canada, but also internationally.¹¹ Unlike the FrenchBT corpus, the comparator corpus did not focus on a single topic related to the Commission.

Step 5: Establishment of EnglishBT corpus keyword list

A keyword list for the EnglishBT corpus was initially compiled using the British National Corpus (BNC) as a reference corpus. However, it quickly became evident that using the BNC as a reference corpus resulted in a keyword list substantially different from the French keyword list. Differences between the English and French keyword lists were to be expected; however, some fundamental problems resulted from an initial comparison of the two. The

¹¹ The literature was primarily French, and the blogs and academic sources may have originated from any French-speakers around the world.

English-BNC keyword list¹² contained significantly more grammatical words than that of the French keyword list.

As stated above, the French keyword list was compiled with a comparator corpus two-thirds the size of the FrenchBT corpus. If, when a corpus size increases we can expect to find a larger number of grammatical words, then the size of a corpus used for comparison may affect keyness. Keyness is determined by comparing the frequencies in one wordlist with the frequencies of another in order to assess which words occur statistically more often. In order to determine this, the frequency of a word is compared with the overall size of the corpus; the results are statistically tested to determine whether differences between expected and observed frequencies might have occurred by chance alone. The results of the English-BNC keyword compilation suggest that if the reference corpus is considerably larger than the sub-corpus, then grammatical words occur more frequently in comparison to the overall size of the corpus. In contrast, if a smaller corpus is used for comparison, grammatical words may occur in proportions more comparable to these in the corpus under analysis. Therefore, differences between the relative frequencies of grammatical words can be expected between the two corpora. These differences can be expected not only because of the higher proportion of grammatical words in the reference corpus, but also because the BNC is much more diverse in registers, modes, and genres than the corpus of Commission briefs, which contains only briefs (presumably one genre, one register and one mode). The variability in grammatical words can explain to some

¹² The keyword list compiled with the English corpus and the BNC as a reference corpus of oral and written English.

extent why the English-BNC keyword list contains significantly more grammatical words than the French keyword list. Since the comparability of keyness in French, using the comparator corpus, and in English using the BNC, was questionable, I compiled an English comparator corpus to see if it would yield a keyword list similar to the FrenchBT keyword list (also compiled with a comparator corpus).

Step 6: Compilation of English Comparator Corpora

In order to further assess the impact of corpus size on the computation of keyword lists, two separate English comparator corpora were compiled. One comparator corpus (comparator TOKEN) was compiled with the aim of having a similar number of tokens as the EnglishBT corpus. Another English comparator corpus (TYPE) had a similar number of word “types” as the EnglishBT corpus.

English comparator TOKEN	Overall	academic corpus	literature corpus	news corpus	political corpus	blog corpus
tokens (running words) in text	103028	6847	70423	12195	4309	9254
% of subcorpus in comparator corpus	100	6.64	68.35	11.83	4.18	8.98
French comparator corpus	Overall	academic corpus	literature corpus	news corpus	political corpus	blog corpus
tokens (running words) in text	17412	124692	1187173	201453	68698	159283
% of subcorpus in comparator corpus	100	7.16	68.17	11.56	3.94	9.14
English comparator TYPE	Overall	academic corpus	literature corpus	news corpus	political corpus	blog corpus
tokens (running words) in text	72740	6657	48060	8149	2450	7424
% of subcorpus in comparator corpus	100	9.15	66.07	11.20	3.36	10.20

Table 2: English comparator TYPE and comparator TOKEN compared with French comparator corpus

Both English comparator corpora were compiled with a composition similar to that of the French comparator corpus, namely, written texts from academia,

literature, politics, news media, and online blogs in similar proportions (see Table 2).

Baker's (2006) type/token ratio claims are fully substantiated by the comparison of these corpora. Comparator TYPE contained the highest type/token ratio, and it is the smallest corpus, whereas the largest corpus, the FrenchBT corpus, contained the lowest type/token ratio.

	FrenchBT corpus	French comparator corpus	EnglishBT corpus	English TOKEN comparator corpus	English TYPE comparator corpus
Tokens	2659822	1741299	102863	103028	72740
Types	55726	56819	9605	11768	9474
Type/token ratio	2	3	10	12	13

Table 3: Corpus size and type/token ratios compared between corpora

This comparison of comparator corpora also allowed me to examine why grammatical words were so frequent in the English-BNC keyword list. Both English keyword lists (one compiled with the English-TOKEN corpus, the other with English-TYPE) contain a much smaller number of grammatical words than the English-BNC keyword list: they are similar to the French keyword list. In other words, the smaller the comparison corpus, the smaller the number of grammatical words in the respective keyword list.

	FrenchBT corpus	Comparator TOKEN	Comparator TYPE	BNC- Comparator
# grammatical words/ top 50 keywords	13	11	9	36

Table 4: Grammatical words compared in keyword lists

Also of note is a comparison between the keywords in each of the English keyword lists. If the grammatical words are removed from the keyword lists compiled with the BNC, TOKEN and TYPE comparator corpora, then remarkably

similar keyword lists emerge. Regardless of which comparator/reference corpus was used, all three keyword lists in English contain more or less the same “lexical” (non-grammatical) words; therefore, these words of interest are indeed “key.” Most of the keywords in each list also occur in close ranking with the same keywords in the other lists. Indeed, the highest ranked lexical keywords are the same across all three keyword lists (see Table 7).

One crucial difference between the three comparator corpora are their keyness scores. Keyness scores serve as indicators of a word’s significance within a corpus; however, it is impossible to compare keyness scores across different corpora, particularly if each corpus’ keyword list draws on a different comparator corpus. We can see that *Quebec*, *society* and *religion* are the top three keywords in each of the keyword lists generated when the BNC and the two comparator corpora are used for comparison. *Québec*, *société* and *religion* are also the top three keywords on the list generated by comparing the FrenchBT corpus against the French comparator corpus (see Appendix V). However, each keyness score is considerably different, and it would be unreasonable to compare them.

keyword	BNC keyness score	TYPE keyness score	TOKENS keyness score	French comparator keyword list	Keyness
QUEBEC	3227.426	707.6075	637.1941	QUÉBEC	6735.771
SOCIETY	1999.061	455.1692	336.4023	SOCIÉTÉ	5217.296
RELIGIOUS	1266.977	345.7841	257.282	RELIGION	4707.989

Table 5: English and French comparator corpora keyness scores compared

The range of keyness scores also indicates the difficulty comparing keyness across different corpora. The French keyword list has a much larger range of keyness scores than any of the English keyword lists; this may be because the FrenchBT corpus contains a larger list of keywords, or because of the

overall size of the corpus and the comparator corpus. Since the French comparator corpus cannot be used to compile an English keyword list, the keyness scores cannot be compared.

	English- BNC keyness	TYPE keyness	TOKENS keyness	French keyness
High	3227.42	707.6	637.19	27422.89
Low	75.49	24.15	24.17	154.51

Table 6: English and French comparator corpora keyness range compared

Having compared the types and tokens in the various corpora, I decided to abandon the BNC as a reference corpus and to use a comparator corpus in order to have an English keyword list as comparable to the FrenchBT corpus as possible. By having a similar comparator corpus in both languages, the keyword lists are more comparable. Given the main research objective of this project – the salience of references to language in the negotiation of Quebec identity in the Commission briefs – the point of the comparison between the English and French corpora is to establish whether references to “language/langue” (for example) may be more salient in the FrenchBT corpus than in the EnglishBT corpus. While I cannot compare keyness scores across languages, I can determine whether (1) “language” and “langue” are both on the English and French keyword lists, and if so (2), how they rank on their respective list. Thus, the rank of keywords of interest will be compared, rather than the keyness score of each keyword of interest. The rank of a keyword on the list may indicate interesting differences in the saliency or keyness of certain keywords in English and in French. Furthermore, noticeable differences in collocates of each keyword may be interesting.

Step 7: Analysis of keywords and collocates

With the keyword lists compiled in English and French, I first examined the keywords and collocates in the FrenchBT corpus, then the keywords and collocates in the EnglishBT corpus. The EnglishBT corpus analysis is organized based on the ranking obtained by the TYPE comparator corpus because this corpus was compiled using principles most similar to the French comparator corpus.

Step 8: Analysis of dispersion plots and downsampling

As part of the corpus analysis, I analysed dispersion plots to determine which individual briefs contain the highest proportion of vocabulary related to language (*langue/language, Français/French, Anglais/English*). Then, I downsampled (Baker et al., 2008) and selected three briefs where language-related vocabulary is the most salient.

Step 9: Analysis using discourse-historical CDA

The three selected briefs are then analysed following Wodak et al.'s (1999) approach to the discursive construction of national identity. After the discourse analysis, I returned to my corpus analysis to re-examine my findings in a “cyclical path” (Mautner, 2008) to focus the results of my analysis.

Rank	English-BNC	Rank	TYPE	Rank	TOKENS
10	QUEBEC	1	QUEBEC	1	QUEBEC
22	SOCIETY	2	SOCIETY	2	SOCIETY
28	RELIGIOUS	3	RELIGIOUS	4	RELIGIOUS
35	RELIGION	8	IMMIGRANTS	5	CULTURAL
37	IMMIGRANTS	9	ACCOMMODATION	7	IMMIGRANTS
40	RIGHTS	11	RELIGION	9	RELIGION
43	ACCOMMODATION	12	FRENCH	10	ACCOMMODATION
49	CULTURAL	13	WOMEN	12	COMMUNITY
50	CANADA	15	VALUES	13	VALUES
55	WOMEN	17	INTEGRATION	14	WOMEN
57	VALUES	19	ENGLISH	15	FRENCH
61	COMMUNITY	20	DIVERSITY	17	COMMISSION
62	PUBLIC	21	COMMUNITY	19	DIVERSITY
66	DIVERSITY	22	COMMISSION	20	LANGUAGE
67	PEOPLE	23	LANGUAGE	22	RIGHTS
69	FRENCH	24	BELIEFS	23	INTEGRATION
71	CANADIAN	25	MONTREAL	24	SCHOOLS
72	QUEBECERS	26	RIGHTS	25	BELIEFS
76	ENGLISH	27	IMMIGRATION	26	MONTREAL
77	MONTREAL	28	QUEBECERS	27	SOCIAL
78	REASONABLE	29	DISCRIMINATION	28	EQUALITY
79	COMMISSION	31	MINORITIES	30	IMMIGRATION
81	INTEGRATION	32	CULTURE	31	REASONABLE
85	LANGUAGE	33	GROUPS	32	GROUPS
93	RESPECT	34	PUBLIC	33	CULTURE
94	EQUALITY	35	MUSLIM	34	DISCRIMINATION
99	BELIEFS	36	QUEBECOIS	36	MUSLIM
103	IMMIGRATION	37	SIKH	37	MINORITIES
105	FREEDOM	38	REASONABLE	38	EDUCATION
109	MUSLIM	40	PRACTICES	39	PUBLIC
110	COMMUNITIES	41	EQUALITY	40	QUEBECERS
111	BOTH	43	SOCIAL	41	CHARTER
112	INSTITUTIONS	44	COMMUNITIES	42	QUEBECOIS
115	MINORITIES	45	SCHOOLS	43	SCHOOL
116	EDUCATION	47	RESPECT	44	SIKH
118	SCHOOLS	48	HUMAN	45	COMMUNITIES
121	QUEBECOIS	49	NEWCOMERS	46	FREEDOM
123	CHARTER	50	FREEDOM	47	ENGLISH
125	CULTURE	53	SCHOOL	49	PRACTICES

Table 7: English lexical keywords: Keyword lists compiled with the BNC, comparator TOKEN and comparator TYPE

Chapter 4: FrenchBT Corpus Analysis

This chapter analyses keywords in the FrenchBT corpus. The keywords are analysed in descending rank on the keyword list. Since words that are “key” often serve as collocates of other keywords, the analysis of each keyword will build on the analysis of the previous keyword; in this way, results will be increasingly evident as the analysis continues. Furthermore, the EnglishBT corpus analysis largely serves as a point of comparison and contrast with the FrenchBT corpus analysis, and the results of both corpus analyses are further substantiated through the discourse analysis. In this way, results will continue to build throughout this and the next two analysis chapters; these results will culminate in Chapter Seven, Discussion.

As explained in the Procedure section, my analysis of the FrenchBT corpus began with the compilation of frequency lists (see Appendix IV). As explained previously, it is critical to determine if frequent words are of statistical significance. Thus, I compiled a FrenchBT keyword list (see Appendix V). As can be seen in Appendix V, there are many statistically significant words (keywords) that simply demonstrate the subject matter of the FrenchBT corpus. For example, words like *commission* and *accommodements* are within the top twenty keywords and indicate that the texts within the corpus refer significantly to the Bouchard Taylor Commission and reasonable accommodation. However, a number of keywords do not pertain to the explicit Commission topic, and these could be revealing of identity discourses. These words include *Québec*, *société*,

immigrants, Québécois(e), nous, identité, leur, langue and *français*. In this chapter, these keywords will be explored in the order of their keyword rank.

Québec

Québec is one of the top keywords on the list, ranking fourth after three grammatical words (*l', d'* and *qu'*). The word *Québec* was found in 659 of the 703 briefs, which is 93.7 percent of the briefs. In order to determine how the term *Québec* is used, I analyzed the collocates surrounding *Québec*.

The most frequent non-grammatical words that collocate with *Québec* can be separated into four “categories of reference” (Baker et al., 2008, p. 286).¹³

Polity, institutions	Core values	Identity labels	Integration and diversity
GOUVERNEMENT	HISTOIRE	NOUS	IMMIGRATION
SOCIETE	CHARTRE	IMMIGRANTS	INTEGRATION
CONSEIL	FRANÇAIS	PERSONNES	ACCOMMODEMENTS
ASSEMBLEE	LANGUE	CITOYENS	RAISONNABLES
COMMISSION	DROITS	AUTRES	ENSEMBLE
CANADA	FRANÇAISES	FEMMES	DIVERSITE
POLITIQUE	LIBERTE	FRANCOPHONE	RELIGIEUX*
REGIONS	VALEURS	QUEBECOIS	CULTUREL*
NATION	LAICITE	NOTRE	RELIGION*
ETAT	RELIGIEUX*	MAJORITE	
PAYS	CULTUREL*	NOS	
TERRE	RELIGION*		
PROVINCE	TERRITOIRE		
REGION			

Table 8: FrenchBT corpus collocates with Québec: Categories*

First, there are words that associate Quebec with the conceptualization of a polity with its own institutions. These are words such as *gouvernement, société, histoire, politique, population, citoyens, conseil, nationale, état, pays*, and *charte*. Second, there are other words that relate to “core values” (Oakes, 2001) in the province.

¹³ This is not an exhaustive consideration of all collocates of *Québec*; it is only a consideration of the most frequent non-grammatical collocates.

Examples of these include *Français*, *langue*, and *histoire*. Third, there are words pertaining to identity labels. These are words such as *femmes*, *personnes*, *citoyens*, and *immigrants*. Finally, there are words relating to integration and diversity, such as *immigration*, *intégration*, and *accommodements*.

To verify these categories, I examined the most frequent three-word clusters. Although the same categories of clusters appear as with the collocates, the most frequent clusters are in reference to Quebec's government, history, population, and citizens; these indicate the important conceptualization of Quebec as a polity. The observation that Quebec is constructed as a polity is important in a discussion of belonging in the province.

Polity, institutions	Core values	Identity labels	Integration and diversity
GOUVERNEMENT DU QUÉBEC (587)	HISTOIRE DU QUÉBEC (109)	AU QUÉBEC (83)	DE L IMMIGRATION (68)
RÉGIONS DU QUÉBEC (107)	LIBERTÉS DE LA (83)	CITOYENS DU QUÉBEC (80)	IMMIGRATION AU QUÉBEC (68)
POPULATION DU QUÉBEC (104)	DROITS DE LA ¹⁴ (57)	IMMIGRANTS AU QUÉBEC (49)	ARRIVÉE AU QUÉBEC (38)
QUE LE GOUVERNEMENT (104)	FRANÇAIS AU QUÉBEC (57)		
NATIONALE DU QUÉBEC (81)	LA LANGUE FRANÇAISE (48)		
EST UNE SOCIÉTÉ (61)	TERRITOIRE DU QUÉBEC (51)		
L ASSEMBLÉE NATIONALE (44)	DROITS ET LIBERTÉS ¹⁵ (46)		
PREMIER MINISTRE DU (43)	FRANÇAISE AU QUÉBEC (45)		
	CATHOLIQUES DU QUÉBEC (43)		

Table 9: FrenchBT corpus clusters with Québec: Categories

Quebec has credible attributes of a state due to the continued representation of it as an established entity with a government, a national assembly, and citizens. This is seen most clearly through clusters and collocates: the most frequent cluster is

¹⁴ Concordance lines show that this is in reference to *droits de la personne*.

¹⁵ *Droits et libertés* most frequently refers to *la charte québécoise des droits et libertés* or *la charte canadienne des droits et libertés*. Other times, concordance lines reveal that there is no specification of whether or not this is the Canadian or Québécois Charter, and the reference is simply to *la charte des droits et libertés*.

gouvernement du Québec (587 occurrences); the strongest lexical collocate with *Québec* is *gouvernement* (659 occurrences).

The next strongest collocate with *Québec* is *société*; *société* collocates with *Québec* 259 times. *Société* appears most often to the right of *Québec*, more specifically in the third position to the right. This takes the form *Québec est une société*: because positive traits are attributed to society, Quebec is being positively “framed” (Baker et al., 2008, p. 290) through predication (Wodak et al., 1999). As seen in the concordance lines below, Quebec is discursively reinforced as a society, and described as *très accueillante*, *plurielle*, *ouverte*, *pluraliste*, *laïque*, *généreuse*, *francophone* and also *en devenir*.

culturelles estiment que le **Québec est une société** très accueillante pour les minorités. Ce qui le fait que : 1. Le **Québec est une société** qui est née de la rencontre avec l'Autre
Je veux démontrer simplement que le **Québec est une société** plurielle, qui prône des valeurs ainsi qu'elle entrevoit sa terre d'accueil. Donc, le **Québec est une société** ouverte : - pluraliste
Il doit véhiculer le fait que le **Québec est une société** laïque, que la pratique des religions est Nous savons aussi que le **Québec est une société** laïque et comme telle nous devons et surtout politique. Le **Québec EST une société** généreuse et accueillante, et il doit Langue Considérant que le **Québec est une société** francophone dans une Amérique du québécois des gais et lesbiennes, le **Québec est une société** en devenir, une société qui fait fa

Table 10: FrenchBT corpus clusters with Québec: Categories

The next most frequent location in which *société* is found is the R4 position.

Concordance lines of this position (below) show temporal qualifiers that construct different versions of Quebec society. While some lines depict Quebec as a society that has *always* been composed of migrants, others describe it as *now* being a pluralist society; others describe it as *still* being a Catholic society. In other words, the examples illustrate that Quebec is discursively constructed with reference to historical narratives.

de la Renaissance; le Québec fut toujours une société de migrants, les visages de la décroissance constante. Le Québec moderne est une société par ailleurs dont on voit ses plus particulièrement au Québec nous sommes une société en transition et avec différences culturelles. Le Québec est maintenant une société pluraliste. De plus, on « lobbies » qui affirment que le Québec est encore une société catholique. Il en fut peut-

Table 11: FrenchBT corpus concordance lines with société in R4 position in relation with Québec

This investigation of the keyword *Québec* has uncovered potential discourses. *Québec* has semantic preference for collocates relating to two constructs of the province: one is ethnocultural (associating Quebec with core values); the other version is civic (constructing Quebec as a polity with institutions). *Québec* has a strong discursive link with *société*; as a result, Quebec is positively represented as an open, pluralist, host society. This construction relies on the positive connotations associated with *société*; to examine this further, we can turn to the next keyword, *société*.

Société

Société ranks 43 on the frequency list, with an overall frequency of 7413 throughout the FrenchBT corpus. It occurs in 607 of the total 703 briefs, which is 86 percent of the briefs. The examination of this keyword serves to reinforce some of the findings in the analysis of the keyword *Québec*.

The first lexical collocate is *québécoise* (1574 occurrences). This collocate serves to qualify society as a predominantly *québécoise* society; this is evident because *québécoise* is in the feminine form (*québécoise* and not *québécois*) and most frequently in the R1 position (1477 occurrences).¹⁶ Cluster analysis further

¹⁶ R1 refers to a collocate one space to the right of the search term. See Appendix XIII for an explanation of how to read collocation tables.

illustrates this point, with the abundance of *la société québécoise* clusters (1436 occurrences). This emphasizes the point that Quebec is overwhelmingly discursively constructed as a society.

The next lexical collocate is *notre* (“our,” 1107 occurrences). Pattern analysis shows that *notre* is the third most frequent collocate in the L1 position (after the grammatical words *la* and *une*). Cluster analysis also shows that *de notre société* is the seventh most frequent word cluster, occurring 411 times. “We” appear to be strongly discursively linked to Quebec society.

Word	Total	Total Left	Total Right	L5	L4	L3	L2	L1	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5
QUÉBÉCOI									147				
SE	1574	55	1519	7	17	19	10	2	7	14	15	9	4
NOTRE	1107	1052	55	18	15	23	5	991	5	21	10	11	8
ACCUEIL	583	9	574	3	1	3	2	0	0	568	1	3	2
VALEURS	322	271	51	33	4	0	4	0	0	1	11	16	23
LAÏQUE	262	15	247	1	1	7	5	1	183	18	14	16	16
QUÉBEC	259	179	80	33	40	82	21	3	0	9	28	10	33
LEUR	246	174	72	22	72	2	8	70	2	13	24	19	14
DÉMOCRA TIQUE	229	10	219	3	0	7	0	0	101	37	68	8	5
CIVILE	200	14	186	0	9	5	0	0	183	0	0	1	2
INTÉGRATI ON	187	158	29	47	13	93	1	4	0	3	6	7	13
ENSEMBLE	152	109	43	15	7	81	6	0	0	0	20	8	15
PLURALIS TE	148	9	139	1	0	8	0	0	90	13	21	8	7
OUVERTE	120	8	112	1	2	4	1	0	46	27	19	11	9
IMMIGRAN TS	111	83	28	15	10	55	3	0	0	2	4	9	13

Table 12: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest with société(s)

The next most frequent collocate of interest is *accueil*, which acts as a qualifier of *société*: of its 594 occurrences, *accueil* occurs most frequently in the R2 position, forming *société d'accueil* (“host society”). As a cluster, *société d'accueil* occurs 573 times, and is by far the most common qualifier of *société*. This is undoubtedly highlighting discussions of immigrants and newcomers and

the “host society” they join. The next most frequent qualifier of *société* is *laïque* (“secular”), occurring 262 times, and primarily in the R1 position, forming “secular society”: this suggests that a core value in Quebec is secularism. Other collocates that act as qualifiers of *Québec* (by appearing most frequently in the R1 position) are *démocratique* (101 times), *civile* (183 times), *pluraliste* (90 times) and *ouverte* (42 times): these are civic attributes. Collocates show frequent reference to the *valeurs* of Quebec society (322 occurrences); there are few references to identity, culture, language, or religion, so it appears that “Quebec society” has primarily civic connotations.

The collocate *leur* (“their”) provides contrast to discussions of “us” (*nous*). I have already shown that “we” is strongly linked with “society” because of the frequent reference to “our society.” *Leur* occurs most frequently to the left of *société*, but notably not most frequently in the L1 position (“their society”). Of its 256 occurrences, 70 are in the L1 position, but 73 are in the L4 position: this indicates that although there are references to *leur société*, there is another common pattern. Cluster analysis shows that *de leur société* occurs 27 times as a cluster; however, clusters also show a noteworthy use of *leur*: *leur intégration à* (19 occurrences). By examining *leur* in its most frequent position (L4), we arrive at a number of revealing concordance lines (below). From these, we can see that discussions of “them” are important when they are in relation with “our” society. In most examples, *leur* refers to immigrants and newcomers, whereas *société* refers to a host society, more specifically, that of Quebec.

These concordance lines explain why *leur* is found so frequently in the L4 position: “their society” is not as important as a discussion of “their [integration/ place/ contribution] (in)(to) (our) (Québécois) society.” These examples discursively point to newcomers (“them”) in relation to Quebec society; the onus is placed on them to make an effort to integrate, insert themselves, engage and contribute to our/Quebec society. One example also suggests immigrants’ *impact sur la société* and the “negative risks” they might bring with them. In other words, while *société* carries positive attributes and is discursively linked to Quebec, it is associated primarily with *nous* (“us”). In contrast, the “they” is not strongly linked with *société* except in relation with “their” integration into our/Québécois society.

leur identité, de **leur place dans la société** complexe qui s’est organisée autour d’eux. Il de faciliter **leur intégration à la société québécoise**. L’AFIO estime qu’en effet, les (3) favoriser **leur intégration dans la société québécoise** francophone. Durant toute la moyens pour faciliter **leur intégration à la société québécoise**. Au Québec tous les essentielle à **leur intégration à la société d’accueil**. 4.3 Des obstacles à l’intégration Les pour favoriser **leur insertion dans la société d’accueil**. Assemblée des évêques catholiques Il faudrait aussi évaluer **leur impact sur la société d’accueil**, et le risque négatif qu’il comporte spirituelle et **leur engagement dans la société**. Précisons ici ce que signifient les deux pôles de 5 Québec et **leur contribution à la société québécoise** se poursuit. Leur action citoyenne ne dans la construction de **leur appartenance à la société québécoise** sur la base d’une culture de

Table 13: FrenchBT corpus concordance lines with *leur* in L4 position with société

In summary, society, strongly linked with Quebec and “us,” is positively constructed in the civic sense as pluralist and open to others; “others,” namely immigrants and newcomers, are constructed in terms of their integration into or (negative) impact on this society.

Immigrants

The subsequent keyword of interest on the keyword list is *immigrants*. It ranks 12 on the keyword list, and it is 76 on the frequency list, with an overall frequency of 4036. *Immigrants* occurs in 513 of the 703 briefs, which is 72.3 percent of the briefs. As an initial observation, it is curious that the plural form of the word (*immigrants*) occurs before the singular form (*immigrant*). As Baker et al. (2008) have noted, discussions of immigrants, refugees, and asylum seekers lend themselves to quantification; the large numbers create a sense of alarm. Concordance lines emphasize the “quantification” of immigrants, as there are 60 concordance lines that numerically quantify immigrants, and this does not include a consideration of examples that quantify immigrants without specific numbers (*de plus en plus d’immigrants*).

<p>le Québec va chercher environs 10.000 immigrants par année au grand Maghreb musulman favorisant : l’immigration d’environ 50 000 immigrants par année ; l’immigration de personnes décider s’il faut accueillir 40 000 ou 80 000 immigrants par année, et comment les intégrer. Il 12 CONCLUSION Avec l’arrivée de 45 000 immigrants par année, il nous apparaît important le Québec aurait besoin de 50 000 immigrants par année pour compenser le déficit de sa pour accueillir un minimum de 75 000 immigrants par année. À première vue, ce chiffre peut Le Québec est inculte à 85%, environ 50,000 immigrants par année, ce qui fait un million dans</p>
--

Table 14: FrenchBT corpus sample concordance lines quantifying immigrant(e)(s)

Wodak et al. (1999) explain that plural forms are often used the discursive construction of sameness and similarity. Although the plural form *immigrants* may suggest the construction of a single homogeneous group, cluster analysis shows that categorization serves as a means of differentiating *immigrants*: there are male and female immigrants, refugees and immigrants, and immigrants specific to Quebec.

Cluster	Freq
DES PERSONNES IMMIGRANTES	238
LES PERSONNES IMMIGRANTES	109
LES FEMMES IMMIGRANTES	57
PERSONNES IMMIGRANTES ET	53
IMMIGRANTES ET IMMIGRANTS	50
IMMIGRANTS AU QUÉBEC	48
DES NOUVEAUX IMMIGRANTS	42
DES FEMMES IMMIGRANTES	42
DE PERSONNES IMMIGRANTES	40
RÉFUGIÉES ET IMMIGRANTES	37
LES NOUVEAUX IMMIGRANTS	35

Table 15: FrenchBT corpus clusters with immigrant(e)(s): Categories of immigrants

Concordance lines categorize of immigrants according to their education (*immigrants diplômés*), status (*immigrants admis*), religion (*immigrants catholiques, immigrants juifs, immigrants islamistes*), ethnicity and nationality (*immigrants chinois*), gender (*immigrants* and *immigrantes*) and language (*immigrants francophones, immigrants allophones*). There appears to be no shortage of ways to describe and categorize immigrants. Nevertheless, most subcategories continue to pluralize immigrants and construct them as a single group.

The most frequent lexical collocates of *immigrants* may seem familiar: *Québec, société, nous, leur, accueil, Québécois, and notre*. However, *intégration* is by far the strongest collocate, with 743 occurrences. Indeed, clusters make apparent how much integration figures into discussions of immigrants in Quebec. The cluster *intégration des immigrants* occurs 366 times, and there are other versions of this cluster, such as *intégration des personnes* (85 occurrences). Thus, collocation, clusters, and concordances show that discussions of *immigrants* are primarily in reference to integration into “our” Québécois host society.

Word	Total	Total	Total	L5	L4	L3	L2	L1	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5
l	Left	Right											
INTÉGRATI													
ON	743	680	63	55	43	186	396	0	2	8	19	9	25
PERSONNES	511	490	21	4	6	38	0	442	0	2	9	6	4
QUÉBEC	428	132	296	41	43	32	16	0	1	101	57	82	55
NOUS	362	108	254	43	29	25	8	3	63	62	47	39	43
LEUR	263	24	239	9	7	7	1	0	11	58	64	38	68
ACCUEIL	196	150	46	31	17	47	55	0	0	0	0	8	38
SOCIÉTÉ	192	59	133	26	20	8	4	1	0	8	89	16	20
QUÉBÉCOIS	189	94	95	30	30	17	15	2	7	10	31	24	23
NOUVEAUX	172	152	20	9	6	4	2	131	1	3	9	3	4
FEMMES	149	135	14	3	5	11	0	116	0	2	7	2	3
NOMBRE	145	130	15	6	8	30	86	0	0	2	4	2	7
COMMUNA													
UTÉS	138	57	81	4	11	5	6	31	0	3	41	19	18
NOTRE	137	30	107	12	8	10	0	0	5	40	14	23	25
ILS	124	22	102	11	3	3	2	3	12	22	23	14	31
LEURS	123	23	100	8	8	2	2	3	3	25	40	13	19
NOS	118	66	52	10	8	7	4	37	6	12	8	14	12
FRANÇAIS	113	49	64	8	11	16	13	1	6	4	16	13	25
PAYS	112	38	74	15	12	7	3	1	0	4	25	29	16
INTÉGRER	107	50	57	4	5	12	28	1	0	2	23	18	14
MAJORITÉ	96	81	15	5	10	12	52	2	0	1	11	3	0

Table 16: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest with immigrant(e)(s)

Québécois(e)

The next two words on the keyword list are *québécoise* and *québécois*. These are the thirteenth and sixteenth words on the keyword list, respectively. On the frequency list, *québécois* is in 54th place, occurring 5235 times, and *québécoise* is in 71st place, occurring 4155 times. *Québécois* occurs in 572 different briefs, which is 81.4 percent of the total briefs; *Québécoise* occurs in 540 different briefs, which is 76.8 percent of the total number of briefs.

Collocates of *québécois* and *québécoise* can be broken down into two principal categories: (1) collocates that serve as nouns where *québécois* is used as an adjective (i.e. *identité québécoise*); and (2) collocates that modify *québécois* when used as a nominalized adjective.

Word	Total I	Total Left	Total Right	L5	L4	L3	L2	L1	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5
SOCIÉTÉ	1681	1586	95	18	26	37	17	1488	2	19	30	23	21
NOUS	732	279	453	71	52	33	43	80	136	91	80	74	72
IDENTITÉ	567	496	71	27	27	35	53	354	0	12	19	20	20
CULTURE	476	422	54	28	25	17	26	326	0	15	8	18	13
VALEURS	471	347	124	81	78	46	45	97	2	24	31	35	32
SOUCHE	397	21	376	6	4	5	3	3	0	296	56	13	11
NATION	297	265	32	3	8	3	3	248	0	7	11	8	6
QUÉBEC	294	171	123	48	46	57	19	1	5	32	14	30	42
CANADIENNE	282	130	152	13	18	14	84	1	8	60	57	14	13
DROITS	244	65	179	24	21	14	3	3	0	108	9	39	23
NOTRE	220	133	87	27	17	16	72	1	17	15	19	12	24
IMMIGRANTS	217	114	103	24	55	24	8	3	2	16	20	37	28
INTÉGRATION	217	138	79	24	62	37	9	6	2	45	8	6	18
MAJORITÉ	211	185	26	8	17	18	9	23	0	2	6	10	8
ORIGINE	205	38	167	12	6	8	1	11	0	126	17	12	12
FRANCOPHON ES	203	50	153	10	8	19	4	9	122	5	13	7	6
ÉTAT	196	162	34	4	4	4	6	144	0	4	7	12	11
FRANÇAISE	184	61	123	20	15	12	9	5	4	9	24	76	10
AUTRES	174	87	87	19	18	11	16	23	1	16	28	16	26
NÉO	154	130	24	3	8	2	0	117	1	12	9	1	1
LAÏCITÉ	153	105	48	17	35	21	7	25	3	12	15	7	11
IMMIGRATION GOUVERNEME NT	139	52	87	15	12	14	4	7	2	9	17	43	16
LANGUE	129	51	78	20	21	6	4	0	2	13	31	19	13

Table 17: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest with Québécois(e): positions

Québécois as an adjective: civic and ethnocultural nationalism

Where *québécois* is used as an adjective, it refers to two primary conceptualizations of the province. On one hand, collocates such as *identité*, *culture*, *valeurs*, and *langue* refer to the common (ethnocultural) values of Quebec. On the other hand, collocates such as *société*, *charte*, *état*, *population*, *gouvernement*, and *politique* depict Quebec as a polity. All of these collocates serve to construct Quebec as a nation according to Kymlicka's (1995) definition:

a historical community, more or less institutionally complete, occupying a given territory or homeland, sharing a distinct language and culture. A 'nation' in this sociological sense is

closely related to the idea of a ‘people’ or a ‘culture’ – indeed, these concepts are often defined in terms of each other (p. 11).

According to Kymlicka’s definition, then, collocates discursively construct Quebec as a nation: some corpus collocates refer to the attributes of a civic nation (shared institutions and political structures); others refer to the attributes of an ethnocultural nation (shared culture, language, and values).

Clusters reinforce collocate findings: the depiction of Quebec as an ethnocultural nation can also be seen through clusters such as *l’identité québécoise* (276 occurrences), and *la culture québécoise* (264 occurrences). Quebec’s civic attributes are evident in clusters such as *la charte québécoise* (238 occurrences) and *l’état québécois* (143 occurrences). Moreover, Quebec’s civic side is evident in the frequent references to Quebec (civic) society: the cluster *la société québécoise* occurs 1422 times, and this is more than five times the occurrence of any other *québécois* cluster. Furthermore, as shown above in the discussion of *société*, Quebec society is constructed primarily in terms of civic (and not ethnocultural) values.

Although Quebec is predominantly represented as a society, it is also often explicitly constructed as a nation. *Nation* collocates 83 times with the keyword *Quebec*, but no clear discursive pattern links the two terms. However, *nation* also collocates 291 with *québécois(e)(s)*, primarily in the L1 position, creating *nation québécoise* (247 occurrences). Cluster data show that *la nation québécoise* occurs 224 times.

The analysis of the *québécois* as an adjective has reveals that there are representations of Quebec both as an ethnocultural and civic nation. These two versions of nationalism may work together in the “modernizing” discourse of Quebec identity and nationalism. The modernizing discourse emphasizes conditions of inclusion based on democratic values and not explicit ethnocultural criteria, because “Modernizing values of democracy militate against too ethnic an interpretation” (Heller, 2001, p. 124). Still, since the state has historically been so clearly defined in terms of its ethnocultural heritage, inclusion means inclusion in “what is essentially an ethnic category” (Heller, 2001, p. 123-4). Thus far in this corpus analysis, there has been no explicit reference to French Canadian ethnicity; however, references to core values suggest that the “nation” remains based on the vestiges of the traditional (ethnocultural) French Canada. Quebec seems to be constructed through reference to both core values and political institutions: this merger (or masking) of ethnocultural elements with democratic values is precisely that which Heller (2001) cites as central to modernizing discourse.

Categories of “québécois”

The keyword *Québécois* is also of interest as a nominalized adjective. Here, we begin to see different identity categories that form under the umbrella term of *Québécois*. The largest category of *Québécois* includes those of specific origins. As explained in Chapter 2, “hyphenated” identities and identity labels are common in Quebec at least in part because of the divide between French Canadians and those of other origins. These identity labels are evidence of how language is used to construct belonging in Quebec (see also Appendix VI).

The ethnic identity label *Québécois de souche* (“Old stock Québécois”) is the most common proper noun cluster, occurring 270 times. In addition, the feminine version, *Québécoise de souche*, occurs 22 times within the FrenchBT corpus. Another ethnic label is *Québécois pure laine* (21 occurrences). Other identity labels that arguably euphemize the same ethnic identity criteria are *Québécois francophones* (36 occurrences), *franco-Québécois* (24 occurrences), *Québécois d’origine canadienne-française* (5 occurrences), and *Québécois Canadien français* (5 occurrences). According to the concordance lines listed below, the Francophone Québécois are described as “a people,” “a nation,” “the majority,” or as “nationalists.” Indeed, these concordance lines suggest that nationalism is associated with ethnocultural French Canadian identity in Quebec. Even Prime Minister Stephen Harper’s (2006) declaration of *the Québécois* (and not Quebec) as a nation caused controversy because it used the term “Québécois” in English, which has more ethnocultural connotations than “Quebeckers.”

existence, les nationalistes franco québécois réclame nos (encore sens petit)contributions trente ans, les nationalistes franco québécois ont dominé le pouvoir politique au Québec, soit par l’histoire du peuple franco-québécois installé dans la vallée du St-Laurent. Le profil d’un à venir, il faut que la majorité franco-québécoise établisse de façon plus nette les repères de sa réelle problématique. La majorité franco-québécoise est minoritaire. Dans le pays. Sur le vise à suggérer que la majorité franco-québécoise devrait en quelque sorte affaiblir son tirée du peuple francophone québécois, une nation respectant ses minorités. Résident de

Table 18: FrenchBT corpus sample concordance lines with Franco/Francophone Québécois(e)s

There are also various ways of being Québécois. Above, in the consideration of the keyword *immigrants*, I discussed how immigrants are categorized; the analysis of the keyword *Québécois* shows that there are also various categories of Québécois. Concordance lines reveal that some references to

Québécois are globally inclusive (*les Québécois dans leur ensemble*); however, others employ consistent language patterns that differentiate between identity subcategories, such as origins (specifically *Québécois d'origines culturelles*), gender (*Québécois et Québécoises*), language (*franco-Québécois*¹⁷) and ethnicity (*Québécois de souche*).

To further the discussion of identity labels, I examined concordance lines concerning Anglophone Québécois to see how they were discursively constructed. Concordance lines show that even when the discussion favours the rights and recognition of Anglophone Québécois, they remain discursively constructed differently from that of Francophone Québécois. Anglo Québécois are represented as a minority (*la minorité anglo-québécoise*), a community (*la communauté anglo-québécoise*), and “aren’t fully Québécois” (*ne sont pas des Québécois à part entière*). Indeed, Anglo Québécois are constructed as an ethnocultural group, not as a “national minority,” a territorially concentrated culture that is incorporated into a larger state and wishes to maintain a distinct society alongside the majority culture (Kymlicka, 1995). Since the Québécois are a “national minority” in Canada, recognizing Anglo Québécois’ national minority status would imply rights similar to those of the Québécois in relation to Canada.

The final dominant identity label in Quebec refers to people who are new to the province. This subcategory of Québécois identity can be examined through clusters such as *Néo-Québécois* (117 occurrences) and *Nouveaux Québécois* (41 occurrences).

¹⁷ The identity label *Franco-Québécois* can be used both as an ethnic and linguistic marker; it remains an ambiguous term.

Order	<i>Québécois</i> as proper noun	Frequency
4	QUÉBÉCOIS DE SOUCHE	270
15	TOUS LES QUÉBÉCOIS	132
17	QUÉBÉCOISES ET QUÉBÉCOIS	127
19	QUÉBÉCOIS ET QUÉBÉCOISES	121
24	QUÉBÉCOIS D ORIGINE	104
40	MAJORITÉ DES QUÉBÉCOIS	81
41	CANADIENNE ET QUÉBÉCOISE	74
43	QUÉBÉCOIS D ORIGINES	69
50	LES QUÉBÉCOIS FRANCOPHONES	64
67	QUÉBÉCOISE ET CANADIENNE	47
84	DES NÉO QUÉBÉCOIS	39
92	DES QUÉBÉCOIS FRANCOPHONES	36
179	LES NOUVEAUX QUÉBÉCOIS	23
185	QUÉBÉCOISE DE SOUCHE	22
198	QUÉBÉCOIS PURE LAINE	21
204	NOUS LES QUÉBÉCOIS	20
206	QUÉBÉCOIS ET QUÉBÉCOISE	20
222	MAJORITÉ DE QUÉBÉCOIS	19

Table 19: FrenchBT corpus clusters of interest with québécois(e), nominalized

This section has shown that *Québécois*, as an adjective, is associated with ethnocultural and civic attributes of a Quebec nation; belonging to this ethnocultural or civic nation depends on specific identity terminology. *Québécois* as a nominalized adjective is primarily used as an identity term, but this identity has various subcategories that indicate different levels of inclusion and exclusion.

Nous

In order to examine how the identity term *Québécois* may include or exclude certain groups, it is important to examine the keyword *nous* (“we” or “us”). *Nous* ranks 24 on the keyword list and occurs 17 181 times within the FrenchBT corpus. It also occurs in 668 of the 703 briefs, which is 95 percent of the briefs. Also interesting are the possessive pronouns of “nous,” *notre* and *nos*. These pronouns are also among the top keywords on the list; *notre* ranks 18 on the keyword list, occurring 6672 times; *nos* ranks 59 on the keyword list, occurring

4433 times. The frequency and keyness of these terms serve to illustrate how discussions of “us” dominate the briefs; this also illustrates how in-groups and out-groups are linguistically evident through identity labelling.

Relational processes	Rank	Modals/ Modalized	Rank	Mental processes	Rank
AVONS	1	DEVONS	5	CROYONS	6
SOMMES	2	VOULONS	8	PENSONS	14
AVIONS	56	POUVONS	9	SAVONS	23
SERONS	59	SOUHAITONS	18	CONSIDÉRON	24
ÉTIONS	40	DEVRIONS	31	ESTIMONS	39
		ALLONS ¹⁸	36	VOYONS	42
		POURRIONS	38	CONSTATONS	45
		TENONS	49	RECONNAISSONS	54
		AIMERIONS	55	ENTENDONS	57
		ESPÉRON	58		
		ESPÉRON	58		

Material processes: VIVONS, 17; FAISONS, 30; VENONS, 47

Verbal processes: PROPOSONS, 25; RECOMMANDONS, 35

Table 20: FrenchBT corpus patterns with *nous*: Verbs in R1 location

Most of the words that occur directly to the right of *nous* (R1 position) are verbs; the notable non-verb that collocates frequently in the R1 position is *Québécois*. The most frequent verbs in the R1 position are *avons* and *sommes*. These are also keywords: *avons* occurs 1663 times in the FrenchBT corpus and ranks 190 on the keyword list; *sommes* occurs 1556 times in the FrenchBT corpus and ranks 130 on the keyword list. The verbs *sommes* and *avons* are potentially valuable to our discussion if they serve to explain who or what “we” are and have. However, both verbs can serve two functions: they can serve as relational processes, and they can serve as auxiliaries in past-tense constructions (Biber et

¹⁸ Used in the future tense, *aller* is a modal auxiliary verb. Biber et al. (2002) call these verbs that make time restrictions “central modals” (p. 175). The “logical meaning” of these modals is that of prediction (p. 176); the authors explain “the modals *will* and *shall* can be used to refer to future time” (p. 175).

al., 2002; Eggins, 2004). Of primary interest are relational processes, where a verb is used to denote attribution, identification, or possession (Eggins, 2004).

Sommes

With reference to the collocate *sommes*, we have two subcategories of relational processes: attributive and identifying processes. Attributive processes are those where an attribute is assigned; identifying processes are about defining (Eggins, 2004).

Word	Total	Total Left	Total Right	L5	L4	L3	L2	L1	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5
CONSCIENTS	60	2	58	0	0	2	0	0	38	15	3	2	0
SOCIÉTÉ	56	16	40	3	2	7	4	0	0	20	10	5	5
QUÉBEC	44	28	16	4	5	8	10	1	0	2	8	2	4
PEUPLE	39	4	35	0	0	4	0	0	0	23	7	3	2
CONVAINCUS	35	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	26	9	0	0	0
QUÉBÉCOIS	34	15	19	4	3	3	4	1	5	3	4	7	0
FIERS	23	2	21	0	2	0	0	0	14	4	1	0	2
IMMIGRANTS	21	9	12	4	1	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	3
VALEURS	20	11	9	3	5	1	2	0	0	1	1	2	5
CULTURE	18	11	7	2	4	4	1	0	0	2	1	1	3
CONTRE	17	8	9	0	2	3	3	0	5	1	2	1	0
CITOYENS	16	5	11	1	1	2	1	0	1	3	2	4	1
PRÊTS	16	1	15	1	0	0	0	0	9	5	0	1	0
HEUREUX	16	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	1	1	1

Table 21: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest with *sommes*: positions

Looking at clusters, we have attributive examples, such as *sommes d'avis* (39 occurrences), *nous sommes conscients* (36 occurrences), *nous sommes convaincus* (23 occurrences), and *nous sommes devenus* (21 occurrences).¹⁹ For identifying processes, we have such examples as *ce que nous sommes* (70 occurrences), *qui nous sommes* (55 occurrences), *sommes un peuple* (20 occurrences) and *sommes*

¹⁹ To truly be attributive, this cluster would have to be followed by an attribute. This cluster could also serve as an identifying process if it were followed by a definite nominal group (see Eggins, 2004, p. 242).

une société (19 occurrences). In these clusters, *sommes* is only used once as an auxiliary verb: *nous sommes devenus* (21 occurrences).

In order to investigate the use of *sommes* as a relational process rather than an auxiliary verb, we can also use collocate pattern tools. By looking at a pattern chart to see what words fall most often in the R2 and R3 positions, we can determine if there are past participles. If not, this could be where potential predicative phrases are used to describe who *nous sommes*. The examination of these collocate positions shows that there is only one past participle used (*arrivés*²⁰); thus, the words in the R2 and R3 position are primarily adjectives and nouns. Thus, *nous* positively self-represent using adjectives, nominalized adjectives, and nouns:

- *Nous sommes* + adjective: *conscients, convaincus, heureux, témoins, prêts, ouverts, capables, égaux*
- *Nous sommes* + nominalized adjective: *Québécois*
- *Nous sommes* + determiner + noun: (une) *société* and (une) *groupe*

By examining the most frequent positions of these collocates, we can gain a better sense of how they are being used. For example, *société* is most commonly found in the R2 position, and is most commonly used in the construction *nous sommes une société*. Concordance lines show that, through predication and because society has already been shown to be a positive attribute, *nous* is positively self-representing as a society. This positive self-representation takes shape in the following pattern:

²⁰ *Arrivés* could also be used as a relational process in historical narration, denoting origin or destination.

Nous sommes une société + attribute [de droits, libérale, libre, démocratique...]

As explained in previous sections, positive values are attributed to Quebec society; since *nous* and *société* are explicitly linked, *nous* is positively self-representing through connotations associated with *société*.

chez nous. N'oublions pas que **nous sommes une société** d'immigrants. Nous sommes tous un vos yeux, mais libre à vous, **nous sommes une société** libre. Et vous finirez peut-être vous aussi et ils ont leur mot à dire puisque **nous sommes une société** démocratique et ouverte. Nous leur religieux doit être refusé parceque **nous sommes une société** laïque par ceci nous devons protégé d'immigration à l'effet que **nous sommes une société** libérale et démocratique, basée sur Il est inutile de prétendre que **nous sommes la société** la plus ouverte de la planète si nous proposer une solution à l'amiable. **Nous sommes une société** qui est de plus en plus grandissante Nos lois établissent déjà que **nous sommes une société** laïque. Encore faut-il savoir quoi en

Table 22: FrenchBT corpus selected concordance lines with *nous sommes* and *société*

Collocation shows a strong link between *nous*, *Québec* and *société*; what we have, then, are clear links between “us,” “a pluralist, secular, host society,” and “Quebec.” This is evident through concordance lines that locate discussions of *nous* specifically in Quebec:

Bien que majoritaires **au Québec**, **nous sommes**, en tant que francophones, une minorité en Toussaint ou de la Pentecôte. **Au Québec**, **nous sommes** attachés à des concepts comme les fêtes diversité. L'immigration et **le Québec** **Nous sommes** originaires d'un pays très diversifié sur nous avoir fait historiquement! **Au Québec**, **nous sommes** tous égaux, tous libres, et tous remet en question l'histoire **du Québec**, **nous sommes** dans une société des droits. Là nous canada et plus particulièrement **au Québec** **nous sommes** une société en transition et avec

Table 23: FrenchBT corpus concordance lines with *Québec* in L2 position with *société*

Immigrants is another strong collocate with *sommes*, occurring primarily in the R4 position but also frequently in other positions (see Table 22, above). In order to investigate how *immigrants* is used in the context of *nous*, I analysed concordance lines, some with *immigrants* in the R4 position, and others in other positions. There are two themes in these concordance lines: (A) *nous* are

discursively constructed as immigrants (*nous, les immigrants de vieille date; nous sommes une société d'immigrants*), or (B) *nous* are discursively constructed in opposition to immigrants (*le respect doit être mutuel entre nous et les immigrants; les immigrants "vivent comme nous"*).

N'oublions pas que nous sommes une société d'immigrants . Nous sommes tous un	A
qu'après tout nous sommes tous ici des «immigrants» et qu'en conséquence	A
France alors nous sommes nous aussi des immigrants au Québec (Québec qui en	A
pays. Nous avons été aussi immigrants en Suède ou nous sommes demeurés deux années	A
Eux. Nous, les immigrants de vieille date, nous sommes nés ici . Nous n'avons pas eu	A
notre histoire. Nous sommes aussi des « immigrants » sur une terre habitée avant	A
au Québec n'est pas nouveau. Nous sommes nous-mêmes immigrants et	A
millénaires, nous sommes tous des immigrants de plus ou moins longue durée. IV	A
Le respect doit être mutuel entre nous et les immigrants : si nous sommes appelés	B
nous sommes ouverts à des incitatifs pour accueillir plus d'immigrants , nous ne	B
Pour que les immigrants "vivent comme nous" ... nous sommes impatients. Nous	B
accueillis. Nous sommes convaincues que les immigrants nous doivent beaucoup ,	B

Table 24: FrenchBT corpus concordance lines with *sommes* and *immigrants*

These concordance lines may show a conflictual relationship between *nous* and *immigrants*. However, these lines may also show that any individuals can employ pronouns to refer to different groups. For example, the term *nous* can be appropriated by a variety of groups to show membership; *nous* can indicate Quebec society as a whole, or smaller groups or communities within that society. By examining concordance lines, we can ascertain that *nous* is being employed by various groups, and therefore does not always refer to the same in-group. In the table below, words in italics indicate a smaller group or community; underlined words discursively unite society as a whole:

nous sommes le collège des médecins le plus avant-gardiste au Canada
nous sommes unis à la volonté de Dieu. Jésus est vraiment « Le chemin, la Vérité
 Nous sommes dans une économie de savoir, nous avons affaire avec des gens extrêm
 c'est l'oubli, c'est d'oublier qui *nous sommes*. Une société, qui abandonne ses règles au profit
 d'accommodements
notre société à cause de leur caractère sexiste ou dangereux. *Nous sommes* également en faveur de
 la déconfectionnalisation du système scolaire
Nous sommes un bel exemple au Québec car, en général, le peuple québécois aime
 Cependant, *nous sommes* opposées à tout accommodement aussi raisonnable
nous sommes en présence d'un seul et même défi : l'évolution culturelle d'une pe
 On ne peut plus affirmer que *nous sommes* de fervents pratiquants, mais nous sommes « de culture
 catholique ».
nous sommes désormais en mesure de jeter un regard lucide sur ce que révélaient

Table 25: French concordances with sommes

Wodak et al. (1999) explain that the personal pronoun “we” can be broken down into various categories of inclusion or exclusion (see Appendix III). To determine the ways in which *nous* is being used, a closer discourse analysis would have to be performed in order to take into account the various contextual elements surrounding each use of *nous* in each instance. For the moment, the focus is on the ways in which *any* individual or group constructs their sense of belonging.

This investigation of *nous sommes* has led to interesting results. On one hand, we have discovered in-groups and out-groups; on the other hand, in-groups can be as large as society as a whole or as small as groups or communities. Overall, *nous* is positively constructed as an open and pluralist Quebec society.

Avons

After *sommes*, the next most frequent collocate with the term *nous* is *avons*. We face the same task with *avons* as we did with *sommes*, to determine if the verb is used as an auxiliary verb, or as possessive relational process where possession or belonging is attributed to a possessor (Eggins, 2004). Clusters illustrate that *avons* is used both as an auxiliary and as a possessive relational process. Where it is used in the possessive form, some examples, such as *besoin*, *responsabilité* and

peur, indicate responsibility and fear within the group. Others, such as *chance* and *choix*, indicate opportunities and choices.

Cluster	Frequency
QUE NOUS AVONS	330
NOUS AVONS DES	37
NOUS AVONS BESOIN	36
NOUS AVONS LE	35
NOUS AVONS LA	35
CE QUE NOUS AVONS	33
NOUS AVONS ÉTÉ	33
NOUS AVONS UNE	30
NOUS AVONS FAIT	30
NOUS AVONS UN	28
DONT NOUS AVONS	22
AVONS BESOIN DE	22
NOUS AVONS CHOISI	29
NOUS AVONS DÉCIDÉ	29

Table 26: French clusters with avons

***Notre* and *Nos*: possessive personal pronouns**

Another way to investigate “our” possessions is through possessive determiners:

notre and *nos* are both among the top 60 keywords in the FrenchBT corpus.

R1 (<i>notre</i>)	R1 (<i>nos</i>)
SOCIÉTÉ	VALEURS
CULTURE	INSTITUTIONS
IDENTITÉ	LOIS
HISTOIRE	ENFANTS
LANGUE	ÉCOLES
PAYS	SOCIÉTÉS
AVIS	DROITS
MÉMOIRE	CHARTES
SYSTÈME	ANCÊTRES
NATION	CONCITOYENS
RÉGION	JEUNES
PASSÉ	COUTUMES
PATRIMOINE	TRADITIONS
TERRITOIRE	IMMIGRANTS
RELIGION	POLITIQUES
COMMUNAUTÉ	RACINES
HÉRITAGE	GOUVERNEMENTS

Table 27: FrenchBT corpus collocates with *notre*: in R1 position

Here again, we see the similar themes emerge from the data. Consistently the most important concept is that of *société*; it is the most frequent lexical collocate with *notre* and reinforces that “we” are a society. There are also such familiar key terms as *culture*, *identité*, *histoire*, *langue*, *pays* and *nation*. Here, again, there are themes relating to a polity, core values, and various groups.

Polity, institutions	Core values	Groups
SOCIÉTÉ	CULTURE	PEUPLE
PAYS	IDENTITÉ	COMMUNAUTÉ
NATION	HISTOIRE	COLLECTIVITÉ
RÉGION	LANGUE	GROUPE
MONDE	RELIGION	CONCITOYENS
POPULATION	TERRITOIRE	IMMIGRANTS
CHARTÉ	HÉRITAGE	
ORGANISME	FOI	
ÉTAT	PASSÉ	
CONSTITUTION	VALEURS	
DÉMOCRATIE	ANCÊTRES	
GOUVERNEMENT	COUTUMES	
PROVINCE	TRADITIONS	
INSTITUTIONS	RACINES	
LOIS	MOEURS	
POLITIQUES	CROYANCES	

Table 28: FrenchBT corpus collocates with *notre* and *nos*: categories

Notre/nos and Québécois

As shown above in the consideration of the keywords *nous*, *société* and *Québec*, there seems to be an explicit link between the in-group (“we”) and Quebec society. Table 29, below, shows the remarkable similarities between the collocates of *notre* and *québécois*: this suggests that *nous* and *québécois* may refer to the same group.

<i>Québécois</i>	<i>Notre/Nos</i>
SOCIÉTÉ QUÉBÉCOISE	Notre SOCIÉTÉ
IDENTITÉ QUÉBÉCOISE	Notre IDENTITÉ
CULTURE QUÉBÉCOISE	Notre CULTURE
CHARTÉ QUÉBÉCOISE	Notre CHARTÉ
NATION QUÉBÉCOISE	Notre NATION
POPULATION QUÉBÉCOISE	Notre POPULATION
ÉTAT QUÉBÉCOIS	Notre ÉTAT
PEUPLE QUÉBÉCOIS	Notre PEUPLE
GOUVERNEMENT QUÉBÉCOIS	Notre GOUVERNEMENT
CONSTITUTION QUÉBÉCOISE	Notre CONSTITUTION
VALEURS QUÉBÉCOISES	Nos VALEURS
TERRITOIRE QUÉBÉCOIS	Notre TERRITOIRE
IDENTITÉ QUÉBÉCOISE	Notre IDENTITÉ
CITOYENNETÉ QUÉBÉCOISE	Nos CONCITOYENS
DE LA LANGUE ²¹	Notre LANGUE

Table 29: Comparison of FrenchBT corpus collocates of québécois(e) and notre/nos

Nous + verbs

To return to our discussion of verbs in association with *nous* (see Table 21), there are a number of “mental processes” in relation with *nous* (verbs of cognition, affection, or perception). Examples of these verbs are *croyons*, *voulons*, *souhaitons*, *savons*, *considérons*, *estimons*, *constatons*, *aimerions*, *entendons* and *espérons*. This lends an affective element to “we”: *nous* is a thinking, feeling, perceiving group of people, who, through their verbal processes, are making these thoughts, feelings and perceptions known to the Commission. There are also a number of verbal processes (verbs of communication), such as *proposons* and *recommandons*; these verbs would presumably indicate the objective or purpose of making propositions and recommendations to the Commission (Consultation Commission, 2007a).

²¹ A frequent word cluster not containing *québécois* but within the 5-word collocation context of *québécois*.

More interesting, perhaps, is that verbs in the R1 position with *nous* are mainly modals or verbs of modality. Even auxiliary verbs, such as *sommes* and *avons* serve modal functions when used in periphrastic modality. Where with a modal an example might be *nous devons faire*, a similar meaning can be created with *avons*: *nous avons besoin de faire*.

	Modals	Periphrastic modality
Volition or intention	Nous souhaitons	Nous avons choisi
	Nous aimerions	Nous avons décidé
	Nous voulons	Nous avons besoin de
Obligation or necessity	Nous devons	Nous avons la
		responsabilité de

Table 30: FrenchBT corpus modals and periphrastic modality

Modals are important, because they highlight possibilities, necessities, predictions, and volition (Biber et al., 2002). For instance, in the FrenchBT corpus, the modal verb of obligation and necessity *devons* (*devoir*, or “must”) highlights the need to learn and accept, but also the need to recognize, avoid, stop, continue and remember:

DEVONS	
R1	R2
FAIRE	FAIRE
RECONNAÎTRE	ACCEPTER
APPRENDRE	RAPPELER
ÉVITER	
CESSER	
CONTINUER	

Table 31: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest with *devons* in R1 and R2 position

These references to modality and the discursive evidence of the desire to choose, decide, continue, and remember suggests what Renan (1896) calls the nation’s

“daily plebiscite” (p. 81); the citizens of a nation express desire to continue living a common life.

In conclusion, the examination of *nous* and its possessive forms *notre* and *nos* has reinforced previous findings that *nous* is strongly connected to *Québec* and *société*. In this section, I found that the collocates of *nous* construct the group as (members of) Quebec society with positive attributes.

Identité

Identité ranks 52 on the keyword list, with an overall frequency of 2244 occurrences. *Identité* occurs in 373 of the 703 briefs, which is a total of 53 percent of the briefs. This keyword has already figured into this discussion in the consideration of previous keywords: we have seen that *identité* serves as a strong collocate for keywords such as *Québec*, *québécois(e)*, and *nous/notre/nos*. This section will serve to uncover more functions of the keyword *identité*.

By looking at the word clusters centring around *identité*, apart from the clusters involving grammatical words, by far the most frequent use of *identité* is in the context of *québécoise* (275 occurrences). The next most frequent cluster is *de notre identité*, and the subsequent clusters include *l'identité culturelle*, *l'identité nationale*, and *l'identité sociale* (see Table 32, below). While some of the less frequent clusters perhaps refer to civic identity (*identité sociale*, *l'identité collective*, *une identité commune*), more clusters seem to be cultural and often exclusive (*de notre identité*, *de leur identité*, *des identités culturelles*, *notre identité culturelle*, *son identité culturelle*).

Cluster	Freq.
L IDENTITÉ QUÉBÉCOISE	275
DE NOTRE IDENTITÉ	98
L IDENTITÉ CULTURELLE	82
L IDENTITÉ NATIONALE	54
DE LEUR IDENTITÉ	52
L IDENTITÉ SOCIALE	51
DES IDENTITÉS CULTURELLES	40
NOTRE IDENTITÉ CULTURELLE	37
SON IDENTITÉ CULTURELLE	35
L IDENTITÉ COLLECTIVE	35
UNE IDENTITÉ COMMUNE	30
UNE IDENTITÉ QUÉBÉCOISE	29
L IDENTITÉ CANADIENNE	27
IDENTITÉ QUÉBÉCOISE ET	26
NOTRE IDENTITÉ ET	26

Table 32: FrenchBT corpus clusters of interest involving identité

Collocates can also be divided into groups: some (*notre, culture, culturelle, culturelles, valeurs*) seem to evoke ethnocultural dimensions of identity; others, civic dimensions (*collective, société, integration, commune*); and still others are ambiguous (*québécoise, Québec, québécois, nationale*). Some of the most frequent R1 collocates of *identité* suggest that discussions of identity are in relation to culture and nation:

R1	Frequency
QUÉBÉCOISE	356
CULTURELLE	255
NATIONALE	111
COLLECTIVE	81
SOCIALE	65
COMMUNE	55
CANADIENNE	46
RELIGIEUSE	25
PERSONNELLE	17

Table 33: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest in R1 position with identité

Frequency remains critical to the understanding of these collocates:

identité québécoise is by far the most frequent identity label with a frequency of 477, and the next most frequent is *notre identité*. If *nous* refers to the same group

as *québécois*, then both of these terms refer to the same collective identity, that of the Quebec people. There are also frequent references to *identité culturelle* (261 occurrences) and substantially fewer references to civic identity (for example, *identité collective*, 81 occurrences): this suggests that discussions of identity in the briefs are predominantly (ethno)cultural national identity.

The examination of the keyword *identité* serves to illustrate that there are various kinds of identity evoked in the corpus; each is discursively constructed differently, and each is given different weight within the discussion. If frequency is indicative of the importance of the term or subject (Baker, 2006; Stubbs, 1996), then *identité québécoise* is by far the most important type of identity, particularly if *notre identité* also refers *identité québécoise*. There are also more references to ethnocultural than civic dimensions of identity in the briefs.

Leur

Leur (“their”) is number 49 on the keyword list, with a total frequency of 8147 in the FrenchBT corpus. *Leur* occurs in 654 briefs, which is 93 percent of the briefs. The plural form, *leurs*, is number 166 on the keyword list, and occurs 3830 times throughout the corpus, in 82.9 percent of the briefs.

R1	Frequency
PAYS	282
RELIGION	281
ENFANTS	258
CULTURE	201
INTÉGRATION	168
VIE	142
DROITS	140
IDENTITÉ	138
CROYANCES	114
ARRIVÉE	114
VALEURS	100
PLACE	92
ORIGINE	88
LANGUE	79
COMMUNAUTÉ	76
APPARTENANCE	74
PARENTS	71
SOCIÉTÉ	70
FOI	69
CONVICTIONS	64
BESOINS	62

Table 34: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest with leur(s)

A preliminary way to examine these possessive pronouns is to look at the word that follows *leur* one space to the right (R1). The most frequent collocate of interest in this position is *pays* (“country”). *Pays* occurs as a collocate of *leur* 466 times; of those times, clusters reveal that it is often in the form *pays d’origine*, which occurs 126 times and is the second most frequent cluster. The next word of interest in the R1 position is *religion* (520 occurrences), which occurs in the R1 position 281 times, forming *leur religion*. Other R1 collocates of interest are *enfants*, *culture*, *intégration*, *identité*, *croyances*, *arrivée*, *valeurs*, and *origine*.

What is interesting from these collocations is that many of them show remarkable similarities with the personal pronouns *notre* and *nos* (see Table 35, below). It almost seems as though the “we” and “them” are being depicted in the same manner. Both “we” and “they” have religion, country, culture, values,

communities, and societies. Still, since any language user can adopt the deictics and pronouns to discursively construct in-groups and out-groups, this is not necessarily be revealing. For example, immigrants may refer to themselves as “we” and the Québécois as “they,” whereas a Québécois could use the same language to refer to the opposite groups. Thus, it is important to note the differences, rather than the similarities, between the collocates and referents of *leur* and *notre/nos* in order to determine the dominant ways in which the terms are being used.

The collocate *intégration* is a term used exclusively with *leur* and not with *notre* or *nos*. Other terms of interest that are used exclusively with *leur* are *arrivée, compétences, permettre, formation, études, sexe, insertion* and *profession*. Since, as previously discussed, immigrants are discussed in terms of their education (*formation, études*), status (*arrivée*), ethnicity and nationality (*pays, origine*), the repetition of these collocates suggests that discussions of “them” refer to immigrants. In contrast, terms of interest that are used exclusively with *notre* and *nos* are *nation, région, patrimoine, immigrants, gouvernements, politicians, recommandations, civilisation, constitution* and *démocratie*. These seem to indicate that, predominantly, references to the in-group refer to the Quebec majority, which is constructed in the briefs as a nation with a common history (*patrimoine, civilisation*), and common political institutions (*constitution, gouvernements, démocratie*). Of note, while the collocates common to *leur(s)* and *notre/nos* include ethnocultural attributes (*langue, religions, valeurs, culture, foi, pratiques, croyances*), collocates exclusive to *nous* refer to political institutions

typically associated with nation states or nationhood (Kymlicka, 1995). These collocates suggest that the in-group self-represents in terms of civic and ethnic nationalist attributes, in a perhaps modernizing discourse (Heller, 2001).

LEUR(S) R1	NOTRE R1	NOS R1
PAYS	SOCIÉTÉ	VALEURS
RELIGION	CULTURE	INSTITUTIONS
ENFANTS	IDENTITÉ	LOIS
PROPRE	HISTOIRE	ENFANTS
CULTURE	LANGUE	ÉCOLES
INTÉGRATION	PAYS	SOCIÉTÉS
VIE	VIE	DROITS
DROITS	AVIS	JOURS
IDENTITÉ	PROPRE	PROPRES
CROYANCES	MÉMOIRE	CHARTES
ARRIVÉE	SYSTÈME	ANCÊTRES
VALEURS	NATION	CONCITOYENS
PLACE	RÉGION	DIFFÉRENCES
ORIGINE	PASSÉ	JEUNES
PROPRES	FAÇON	VIES
LANGUE	PATRIMOINE	MEMBRES
COMMUNAUTÉ	TERRITOIRE	COUTUMES
APPARTENANCE	PEUPLE	TRADITIONS
PARENTS	RÉFLEXION	IMMIGRANTS
SOCIÉTÉ	POINT	ÉLUS
FOI	RELIGION	POLITIQUES
EST	COMMUNAUTÉ	RACINES
CONVICTIONS	HÉRITAGE	GOUVERNEMENTS
BESOINS	VISION	MOEURS
GROUPE	MONDE	YEUX
DROIT	DAME	CROYANCES
FAMILLE	POPULATION	COMMUNAUTÉS
COMPÉTENCES	FOI	RÈGLES
PRATIQUES	POSITION	PRATIQUES

Table 35: FrenchBT corpus R1 collocates with *leur*, *notre* and *nos*, in order

As can be seen in Appendix VII, R1 collocates exclusive to *leur* fall into categories of work, processes (of integration), education, family, modulation and modality, religion, and verbal processes. This seems to indicate civic concerns as to how immigrants will integrate into Quebec society in terms of jobs and according to their education. Notably, there are no references to *leur* patrimony,

past, or history; there is, instead, reference to *leur* origins. It seems that immigrants are being discursively constructed with no past, heritage or history.²² If, according to Renan (1896) a national idea is founded on “common glories in the past [and] a common will in the present” (p. 81), then immigrants are being constructed as a group devoid of a common history.²³ In contrast, R1 collocates exclusive to *notre* and *nous* tend to be attributes of nationhood, particularly in reference to territory and civic society. These categories again seem to indicate versions of the ethnocultural and civic (state) nation.

The discussion of *leur* has shown that it is a term referring principally to immigrants. Although *leur* has many collocates in common with *notre/nos*, the collocates that differ serve to construct “them” (immigrants?) as a group without national attributes, whereas “we” are increasingly reinforced as a nation with both ethnocultural and civic attributes. As discussed previously with reference to Anglo Québécois, it seems that immigrants are being constructed as “ethnic groups” not “national minorities” (Kymlicka, 1995). While national minorities are “distinct societies alongside the majority culture, and demand various forms of autonomy or self-government to ensure their survival as distinct societies,” ethnic groups “typically wish to integrate into the larger society, and to be accepted as full members of it ... their aim is not to become a separate and self-governing

²² For example, *patrimoine* is not a collocate with *leur*, but occurs 54 times in the R1 position with *notre*. *Passé* occurs only seven times in the R1 position with *leur*, in contrast with 56 times in the R1 position with *notre*. *Histoire* occurs 43 times in the R1 position with *leur*, in contrast with 249 times in the R1 position with *notre*.

²³ See also Létourneau, 2006 and Létourneau, Aronoff, & Scott, 2004 for discussions of the importance of history in nationalism in Quebec and Canada.

society, but to modify the institutions and laws of the mainstream society to make them more *accommodating of cultural differences*” (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 10-11, my emphasis). In other words, while national minorities have rights and privileges, ethnic groups are meant to integrate, albeit with accommodation from the majority group.

Langue

Langue is the next keyword of interest; it is number 40 on the keyword list, and number 99 on the frequency list, occurring 2708 times. *Langue* occurs in 444 (63%) briefs.

Word	Total	Total Left	Total Right	L 5	L 4	L3	L2	L1	R1	R 2	R 3	R 4	R 5
FRANÇAISE	847	41	806	6	9	10	13	3	774	15	4	4	9
FRANÇAIS	414	300	114	22	30	72	125	51	4	6	29	44	31
COMMUNE	256	14	242	3	2	8	0	1	151	64	12	4	11
QUÉBEC	236	90	146	28	33	14	14	1	1	14	96	13	22
CULTURE	228	77	151	17	17	21	21	1	3	38	48	39	23
NOTRE	190	149	41	10	11	4	8	116	6	9	12	7	7
LEUR	189	119	70	8	14	7	11	79	9	20	18	12	11
OFFICIELLE	187	18	169	6	1	5	5	1	147	5	7	5	5
CHARTÉ	161	152	9	1	5	145	0	1	0	0	4	4	1
RELIGION	135	63	72	26	4	14	13	6	5	17	34	12	4
MATERNELLE	113	2	111	0	1	1	0	0	109	0	0	1	1
ANGLAISE	97	8	89	2	2	0	3	1	76	3	3	1	6
PUBLIQUE	92	3	89	0	2	0	1	0	62	1	0	7	19
ANGLAIS	88	60	28	7	15	15	21	2	0	3	5	12	8
CONNAISSANCE	88	77	11	2	18	50	7	0	0	1	5	3	2
TRAVAIL	82	14	68	2	5	4	3	0	0	39	9	4	16
AUTRE	75	42	33	2	2	6	2	30	15	10	2	1	5
MÊME	70	40	30	11	7	4	2	16	4	4	7	4	11
QUÉBÉCOIS	70	48	22	6	9	23	10	0	0	1	7	8	6
USAGE	69	19	50	3	3	13	0	0	0	41	3	4	2
APPRENTISSAGE	63	61	2	3	7	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
NATIONALE	62	8	54	2	0	3	3	0	15	1	1	15	22

Table 36: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest with langue

The collocates of *langue* fall into four principal categories: (1) kind of language, (2) context of language, (3) language education, and (4) ownership of language.

Kind of language

In the first category, “kind of language,” *française* is by far the strongest collocate, occurring 847 times, and followed by *français* with a frequency of 414. *Française* refers to *la langue française*, which occurs as a cluster 713 times; *Français* occurs in clusters such as *Français comme langue*, which occurs 100 times. French is evidently the language in question. The next most frequent collocate of interest is *commune*. This collocate occurs in two frequent clusters, *langue publique commune* (59 occurrences) and *la langue commune* (56 occurrences). *Commune* is an interesting collocate because it indicates that language is presented as a unifying factor. Political rhetoric, too, places the French language at the heart of belonging in Quebec. The Commission Document (2007a) explains:

The French language is the main medium that allows Quebecers of all origins to learn about each other, interact, cooperate and participate in the development of Québec society. (p. 14)

Heller (2001) explains that in “modernizing” French Canadian identity discourse, the French language is presented not only as a symbol of collective identity, but also as transcending ethnic identities: collocating with *officielle*, *nationale* and in the cluster *langue publique commune*, French is branded as the language of Quebec citizenship, of a civic Quebec nation, rather than being associated with potentially more exclusive notions of French Canadian ethnicity. Frequent

references to the French language contrast strongly with the few references to *anglaise* and *anglais*; these collocates occur only 97 and 88 times, respectively, as opposed to 847 and 414 occurrences for *française* and *Français*, respectively.

Social domains associated with language

The next category, “context of language,” can be broken down into further categories: 1) context of use; 2) legal context or status, and 3) associated contexts. In the context of use, for example, there is the collocate *travail*. This indicates that French is the common language of work, and this is verified by the frequent cluster *langue du travail* (31 occurrences). There are also ethnocultural references, as shown through collocates such as *culture* and *religion*.

Language education

The next category, “language education” contains a number of collocates that refer to language learning, such as *apprentissage* (63 occurrences), *apprendre* (52 occurrences), *maîtrise* (50 occurrences), and *enseignement* (39 occurrences). The salience of collocates associating language and learning evokes a “topos” identified by Heller (2001) in the modernizing French Canadian identity discourse. “Topoi” are argumentation schemes that rely on “common-sense” reasoning (Baker et al., 2008). The topos, in this case, is that language learning allows “others” to integrate into Quebec society through their adoption of the *langue commune*. This draws on the civic understanding of the role French plays in Quebec as a language of common citizenry; the argument is that since anyone can learn a language, Québécois (civic) identity is not exclusive. However, as

explained in Chapter 2, Heller (2001) refutes this, arguing that democratic processes simply mask the ethnocultural value of the French language.

Ownership of language

Finally, the category termed “ownership of language” includes collocates such as *notre*, *leur*, *québécoise* and *québécois*. Below, there is a chart of the most frequent L1 collocates of *langue*. *Notre* and *leur* are the most frequent, suggesting a dichotomy being constructed between “our language” and “their language.”

Table 37: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest in L1 position with *langue(s)*

To conclude, the investigation of the keyword *langue* has shown a primarily civic construction of the role of language in Quebec society. This is achieved through collocates referring to French as a common, public, official, and national language. This language is accessible through public education to all those in the province, irrespective of their origins. Still, the civic depiction of language is not clear-cut: some examples showed that language remains linked to religion and culture; others refer to conflicting versions of ownership over language (our language/their language/common language).

Français

The next keyword of interest is *français*; it ranks 61 on the keyword list and occurs 2443 times in the FrenchBT corpus. The strongest collocates with *français(e)* reveal a wide scope of association. By far the strongest collocate is *langue* (1250 occurrences); the next most frequent is *Québec*, with 373 occurrences. Examining the locations of this collocate, it appears that *Québec* appears almost equally on either side of *français(e)*.

Word	Total	Total Left	Total Right	L5	L4	L3	L2	L1	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5
LANGUE	1250	918	332	40	46	31	16	785	54	138	80	34	26
QUÉBEC	373	132	241	42	31	26	13	20	3	139	23	24	52
CANADIENS	201	184	17	4	4	2	0	174	2	4	5	3	3
CANADIENNE	198	189	9	1	6	3	0	179	0	2	2	5	0
QUÉBÉCOIS	191	130	61	18	69	24	13	6	5	7	17	17	15
ANGLAIS	190	49	141	12	7	19	7	4	16	40	58	17	10
NOUS	182	47	135	11	9	14	13	0	39	26	25	23	22
CHARTÉ	162	147	15	3	141	0	1	2	0	6	5	3	1
COMMUNE	151	29	122	2	6	12	9	0	0	13	42	54	13
CULTURE	137	83	54	16	8	4	19	36	0	8	12	23	11
LEUR	131	47	84	15	9	18	1	4	4	27	18	22	13
IMMIGRANTS	110	60	50	23	14	14	4	5	1	17	17	7	8
ORIGINE	106	94	12	2	7	6	61	18	0	6	3	2	1
QUÉBÉCOISE	99	42	57	10	15	6	7	4	5	7	7	13	25
OFFICIELLE	96	23	73	4	5	8	6	0	0	9	28	30	6
CONNAISSANCE	89	84	5	8	18	11	47	0	0	1	1	2	1
COURS	89	79	10	5	5	2	67	0	1	5	0	1	3
APPRENTISSAGE	88	84	4	4	17	0	63	0	0	1	0	1	2
NOTRE	88	47	41	10	12	9	16	0	2	12	9	11	7
CANADIEN	78	69	9	4	4	2	1	58	3	1	1	4	0
LAÏCITÉ	78	35	43	9	7	10	2	7	0	11	12	5	15
SOCIÉTÉ	75	52	23	7	6	17	12	10	0	1	10	5	7
APPRENDRE	72	65	7	2	3	5	55	0	1	1	2	1	2
IDENTITÉ	69	49	20	7	4	7	27	4	0	0	5	5	10
PUBLIQUE	67	12	55	1	2	3	2	4	0	6	36	8	5
PRIMAUTÉ	62	60	2	0	18	10	32	0	0	1	1	0	0

Table 38: FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest with français(e)(s)

Clusters of interest are *Français au Québec* (58 occurrences), *française au Québec* (43 occurrences), *Français du Québec* (21 occurrences) and *du Québec*

français (11 occurrences). These examples show how the French language is connected to Quebec by being both “in” and “from” the province.

Also of interest are the collocates *canadiens*, *canadienne*, and *canadien*. These occur most often to the left of *français*, more specifically, in the L1 position in the following phrases: *canadiens français*, *canadienne française*, and *canadien français*. One recurrent cluster is *origine canadienne française* (60 occurrences). As discussed earlier, *canadien(ne) français(e)* is an ethnic term to refer to the original descendants of the settlers of New France. This term overlaps with other ethnic terms such as *Québécois de souche*; however while *Québécois de souche* puts emphasis on Québécois ethnicity, *canadienne française* puts emphasis on the ethnicity of the pan-Canadian French nation as understood in the traditionalist discourse (Heller, 2001). Thus, the frequent use of *canadienne française*, and particularly the reference to French Canadian *identité* (*identité canadienne française*, 24 occurrences), may be indicative of traditionalist discourse within the province.

Word	Total	Total Left	Total Right	L1
CANADIENS	201	184	17	174
CANADIENNE	198	189	9	179
CANADIEN	78	69	9	58

Table 39: FrenchBT corpus collocates with Français(e)(s): Canadien(ne)(s)

The next most frequent collocate of interest is *anglais*, which occurs 190 times as a collocate with *français*, primarily to the right. Recurrent clusters include *et l'anglais* (16 occurrences) and *français ni anglais* (15 occurrences). Other recurring words are *commune*, *officielle*, *publique* and *primauté*, which again indicate the important status of French in Quebec as the common language of public life. Like *langue*, *français* is discursively associated with terms of

learning (*connaissance, apprentissage, cours, apprendre*), again evoking the topos that since everyone can learn a language, a common language (as opposed to ethnicity or religion) can be the common denominator in an inclusive identity.

Summary

In conclusion, the analysis of the FrenchBT corpus has shown that *Québec* is constructed through ethnocultural and civic representations with references to in-groups and out-groups. While the in-group (*nous*) is primarily connected with Quebec and civic society, the out-group (namely, *immigrants*) is primarily constructed as a group devoid of national attributes. Moreover, there is concern about immigrants' integration into society. The majority of briefs associate the French language with attributes of an inclusive civic nation, but others continue to stress its link to culture, religion, and as both an ethnocultural and linguistic identity marker. In the subsequent chapter, the findings from the FrenchBT corpus analysis are compared and contrasted with the findings from the EnglishBT corpus analysis.

Chapter 5: EnglishBT Corpus Analysis

The analysis for the EnglishBT corpus took a similar shape to the analysis of the FrenchBT corpus. First a frequency list, and then a keyword list were compiled (see Appendices VIII and IX).

Remarkably, the top 50 lexical keywords of interest in EnglishBT corpus are similar to the top 100 lexical keywords found in the FrenchBT corpus (see Table 42, below). Unfortunately, as explained in Chapter 3, Methodology, the keyness scores cannot be compared. What can be compared is the ranking of each keyword; the rankings in each corpus are indeed similar. Despite the similar rankings, two keywords notably stand out in the English keyword list: *English* and *Canada*. *English* is ranked 47 on the English keyword list, whereas on the French keyword list, *Anglais* is ranked 221. In contrast, *French* in the English keyword list is ranked 15, which is a higher ranking than the ranking of 61 for *Français* in the French keyword list. The other notable keyword, *Canada*, is ranked 50 on the English keyword list, whereas it is ranked 255 on the French keyword list. This is suggestive, perhaps, of an English Québécois perspective: traditionally, English Quebecers position themselves with reference to Canada and the English language or the English language community. Notable keywords from the French list are *laïcité* (rank 21), *état* (rank 33), and *identité* (rank 35). In the EnglishBT corpus, the equivalent in translations have noticeably lower rankings: *secular* and *secularism* rank 76 and 80, respectively; *state* ranks 114; and *identity* ranks 56.

English	Rank	Freq.	Keyness	French	Rank	Freq.	Keyness
QUEBEC	1	633	637.19	QUÉBEC	4	11497	6735.77
SOCIETY	2	425	336.40	SOCIÉTÉ	5	7413	5217.30
RELIGIOUS	4	285	257.28	RELIGIEUX	15	4052	3568.38
CULTURAL	5	205	219.45	CULTURELLES	26	2507	2387.20
IMMIGRANTS	7	192	194.76	IMMIGRANTS	12	4036	3945.98
OUR	8	586	170.08	NOTRE	24	6672	2446.44
RELIGION	9	216	158.33	RELIGION	8	5430	4707.99
ACCOMMODATION	10	185	150.24	ACCOMMODEMENT	11	4144	4132.56
COMMUNITY	12	173	143.19	COMMUNAUTÉ	71	1450	1027.19
VALUES	13	162	142.73	VALEURS	14	4089	3578.38
WOMEN	14	186	142.00	FEMMES	39	3802	1728.67
FRENCH	15	186	133.61	FRANÇAIS	61	2443	1234.51
COMMISSION	17	124	115.68	COMMISSION	17	3629	3068.59
DIVERSITY	19	126	111.63	DIVERSITÉ	41	1954	1713.20
LANGUAGE	20	165	106.43	LANGUE	40	2708	1718.21
WE	21	787	105.89	NOUS	18	17181	3049.76
RIGHTS	22	212	103.33	DROITS	32	5176	2062.25
INTEGRATION	23	111	102.20	INTÉGRATION	19	3696	3023.71
SCHOOLS	24	90	96.30	ÉCOLE	100	1505	715.21
BELIEFS	25	90	96.30	CROYANCES	87	966	826.75
MONTREAL	26	110	95.30	MONTREAL	110	2048	651.85
SOCIAL	27	100	90.84	SOCIAL	103	1319	700.87
EQUALITY	28	98	88.78	ÉGALITÉ	22	2666	2520.11
IMMIGRATION	30	87	83.91	IMMIGRATION	25	2471	2437.70
REASONABLE	31	116	82.74	RAISONNABLES	28	2313	2268.34
GROUPS	32	97	82.13	GROUPE	56	1757	1278.37
CULTURE	33	111	82.02	CULTURE	30	3498	2216.90
DISCRIMINATION	34	76	81.32	DISCRIMINATION	64	1305	1131.42
MUSLIM	36	95	80.11	MUSULMANS	99	852	728.41
MINORITIES	37	74	79.18	MINORITÉS	72	1054	1026.14
EDUCATION	38	99	79.15	ÉDUCATION	91	1483	784.80
PUBLIC	39	184	78.51	PUBLIQUE	67	1665	1060.15
QUEBECERS	40	111	77.99	QUÉBÉCOISE	13	4155	3623.47
				QUÉBÉCOIS	16	5235	3429.35
CHARTER	41	80	76.58	CHARTRE	37	2006	1790.92

Table 40: Comparison of English and French corpora words of interest

While the comparison of the keyword lists is interesting and potentially revealing, it is more insightful to investigate individual keywords to determine how they are being used and how they might be indicative of underlying discourses. This

chapter will analyze keywords in the EnglishBT corpus according to their rank on the keyword list.

Quebec

The first keyword on the English keyword list is *Quebec*. *Quebec* appears 633 times on the frequency list, in a total of 92% of the briefs.

Word	Total	Total Left	Total Right	L5	L4	L3	L2	L1	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5
QUEBEC	649	8	8	2	2	1	3	0	0	3	1	2	2
SOCIETY	113	11	102	4	2	3	1	1	96	2	3	1	0
CANADA	31	18	13	0	0	2	14	2	0	8	4	0	1
OUR	27	17	10	1	5	5	2	4	1	3	2	3	1
ENGLISH	25	10	15	1	6	2	1	0	3	6	3	1	2
COMMUNITY	21	10	11	0	1	2	7	0	4	0	4	2	1
THEIR	19	9	10	3	3	2	0	1	1	1	3	3	2
RIGHTS	19	5	14	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4
CANADIAN	19	11	8	1	0	3	7	0	0	7	1	0	0
IDENTITY	18	5	13	2	0	2	1	0	10	2	0	1	0
GOVERNMENT	18	7	11	1	0	0	6	0	8	0	2	1	0
IMMIGRANTS	17	11	6	0	1	4	5	1	2	0	1	2	1
FRENCH	15	11	4	2	0	5	3	1	0	1	0	2	1
VALUES	15	5	10	0	0	2	3	0	7	0	0	1	2
LANGUAGE	15	7	8	0	1	2	3	1	2	1	3	1	1
INTEGRATION	15	14	1	2	3	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	0
PEOPLE	11	7	4	1	1	0	5	0	0	1	2	0	1
IMMIGRATION	11	4	7	0	1	1	2	0	1	3	2	1	0
CITIZENS	11	6	5	1	0	0	5	0	2	3	0	0	0
CULTURE	11	2	9	0	1	0	1	0	5	0	2	1	1
ACCOMMODATION	11	10	1	1	3	1	5	0	0	0	1	0	0
WOMEN	10	7	3	0	1	0	5	1	1	0	1	0	1
CHARTER	10	1	9	0	1	0	0	0	8	0	1	0	0
HUMAN	10	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	2	0
RELIGIOUS	10	7	3	2	3	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0
GROUPS	10	5	5	0	2	1	1	1	0	4	0	0	1
THEY	9	5	4	1	3	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	1
QUEBECERS	9	2	7	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	3
CULTURAL	9	6	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1
NATION	8	1	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	2	0	2

Table 41: EnglishBT corpus collocates of interest with Quebec

As in the FrenchBT corpus, the EnglishBT corpus collocates of *Quebec*

break into categories: there are collocates that refer to Quebec as a polity,

collocates that label group identity, collocates that illustrate core values in the province, and collocates that relate to integration and diversity.

Polity, institutions	Identity labels	Core values	Integration and diversity
SOCIETY	WE	ENGLISH	IMMIGRANTS
CANADA	OUR	RIGHTS	INTEGRATION
COMMUNITY	THEIR	IDENTITY	IMMIGRATION
CANADIAN	GROUPS	FRENCH	ACCOMMODATION
GOVERNMENT	THEY	VALUES	
CITIZENS	WOMEN	LANGUAGE	
CHARTER	QUEBECERS	CULTURE	
NATION		RELIGIOUS	
		CULTURAL	

Table 42: EnglishBT corpus collocates of interest with Quebec: Categories

Quebec as a polity

As with the FrenchBT corpus, there are a number of collocates that present Quebec in political terms: *government*, *citizens*, *charter*, and *Quebecers*. Also similar to the FrenchBT corpus, Quebec is overwhelmingly characterized as a society; this can be seen in the strong relationship between the keyword *Quebec* and the collocate *society* (113 occurrences); also *society* is predominantly found in the R1 position, forming *Quebec society*. Clusters reinforce this point: *of Quebec society* and *in Quebec society* are the two most frequent clusters (22 occurrences each). There are also various other clusters employing *Quebec* and *society*; as a result, the two terms are inextricably linked.

Cluster	Freq.
OF QUEBEC SOCIETY	22
IN QUEBEC SOCIETY	22
QUEBEC SOCIETY AND	12
INTO QUEBEC SOCIETY	10
AND QUEBEC SOCIETY	7
QUEBEC SOCIETY IS	7
WITHIN QUEBEC SOCIETY	5
EGALITARIAN QUEBEC SOCIETY	5

Table 43: EnglishBT corpus clusters with society and Quebec

Clusters and collocates show a strong relationship between the terms *Canada* and *Quebec*: *Canada and Quebec* (eleven occurrences), *Quebec and Canada* (seven occurrences), *Canadian and Quebec* (seven occurrences) and *Quebec and Canadian* (five occurrences). When the collocate *Canada* in its most frequent position, L2, we arrive at concordance lines that show “Quebec” as a conjunct of “Canada”; one concordance line (in italics, below) clearly subsumes Quebec as part of Canada.

challenges to social cohesion than **Canada or Quebec** (and this commission's mandate we have redefined marriage in **Canada and Quebec** to include individuals of the same - To immigrants who are coming here to **Canada and Quebec**, integrating means to respect situation for people before they come to **Canada and Quebec**. We also, however, have to that immigration has brought with it to **Canada and Quebec** in recent decades has enriched immigration and diversity to **Canada and Quebec** Immigration has contributed to the spoken to a new immigrant, never seen one. **Canada and Quebec** bemoan the fact that about discrimination. *We have always seen **Canada and Quebec** in particular as our second* contributed to the development of **Canada and Quebec** in a number of ways. One of the the economy and society in general in **Canada and Quebec** of those newcomers already in or multiculturalism. From outside **Canada and Quebec** these models look essentially the

Table 44: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines, Canada in L2 position with Quebec

Concordance lines show that discursive positioning relative to Quebec is associated with positioning relative to Canada; this suggests English-speaking Québécois’ dual membership in Canada and Quebec in the sense of federalism. The FrenchBT corpus contains some similar trends when the collocate *Canada* is in its most frequent position, R3, in relation to *Québec (le Québec et le Canada)*. However, as noted above, *Canada* is not a strong keyword in the FrenchBT corpus, and clusters linking the two terms remain infrequent. The most frequent cluster referring to *Canada* ranks 78 in the FrenchBT cluster list; in contrast, the most frequent cluster referring to *Canada* ranks 6 in the EnglishBT corpus.

Therefore, although the FrenchBT corpus suggests some potential federalist voices, federalism does not appear to be a central consideration; in contrast, the EnglishBT corpus contains keywords, collocates and concordance lines that are suggestive of a federalist perspective.

Therefore, although *Quebec* is described overwhelmingly as a society, frequent references to Canada suggest a more systematic dual positioning toward both Quebec and Canada, which is little surprising since, traditionally, English Québécois have advocated federalism (Oakes & Warren, 2007).

Groups in Quebec

According to the collocates of *Quebec*, two groups appear most salient within the corpus: *we* and *them*. Other groups include *women*, *immigrants*, and *Quebecers*. There do not appear to be significant patterns concerning the placement of these collocates in relation to *Quebec*; discussions of *we*, *them*, *women*, *immigrants* and *Quebecers* seem to be positioned widely on both sides of *Quebec*.

Core values

There are significantly fewer “core value” collocates in the EnglishBT corpus than in the FrenchBT corpus. The FrenchBT corpus has a wealth of references to core values such as *libertés*, *culture*, *laïcité*, and *religion*. This may simply be due to the large size of the FrenchBT corpus and the relatively small size of the EnglishBT corpus; however, it may also indicate different conceptualizations of the province. These lacking collocates are attributes associated with nationhood, as defined by Kymlicka (1995, explained in Chapter 5). Kymlicka’s (1995) definition stresses, for example, the importance of territory in nationhood. In the

EnglishBT corpus, there is no reference to Quebec's geography; words such as *régions*, *terre* and *territoire* that collocate strongly with *Québec* in the FrenchBT corpus do not collocate with *Quebec* in the EnglishBT corpus.

We can also examine expressions of nationalism in the EnglishBT corpus through the collocate *nation*. In the FrenchBT corpus, *nation* ranked 121 on the keyword list, and *la nation québécoise* was a common cluster. In the EnglishBT corpus, *nation* is not a keyword; even as a collocate of the keyword *Quebec*, *nation* is infrequent; furthermore, *Quebec nation* does not appear as a cluster. *Nation* appears only eight times as a collocate of *Quebec*, and of these eight times, only three times does it occur in the R1 position to form *Quebec nation*. Concordance lines show that one example refers to Quebec as *our Quebec nation*; however, other examples seem to mock that title by referring to it as *the so-called* or *nonsmoking* Quebec nation. This is all to indicate that there is little to no representation of Quebec as a nation within the EnglishBT corpus.

celebrate diversity as a basic element of **our Quebec nation**. We must confront myths and three values of great importance to the **so-called Quebec nation** that were articulated by No one would cherish the idea of the **nonsmoking Quebec nation**. Now that we see that the

Table 45: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with Quebec nation

Although there appears to be little representation of Quebec as a nation, some collocates concern core values and dimensions of identity: *English*, *rights*, *French*, *values*, *language*, *culture*, and *religious*. Interestingly, as a collocate of *Quebec*, *English* (25 occurrences) is more frequent than *French* (15 occurrences), suggesting a more English-centred perspective. In the FrenchBT corpus, *Français* (246 occurrences) is a more frequent collocate of *Québec* than *Anglais* (49 occurrences). Concordance lines (listed below) show that, in the EnglishBT

corpus, *English* and *French* show patterns of (a) singling out identity, (b) vying for status (such as primacy), and (c) concern over language instruction.

understanding of the **French speaking and non-French speakers in Quebec**. 5. Will Law 101 nor the **primacy of the French Language in Quebec**, some important corrections in the case of the **status of the French language in Quebec**. The contribution of immigration considering the **cost of providing French instruction in Quebec**. 4.4 Secularism Choosing accommodated. By learning French, **our French here in Quebec**, he knows that the linguistic history and language of **English Speaking Community in Quebec** by the Provincial The contribution of the **English speaking community of Quebec** –itself very diverse- needs of the rest of Canada. 3 3. **English speaking parents in Quebec** have been permitted to identity needs. As the **English-speaking community of Quebec** does not have a single cultural majority, **English-language institutions in Quebec** tend to be “accommodationist” group. Stated another way, **the English language in Quebec** is not the perceived means of

Table 46: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with French and English in relation to Quebec

Integration and diversity

The remainder of the collocates relate to discussions of integration and diversity. These collocates are *immigrants*, *integration*, *immigration*, and *accommodation*; they indicate the key Commission topic of religious and cultural accommodation in Quebec. However, there are no notable patterns or clusters that indicate specific ways that these collocate are being used in relation to discussions of *Quebec*.

The investigation of *Quebec* has shown that there are the same categories of reference in both the FrenchBT and the EnglishBT corpora. However, while the FrenchBT corpus showed conflicting representations of Quebec as a society and as a nation, the EnglishBT corpus predominantly contains representations of Quebec as a society.

Society

Society ranks second on the keyword list, and occurs 425 times across the corpus.

As shown in the table below, the strongest lexical collocate is *Quebec*, which appears most often in the L1 position to form *Quebec society*.

Word	Total	Total Left	Total Right	L5	L4	L3	L2	L1	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5
QUEBEC	116	104	12	0	2	3	2	97	1	1	4	2	4
OUR	84	78	6	3	3	3	10	59	2	1	1	1	1
WE	28	6	22	2	2	2	0	0	12	3	4	3	0
THEIR	22	12	10	4	1	1	3	3	0	1	4	4	1
VALUES	21	12	9	1	4	6	1	0	3	0	2	2	2
INTEGRATION	21	20	1	4	3	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	0
CANADIAN	20	20	0	0	0	6	0	14	0	0	0	0	0
SECULAR	17	17	0	0	2	1	0	14	0	0	0	0	0
PLURALISTIC	16	16	0	0	3	3	1	9	0	0	0	0	0
HOST	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0
MAINSTREAM	14	13	1	0	0	1	2	10	0	0	0	1	0
INTEGRATE	14	13	1	3	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
THEY	13	5	8	3	1	0	1	0	4	2	1	1	0
OPEN	11	8	3	1	4	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	0
DIVERSE	11	9	2	0	6	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	1
RELIGIOUS	11	7	4	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
RELIGION	11	7	4	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	1
QUÉBEC	11	10	1	0	0	0	0	10	0	1	0	0	0
FREE	10	6	4	0	1	3	0	2	3	0	0	1	0
CIVIL	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0
DEMOCRATIC	10	10	0	0	0	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0
IMMIGRANTS	9	9	0	2	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 47: EnglishBT corpus collocates with society

The next lexical collocate, *our*, also appears most often in the L1 position, to form *our society*. Since *our* qualifies more than one eighth of the occurrences of *society*, and since *Quebec* qualifies another quarter of the total examples, we can make a strong link between the three terms: the briefs are concerned with “our” Quebec society.

Next, *their* is a strong collocate with *society*; however, it does not often appear in the L1 position to form “their society” (only three occurrences). Similar

to the findings in the FrenchBT corpus, discussions of “them” are most important in relation to “their” integration into “our” society. This can be illustrated by examining the collocate *integration*, one of the most frequent lexical collocates of *society*, particularly in the L3 positions, as shown below.

groups will ensure their full integration to our society. However, reasonable accommodation facilitated their integration into mainstream society. Work with immigrants and refugees in ensuring immigrant's integration into our society values. I suggest that the onus should throughout their journey of integration into Quebec society. In this ministry, we take great newcomers as they go through the process of integration into Quebec society. We can work

Table 48: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with integration and society

Finally, collocates in the L1 position qualify *society*, associating *Quebec* with positive attributes such as *secular*, *pluralistic*, *mainstream*, *open* and *diverse*.

Immigrants

The next keyword of interest in the EnglishBT corpus is *immigrants*. It occurs 192 times, and ranks seven on the keyword list. As in the FrenchBT corpus, *immigrants* appears predominantly in the plural form; the singular form, *immigrant*, is further down the keyword list at rank 64 (see Appendix IX). As discussed in the FrenchBT corpus, this plural construction lumps immigrants into a single group.

With regard to collocation, we see familiar words appearing: *Quebec*, *their*, *English*, *integrate*, *society* and *integration*. The words *integrate* and *integration* refer to immigrants because they are found in the L1 and L2 positions, respectively, forming *integrate immigrants*, and *integration (of) immigrants*. Here again, we see that the keyword *immigrants* is principally used in reference to

expectations placed upon immigrants in Quebec society, particularly in terms of integration.

Word	Total	Total Left	Total Right	L5	L4	L3	L2	L1	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5
QUEBEC	17	6	11	1	2	1	0	2	1	5	4	1	0
THEIR	13	2	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	9	2	0	0
ENGLISH	11	3	8	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	3
INTEGRATE	9	6	3	0	0	1	1	4	0	2	1	0	0
SOCIETY	9	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	2
THEY	8	1	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	3
INTEGRATION	8	7	1	0	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	0

Table 49: EnglishBT corpus collocates with immigrants

Their

Related to *immigrants* is the keyword *their*. *Their* occurs 508 times across the EnglishBT corpus and ranks 51 on the keyword list. I explore this term in relation to the keyword *immigrants* because, as shown above in the discussion of *their* as a collocate, *their* principally refers to discussions of immigrants and integration. Indeed, *their* is useful to reveal group distinctions and membership. The collocates of *their* show connections with specific groups, namely cultural, religious, social and linguistic groups.

Looking at the most frequent collocates, we see that “they” are constructed as a religious and cultural group. *Religious* is the most frequent collocate in the R1 position; in concordance lines, this forms *their religious symbols*, *their religious beliefs*, and *their religious affiliation*. Religion appears to be a defining feature of this group, and this is emphasized by the prevalence of the collocate *beliefs* in the R2 position, in phrases such as *their religious/ spiritual/ fundamental beliefs*. Also, the collocates *culture*, *language*, *identity*, *English* and

French occur frequently in the R1 position, indicating the importance of culture, language and identity to “them.”

Word	R1	R2
RELIGIOUS	14	1
CHILDREN	14	1
CULTURE	7	2
LANGUAGE	7	2
COMMUNITY	6	0
RIGHTS	6	3
IDENTITY	5	1
COUNTRY	5	5
ENGLISH	3	0
FRENCH	3	1
BELIEFS	3	7
PEOPLE	2	0
SOCIETY	2	3

Table 50: *EnglishBT* corpus collocates with their

The next most frequent R1 collocate is *children*. Concordance lines show that English briefs are concerned with education; particularly, different kinds of schools are associated with different kinds of children. English schools are for English-speaking children, (private) religious schools are for religious groups, and public schools are for the common people. These concordance lines suggest the controversy over language of schooling in Quebec. The Charter of the French language upholds the right of English-speaking Québécois to send their children to English schools, but prevent immigrants to send their children to public English schools; however, parents who can afford it can send their children to private English schools, including religious ones.

been permitted to continue **sending their children to English schools** provided they attended since parents do not need to **send their children to a private religious school** to transmit parents may be tempted to **send their children to Catholic private schools**. One way for the most part chose to **send their children to English schools**. That trend, one which matter, since parents who **send their children to private schools** must still pay the full cost of parents should be encouraged to **send their children to common public schools** rather than

Table 51: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with their children

Thus the term *their*, used in discussions of group membership, predominantly constructs immigrants as a cultural or religious group.

We

We ranks 21 on the keyword list and occurs 787 times across 97% of the English briefs. As with discussions of “them” (their), *we* does not necessarily refer to one single English-speaking community in Montreal. *We* is a pronoun that can refer to various groups, depending on who is speaking or writing (Wodak et al., 1999). However, the use of this pronoun is revealing of the ways in which people construct their group identity. As in the FrenchBT corpus, verbs collocate strongly to the right of *we*, primarily in the R1 position, and refer to relational attributive and identifying processes, relational possessive processes, mental processes and modulating processes. Also as in the FrenchBT corpus, modalization is salient: speakers not only “take action” (“we work,” “we take”), but they also express values, judgments, or stances (“we should be,” “we must work”). Furthermore, the abundance of mental processes (such as *believe*, *see*, *think*, *know*, *wish* and *hope*) indicates that the authors of briefs are trying to persuade the audience of their opinions, beliefs and desires about reasonable accommodation in Quebec.

Word	Total	Total Left	Total Right	L5	L4	L3	L2	L1	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5
HAVE	118	13	105	3	3	2	1	4	82	13	4	4	2
ARE	115	22	93	5	3	7	1	6	79	4	2	3	5
CAN	54	6	48	1	2	0	0	3	41	0	2	3	2
BELIEVE	48	8	40	1	0	2	4	1	31	7	1	0	1
NEED	44	1	43	1	0	0	0	0	38	1	1	1	2
DO	41	15	26	1	1	2	1	10	14	6	2	3	1
WILL	39	8	31	0	1	0	1	6	26	0	1	3	1
MUST	38	4	34	3	0	1	0	0	32	0	0	0	2
QUEBEC	38	18	20	3	3	3	2	7	0	1	1	10	8
SEE	30	2	28	2	0	0	0	0	17	3	4	3	1
WERE	29	3	26	0	0	1	0	2	25	0	1	0	0
SOCIETY	28	22	6	0	3	4	3	12	0	0	2	2	2
THEM	25	5	20	1	1	0	2	1	0	5	7	7	1
WOULD	24	5	19	1	0	1	0	3	19	0	0	0	0
QUEBECERS	16	4	12	1	0	1	1	1	3	2	2	5	0
OTHERS	15	6	9	0	3	2	0	1	0	0	3	5	1
WORK	15	1	14	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	3	5	0
THINK	13	4	9	0	1	1	0	2	7	1	0	1	0
HAD	13	1	12	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	0	1	1
COULD	13	1	12	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	2	1
TAKE	12	1	11	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	2	1
KNOW	12	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	1	0	1
WISH	11	1	10	0	1	0	0	0	6	0	1	1	2
LIVE	11	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	1	0	2

Table 52: EnglishBT corpus: Collocates of interest with We

Our

To better understand how *we* are described, I examined the keyword *our*, which ranks 8 on the keyword list. *Our* was found to be a collocate of *society*; hence, it is not surprising that *society* is also a collocate, in fact the most frequent lexical collocate (82 occurrences), of *our*. *Society* occurs almost three times more often than any other lexical collocate. *Quebec* is the next most frequent collocate, occurring 27 times. *Québec* does not have a fixed position in relation with *our*; however, the fact that it is in close proximity with *our* and *society* indicates that *we* are strongly connected with *society* in *Quebec*. *Values* is another collocate, occurring most often in the R2 position. Concordance lines show that the R1

position is typically used to qualify *our values* as *cultural, shared, fundamental, secular, society, and common*.

culture. When we all share the best of **our cultural values**, our lives can become enriched by form our identities, will come together to reinforce **our shared values** of respect, acceptance Such an accordence could also diminish **our fundamental values** of pluralism, equality practices, because they impact society. Many of **our secular values** of justice, sharing, and important in ensuring immigrant's integration into **our society values**. I suggest that the onus already begun. **OUR FUNDAMENTAL VALUES DECLARED** The government established cohesion in communities. 4. COMMON VALUES **Our common values** are found and based assimilate to a certain extent to **our society values**? And if they do integrate into our society tenor and implications are not befitting **our fundamental values**. 16 QUEBEC: CATHOLIC

Table 53: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with values in R2 position with *our*

The analysis of *we* and *our* suggests that the in-group is predominantly conceptualized as a society located in Quebec. The R1 and R2 collocates of *our* in particular show that the in-group is associated with civic attributes (*institutions, democracy*) and ethnocultural attributes (*history, church, culture*). Language is also a key attribute of an uncertain kind, since it could play a “civic” role in the modernizing discourse, or a more ethnocultural role in the traditionalist discourse.

Collocate	R1 freq	R2 freq
SOCIETY	56	10
COMMUNITY	11	1
CHURCH	8	0
CULTURE	5	1
INSTITUTIONS	4	3
QUEBEC	4	2
VALUES	4	9
DIVERSITY	4	1
COUNTRY	4	2
LANGUAGE	4	0
DEMOCRACY	3	0
HISTORY	3	3
IDENTITY	3	5

Table 54: EnglishBT corpus lexical collocates with *our* in R1 and R2 positions

Community

Community occurs 173 times across the corpus, and ranks 12 on the keyword list.

Here, we can see the groups of individuals that are considered communities.

Collocates in the L1 position often qualify *community* according to language ([*English*]-*speaking*, 16 occurrences; *Anglophone*, 6 occurrences), country of origin (*Italian*, 11 occurrences), religion (*Sikh*, 9 occurrences), possession (*our*, 11 occurrences; *their*, 6 occurrences), and status (*host*, 9 occurrences; *civic*, 6 occurrences). Also, *Quebec* is a strong collocate, occurring most often in the R2 position. Concordance lines reveal the following pattern:

modifier (i.e. language, religion, or country) + community + in/of Quebec			
L1	centre	R1	R2

Minority groups are thus referred to as “communities” defined in terms of language, nationality or country of origin, and religion. In the EnglishBT corpus, the positioning of minority communities, notably the English-speaking community, relative to Quebec society is notably more salient than in the FrenchBT corpus. In the FrenchBT corpus, the positioning of French-speaking Québécois within Quebec society are more salient, as are discussions of the integration of ethnocultural minorities within Quebec society.

French

French ranks 15 on the keyword list, occurring 186 times across the EnglishBT corpus in 71 percent of the briefs.

Word	Total	Total Left	Total Right	L5	L4	L3	L2	L1	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5
LANGUAGE	35	3	32	1	0	2	0	0	30	0	0	1	1
ENGLISH	31	15	16	2	2	1	10	0	5	6	1	2	2
SPEAKING	21	7	14	2	0	2	1	2	13	0	0	1	0
QUEBEC	15	4	11	1	2	0	1	0	1	3	5	0	2
CULTURE	13	1	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	0	1
THEIR	12	6	6	0	1	1	1	3	0	1	0	2	3
CANADIAN	10	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	0	0	0
SCHOOL	10	4	6	1	1	0	1	1	4	1	0	1	0
QUEBECERS	8	2	6	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	0
PRIMACY	8	8	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
POPULATION	6	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0
SCHOOLS	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0
FLUENT	6	5	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0
IMMIGRANTS	5	3	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
CHILDREN	5	4	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
MINORITY	5	4	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
LAWS	5	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	1

Table 55: EnglishBT corpus collocates with French: positions

Interestingly, *French* is of a slightly higher frequency and ranks higher on the keyword list in the EnglishBT corpus frequency list than *English*; *French* occurs 186 times and ranks 15 on the keyword list, whereas *English* occurs 172 times across the corpus and ranks 47. The collocates surrounding *French* break into three main categories: (1) the French language, (2) linguistic groups, and (3) the language of education.

The French language

Language is the strongest lexical collocate with *French*, and occurs most often in the R1 position, forming *French language* (30 occurrences). The most frequent cluster is, in fact, *the French language*, which occurs 21 times across the EnglishBT corpus.

Perhaps surprisingly, a frequent collocate of *French* is *English*. It occurs most frequently in the L2 position, forming the cluster *English and French* and

English to French. The cluster *English and French* is the fourth most frequent cluster, occurring six times across the corpus. The FrenchBT corpus contains relatively few clusters concerning the English language; clusters such as *et l'anglais*, *Français ni anglais* and *Francaise et Anglaise* occur only 16, 15 and 11 times, respectively.

Quebec is one of the most frequent collocates of *French*, occurring 15 times and most often on the right. Concordance lines, with *Quebec* in its most frequent position (R3), reveal concerns over the status and use of French in Quebec.

in the case of the status of the **French language in Quebec**. The contribution of immigration to challenge Law 101 nor the primacy of the **French Language in Quebec**, some important \By learning French, our **French here in Quebec**, he knows that the linguistic tools of this French speaking and non-**French speakers in Quebec**. 5. Will involvement of the English-considering the cost of providing **French instruction in Quebec**. 4.4 Secularism Choosing an

Table 56: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with French and Quebec

There are also references to *French language* institutions and media.

many francophones- individuals, **French-language media**, comedians and Quebec politicians children were required to attend **French-language schools** and imbibe the language of Molière immigrants from English to **French language institutions**. 6. CONCLUSION: There are an editorial broadcast on a **French-language television channel**- displayed on YouTube.com

Table 57: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with French language institutions

Other references acknowledge the *primacy of the French language*.

secular state and the **primacy of the French language**; therefore, our society could not afford and women • The **primacy of the French language** • The separation of State from Religion challenge Law 101 nor the **primacy of the French Language** in Quebec, some important various legal assurances of the **primacy of the French language**. In this context,

Table 58: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with primacy of the French language

Finally, many concordance lines explicitly link the French language with culture and religion. Closer analysis of the following concordances further show that the French language, culture, and religion are ipresented as attributes of the Quebec majority relative to which minority groups are positioned.

good thing and not a threat. The **French language & culture** will survive no matter what other Today, in order to protect the **French language and culture**, the children of immigrant the actions taken to preserve the **French language and culture** above all others. Defining that the majority's **Christian values and French language** are jeopardised by non-Christian cocooned were they in their culture, **French language and Catholic religion**, the bedrock of

Table 59: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines: French language, culture and religion

These examples show how that discussions of the French language foreground Quebec contexts, civic structures (such as institutions), and ethnocultural attributes (such as culture and religion).

Linguistic groups

A number of *French* collocates suggest membership to different groups, such as French Canada, Quebec, immigrant groups, and the general population. The collocate *Canadian* occurs all but once in the R1 position, forming the identity category *French Canadian*, an ethnolinguistic label typically evoking common French ancestry and pan French Canadianism. Similarly, the collocate *Quebecers* principally occurs to the right of *French*, forming *French Quebecer*, *French-speaking Quebecers* and *French Canadian Quebecers*. Some of these terms highlight common ethnicity and ancestry (*French Canadian*, *French Quebecer*); others simply characterize the majority as “speaking French” (*Francophone*, *French speaking Quebecer*). These distinctions are not neutral, because arguably (and this is one of the main topoi in the modernizing discourse) it is possible for

newcomers to learn the language of the majority, whereas ethnicity cannot be changed. This explains the emphasis placed on immigrants' ability in and learning of French. The collocate *immigrants* occurs more or less equally on either side of *French*, and concordance lines show that immigrants are referred to as a group not according to their language ability, but according to their language inability. Concordance lines show that French education for immigrants is an important consideration:

our groups have web pages for **non-French speaking immigrants** – a kind of lifeline about learning by an **immigrant child who speaks neither French** nor English. Agree 3. Authorize Quebec should consider providing **French-language training to potential** immigrants in their ensuring that all **immigrants can speak in French**; the level of fluency required is unknown receiving new **immigrants from English to French language** institutions. 6. CONCLUSION

Table 60: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with immigrants and French Language of education

School and *schools* collocate most often in the R1 position, forming *French school(s)*. Concordance lines below further illustrate references to training in and acquisition/ learning of the French language.

time and resources to **learn the French language**. Despite all these investments, immigrants Quebec should consider providing **French-language training** to potential immigrants in their reach an acceptable **level of fluency in the French language** and doing so is viewed as the need for all Quebecers to **acquire the French language** and doing so is viewed as

Table 61: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines: Learning/using French language

In conclusion, the examination of *French* has shown that it involves discussions of culture and religion as well as membership into primarily ethnic or linguistic groups in Quebec. There are also references to education and the importance of learning the French language, suggesting elements of the modernizing discourse (Heller, 2001).

Language

An examination of the keyword *language* reveals familiar themes. Again, mentions of *French* and *English* are salient and collocate with *Quebec*. The collocates *their* and *our* reveal a “us versus them” dichotomy. The collocates *laws*, *official* and *primacy* indicate that discourses of language centre on issues of status, and the cultural importance of language is evident with the collocates *culture* and *religion*.

Word	Total	Total Left	Total Right	L5	L4	L3	L2	L1	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5
FRENCH	35	32	3	1	1	0	0	30	0	0	2	0	1
ENGLISH	29	27	2	0	2	2	0	23	0	2	0	0	0
CULTURE	21	8	13	0	1	1	4	2	2	10	0	0	1
THEIR	20	15	5	3	2	1	2	7	0	2	0	2	1
QUEBEC	15	8	7	1	1	3	1	2	1	3	2	1	0
INSTITUTIONS	11	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0
OUR	9	7	2	1	1	1	0	4	0	2	0	0	0
RELIGION	8	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	0	0
IMMIGRANTS	6	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0
PRIMACY	6	6	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAWS	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
OFFICIAL	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0

Table 62: EnglishBT corpus collocates with language

Quebecers

The next keyword is *Quebecers*, ranking 40 on the keyword list and occurring 111 times.

Word	Total	Total Left	Total Right	L5	L4	L3	L2	L1	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5
WE	16	12	4	0	5	2	2	3	1	1	1	0	1
QUEBEC	9	7	2	3	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	1
THEIR	9	1	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	3
ENGLISH	8	7	1	0	0	0	5	2	1	0	0	0	0
FRENCH	8	6	2	0	2	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	0
NATIVE	8	8	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0
CANADIANS	7	3	4	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	1
SPEAKING	7	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0
IMMIGRANTS	7	2	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	0
FRANCOPHONE	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0
RIGHTS	5	4	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0
RESPECT	5	4	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Table 63: EnglishBT corpus collocates with Quebecers: positions

The collocates of *Quebecers* immediately indicate a discussion of groups, with a distinction again between in-groups and out-groups: the most frequent collocate is *we*, and the next most frequent collocate is *their*; there are also references to *Canadians* and *immigrants*. These collocates are closely followed by various subcategories of Quebecers: *English*, *French*, *Native* and *Francophone*.

It is immediately apparent that Quebecers are categorized primarily by the language they speak (*English*, *French*, *-speaking*, *Francophone*). One reason why we can tell that these collocates serve to categorize is their location: *English* occurs most frequently in the L2 position, mainly in the form *English speaking Quebecers*. *French* occurs most frequently in the L4 and L2 positions, forming *French-speaking Quebecers* or *French Canadian (Quebecers)*. *Francophone* occurs most often in the L1 position, forming *Francophone Quebecers*.

Quebecers are also categorized by their origins: *native* occurs most frequently in the L1 position, forming *native Quebecers*. Some Quebecers are constructed in relation to other groups, such as the collocates *Canadians* and *immigrants*. These collocates do not have a stable position in relation to

Quebecers; however, concordance lines show that they refer to different identity categories from that of *Quebecers*. Some concordances suggest an explicit attempt to include immigrants as “*Quebecers*” (*all the Quebecers including the immigrants*). Others, by making a distinction between “*Quebecers* and immigrants” implicitly present immigrants as non-*Quebecers*.

have positive consequences for all the **Quebecers including the immigrants**. The very simple liberal democracy. We believe that most **Quebecers, including recent immigrants**, share a on October 19th reveals that 56 % of **Quebecers wish immigrants** to be discouraged from being represented as the majority of **Quebecers and Immigrants** and that is detrimental to the well established rights of **Canadians and Quebecers**. I extend my best wishes to you as with our new compatriots, **Canadians and Quebecers** in particular, we could bring a wealth

Table 64: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with immigrants or Canadians and Quebecers

Québécois

Québécois is another common Quebec identity label, although it is used slightly less frequently (72 occurrences) than *Quebecer* (111 occurrences) and ranks slightly lower (42) on the keyword list (compared to *Quebecer*, rank 40).

N	Word	Total	Total Left	Total Right	L5	L4	L3	L2	L1	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5
11	THEY	7	3	4	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	0
20	QUEBEC	5	3	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
21	NATION	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
22	THEIR	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2

Table 65: EnglishBT corpus collocates with Quebecois

There are not many lexical collocates with *Quebecois*, however *nation* is one collocate of interest that occurs most often in the R1 position, forming *Quebecois nation*.

Nation is an interesting collocate with *Quebecois* because of its rarity with both *Quebec* and *Quebecer*. It is notable that *nation* is used only with *Quebecois*, which in English, typically refers only to French-speaking Québécois, particularly

Quebec-born. Concordance lines (below) confirm that in the EnglishBT corpus, *Québécois nation* is used not only with exclusive ethnic overtones –including only those Québécois of French Canadian descent – but also to disparage Quebec nationalist ideologies.

to ensure the purity of the **Quebecois nation**, to protect our democracy, secularism 3 and these are values unique to the **Quebecois nation**; shared not they are not by any other, help preserve and promote the **Quebecois nation**, its culture, language and religion. From assimilate the majority; thus, the **Quebecois nation** is perceptibly threatened by the barbarians all have served to strengthen the **Quebecois nation** and franco-Canadians. All these

Table 66: EnglishBT corpus concordance lines with Quebecois nation

English

English is another keyword of interest, occurring 172 times. It has already been explored earlier; when it was discussed in the context of the keyword *Quebecer*, it appeared as one of the many categories of Quebec identity. The table of collocates shows how *English*, and more specifically, *English-speaking*, refers to an identity category. Concordance lines show specific references to *English speaking youth*, *English-speaking seniors*, *the English-speaking sector*, and *English-speaking parents*. More globally, *English* refers to English-speaking Quebecers, the English-speaking population, the English-speaking minority, and the English-speaking community. Notably, English speakers are overwhelmingly described as a *community*. As discussed above, communities in Quebec are identified either by their language, country of origin, or religious affiliation. *English speaking community/communities* occurs 22 times across the EnglishBT corpus. English speakers are not represented as a nation or even as a “national minority,” although they could be considered one according to Kymlicka’s (1995) definition. As a result, the authors of the English briefs seem to reproduce one of the dominant

discourses in the French corpus, making a clear distinction between (French) Québécois (a nation) and (English, immigrant, minority) ethnic communities.

Word	Total	Total Left	Total Right	L5	L4	L3	L2	L1	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5
SPEAKING	55	2	53	0	1	1	0	0	50	0	2	1	0
FRENCH	31	16	15	2	2	1	6	5	0	10	1	2	2
LANGUAGE	29	2	27	0	0	0	2	0	23	0	2	2	0
QUEBEC	25	15	10	2	1	3	6	3	0	1	2	6	1
COMMUNITY	19	1	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	1	1	0
SPEAKERS	16	2	14	1	0	1	0	0	12	1	0	0	1
THEIR	14	9	5	1	2	3	0	3	0	1	2	2	0
INSTITUTIONS	13	1	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	1	0
SCHOOL	12	3	9	1	0	0	2	0	5	4	0	0	0
IMMIGRANTS	11	8	3	3	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	0
POPULATION	10	1	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	1	0	0
SCHOOLS	9	2	7	1	1	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	1
COMMUNITIES	9	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	2	1
THEY	9	3	6	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	1
QUEBECERS	8	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0

Table 67: EnglishBT corpus collocates with English

Another collocate of *English* is *French*; *French* occurs most often in the R2 position, and concordance lines show that this pattern takes the form *English and French* or *English to French*. The collocate *language* occurs most often in the R1 position, forming *English language*; concordance lines show that this almost always refers to English language *institutions*. While collocates of *French* revealed discussions of language status, education, identity, and culture, it is significant that *English* collocates refer almost exclusively to institutions (including schools).

Quebec collocates with *English* 25 times; it is found most often in the L2 position and R4 position. In the L2 position, it most often locates English speakers or the English-speaking community in Quebec, with the form *Quebec's English speakers* and *Quebec's English-speaking community*. The R4 position

serves the same purpose; here, it locates the institutions and speakers in the province, with the form *English-language institutions in Quebec* and *English community of Quebec*. Therefore, the examination of the keyword *English* has demonstrated that this adjective is used to refer principally to a linguistic community and language-based institutions in Quebec.

Canada

The final keyword of interest is *Canada*, which occurs 183 times across the corpus and ranks 50th on the keyword list. One reason why *Canada* is so frequent is because of a brief submitted by the United Church of Canada; in this brief alone, there are 11 references to Canada; this also explains the references to *united* and *church*.

One important collocate is *nation*; this is notable due to its surprising absence as a collocate of *Quebec* and due to its frequent use with *Quebecois*. In relation with *Canada*, *nation* occurs most frequently in the L2 and L3 positions.

the recognition of **Quebec as a nation within united Canada**. At the time, most of we became, the **Métis, a forgotten and a hidden Nation with in Canada** The Eastern our brothers and sisters of the **Métis Nation of Upper Canada** we never gave up the many believe theirs is a **great nation encaged by Canada** that could be strengthened only **do Quebecers differ from other Canadians to form a nation within Canada?** Someone it (even the rest of the **united nation of Canada** promotes a form of separation between the immigrants into the other "**Founding Nation**" of **Canada**. As a result, immigrants' children Quebec's distinctiveness within **the nation of Canada**, or they threaten that the Quebecois

Table 68: *EnglishBT* corpus concordance lines with *nation* in relation with Canada

Concordance lines show that, when *nation* refer to nations other than Canada as a whole (*Québécois* and *Métis nation*), it locates national groups in relation to Canada as a country; in the FrenchBT corpus, this trend occurred only in

reference to the Federal government's declaration of Quebec as a nation "within a united Canada" (*une nation au sein d'un Canada uni*).

Summary

The analysis of the EnglishBT corpus has shown representations of Quebec primarily in relation to civic criteria. However, ethnocultural references do occur within the corpus: authors position minority ethnolinguistic and ethnocultural communities in relation to (and often within) Quebec civic society. They also seem to emphasize schools and education as a means of access to socially valuable linguistic resources (both English and French) in Quebec society. These trends seem to rely on the understanding of minorities within Quebec as "communities" and not "national minorities," and perhaps perpetuate extant discourses that privilege Quebec nationalism and French-speaking dominance. Little emphasis is placed on nationhood, but when it is mentioned, the nation is positioned in relation to Canada; indeed, even references to *Quebec* are strongly linked to *Canada*, suggesting a federalist perspective.

Chapter 6: Critical discourse analysis

The first step in the discourse analysis was to downsample from the English and French corpora in order to select individual briefs for an in-depth CDA analysis. I used dispersion plots to determine which texts had the highest concentration of individual words of interest; the words of interest that were sought were vocabulary relating to language, such as *langue/language*, *Français/French*, and *Anglais/English*. From the large number of briefs containing these words, I selected three that were written by individuals (rather than language councils or interest groups) for closer analysis.

Two French briefs and one English brief were selected. Each brief presents a contrasting viewpoint and represents, perhaps, a wealth of diversity in the province. In this chapter, the French briefs and then the English brief will be analyzed.

Affirmation et ouverture

The first French brief is *Affirmation et ouverture* by Yves Chartrand (see Appendix X). To analyse this brief, I follow van Dijk (2001), who suggests approaching a text by examining its “semantic macrostructures” (p. 102). These are the “topics of discourse” (p. 101) that represent what a text is about; it is by drawing on these topics that language users can understand and mentally organize the coherent meaning of text and talk. van Dijk (2001) explains that semantic macrostructures can be expressed through titles, headings, summaries, abstracts, thematic sentences or conclusions. Chartrand’s title, *Affirmation et ouverture*, is followed by headings: *Introduction*, *L’affirmation*, *L’identité*, *La confusion*,

L'ouverture, Quelques recommandations, and Conclusion. Following van Dijk (2001), I summarized Chartrand's brief with "macropropositions" (summaries of topics) as follows:

- M1. Affirmation and reestablishment of Québécois identity are necessary
- M2. Québécois identity involves ethnic origins, territory, history, culture.
- M3. Problems are birth rates, language issues, and immigration.
- M4. Language issues, aggravated by immigration, causes social confusion
- M5. Quebec's role in Canada sends conflicting messages to immigrants
- M6. The solution is Quebec's political independence
- M7. Québec can only be open to others once its identity is affirmed
- M8. The "others" are Aboriginal people and Québécois of British descent
- M9. Newcomers only acceptable with conditions of respect for Quebec
- M10. Solutions: increase birth rate, create more language laws, a constitution and citizenship
- M7. The way forward is to be a sovereign and harmonious society

With the macropropositions established, van Dijk (2001) explains that a further reduction can summarize the macropropositions at a higher level into an overall topic:

Quebec needs to affirm its identity and assert itself as a sovereign nation before it can be open to others.

With the overall topic of Chartrand's brief established, we can examine the ways in which he discursively constructs the Quebec nation.

Contents/Topics

Similar to van Dijk (2001), Wodak (2001a) also calls for the first step of discourse analysis to be the identification of the topics of a specific discourse. In this case, the specific discourse is that of national identity. As explained in Chapter 3, Methodology, the five topics, or "semantic macro-areas" (de Cillia et al., 1999, p. 158), of national identity discourse are: 1) the idea of an "ideal identity" and the "other"; 2) the narrative of a collective political history; 3) the

discursive construction of a common culture; 4) the discursive construction of a collective present and future; and 5) the discursive construction of a “national body” (p. 158). In order to examine the discursive construction of national identity within Chartrand’s brief, I first sought out evidence of these topics, starting with the topic of ideal national identity and the “other.”

Ideal national identity and the other

de Cillia et al. (1999) explain that ideal national identity (and therefore in-groups and out-groups) can be identified by 1) emotional attachment to the country; 2) alleged national mentality and supposed national behaviour; 3) the biographical genesis of national identity; and 4) the “activation” of national identity in certain situations.

The in-group

Chartrand’s brief clearly shows a clear distinction between in-groups and out-groups. From the very title *Affirmation et ouverture*, Chartrand argues that individual and national identity must be affirmed before “opening” to the Other: “Un peuple c’est comme un individu. S’il ne se connaît pas et ne se respecte pas, il ne peut entrer sainement en rapport avec l’autre” (lines 98-99). This comparison appeals to the ideal “national body” (Wodak et al., 1999), where the complexity of a nation is reduced to a unified core. Chartrand explains that the debate facing the “nation québécoise” is “crucial,” and it will have “un impact majeur sur le futur de notre ‘vivre ensemble’” (lines 2-3). Here, at the outset of his brief, Chartrand explicitly links *nation québécoise* with *nous*; it is thus clear to whom the terms refer throughout the remainder of his brief. Entitled *Affirmation et*

ouverture, Chartrand's brief discusses the need for affirmation of Québécois identity:

je pense que les Québécois d'origine française ... avons besoin de nous affirmer collectivement présentement comme groupe majoritaire parmi l'ensemble des Québécois. (lines 11-14)

Once again, Chartrand reaffirms the fact that the in-group (*nous*) are the Québécois of French Canadian descent; this is made explicit in the conjugation of the verb *avoir* to the first person plural (*avons*) in relation to the proper noun *Québécois d'origine française*. Finally, little doubt remains as to the identity of this majority when Chartrand explicitly states who *nous* are: "Nous sommes environ près de 7 millions de descendants des premiers colons Français, isolés sur un continent amérindien, anglais et espagnol" (lines 31-32). This is clearly the "biographical genesis" (de Cillia et al., 1999) of Québécois national identity through origin, place of birth, place of upbringing and place of residence.

Chartrand calls for identity affirmation through the re-appropriation of "our" space, culture, history and identity, and the reaffirmation of "our" collective values (lines 22-24). Québécois identity is thus linked to territory, culture, history, and collective values. Chartrand continues to describe the "common culture" (de Cillia et al., 1999) of *notre* identity: language, religion, music, creativity, and finances (lines 35-42). Chartrand's construction of Québécois identity is therefore both ethnic (Québécois are of "French" origins) and cultural (Québécois identity is linked to language, religion, music).

Chartrand positively self represents through the predication of stereotypical,

evaluative attributes (Baker et al., 2008, p. 282); these include “healthy traditional music,” “unique institutions,” and “affluence” (lines 35-42). Positive self-representation is also achieved through the description of and evident pride in Quebec’s “immense,” “diverse,” and “majestic and silent” landscape (lines 26-34). Predominantly, Chartrand puts emphasis on the importance of language in Quebec identity. He repeats six times in the space of one page, “notre langue (commune) est le français.” He explains that “Others” are confused because of the conflicting linguistic messages given by Canada and Quebec (lines 92-95); the way forward in social harmony is to require immigrants to learn French. Chartrand is effectively arguing that French is a key element in the “common culture” (de Cillia et al., 1999) of Quebec. However, will immigrants ever be part of *nous*?

“Nous” in Chartrand’s brief refers quite exclusively to those of “French [Québécois]” (French Canadian) ethnocultural origins. This in-group is exclusive because it does not include other groups under the umbrella term “we.” Throughout most of the brief, Chartrand’s references to “nous” include only those “Québécois d’origine française.” This is made evident through oppositions between the in-group and the out-group(s), such as the references to “nous” and “nouveaux arrivants” in lines 92-94. At other points, Chartrand uses “nous” only to refer to “certains d’entre nous à Montréal, et d’un très grand nombre dans les autres régions” (lines 90-91). Although Chartrand directly addresses the co-chairs of the Commission (i.e., line 2), it is unclear if they are included in Chartrand’s in-group. For example, he says: “vous avez décidé à juste titre de l’élargir à

l'ensemble de nos préoccupations" (lines 5-6). Here, it seems that "vous" and "nous" are different people (addressee-exclusive). However, when Chartrand refers to "notre vivre ensemble," he may be referring to everyone within the province (partially/totally addressee-inclusive); this is also the case with the lines 67-70. In another example, Chartrand alternates between an inclusive and exclusive version of "nous":

A cette seule condition, nous [exclusive] pouvons nous ouvrir à eux, à leur culture, à leurs coutumes, à leur histoire, et apprécier leur apport au Québec que nous [inclusive] construisons et vivons ensemble. (lines 118-122, my additions)

Thus, although Chartrand's identification terminology is inconsistent, there are evident in-groups and out-groups within his discussion of "le futur de notre "vivre ensemble"" (line 4). This concern with "le futur" of living together in Quebec is evidence of the discursive construction of a "collective present and future" (de Cillia et al., 1999).

The future of Quebec is uncertain, Chartrand argues, because of the current problems in the province, which Chartrand recognizes as a "débat crucial" (line 4). Indeed, more than a "crucial debate," Chartrand constructs the problems (specifically linguistic confusion) as a threat to the future of Quebec. Since linguistic confusion is largely perpetrated by immigrants, the crisis serves as a "justification of negative attributions" (Baker et al., 2008, p. 282) that allows Chartrand to negatively represent them as "the other."

The other

Chartrand explains that “we can only open ourselves to others once we have affirmed our identity” (lines 97-98). He explicitly states who these “others” are: First Nations people, Québécois of British origins, and newcomers to the province (lines 103-111). Chartrand states that “we” are ready to accept “their” differences provided “they” respect “our” fundamental values and show interest in “our” culture and history. Chartrand argues that it is only if these conditions are met that the Québécois can be open to these groups’ culture, customs, and history.

Strategies

de Cillia et al. (1999) explain that the second principal element involved in the examination of national identity are the “macro-strategies” involved in the “discursive construction, perpetuation, transformation and dismantling” of national identity (p. 160). As explained in the Methodology chapter, these macro-strategies are: 1) constructive strategies; 2) perpetuation and justification strategies; 3) transformation strategies; and 4) dismantling or destructive strategies.

Chartrand’s brief is clearly of the perpetuation and justification strategy. He is not trying to build or establish a (new) national identity; he is trying to “maintain, support and reproduce” (de Cillia et al., 1999, p. 160-1) the extant Quebec national identity. One way to perpetuate and justify national identity is “to support continuity, to discursively construct immigrants as a threat to national identity” (de Cillia et al., p. 161). Chartrand calls for reaffirmation in Québécois identity; he evidently does not want it to evolve or change. Chartrand reluctantly

acknowledges the necessity of immigration because of two national flaws: suicide and low birth rates (line 43). Immigrants are the solution to Quebec's decline in birth rate, Chartrand explains (lines 43-47), but he casts doubt on the need for immigrants: his first recommendation to the Commission is to remedy the national birth rate (lines 125-6). With a rise in national birth rate, fewer immigrants would be needed in Quebec. As explained above, immigration is constructed as a threat: it is a threat in that it effectively challenges the established norms of Quebec society. Finally, Chartrand perpetuates and justifies Quebec identity by drawing on other texts and discourses prevalent in Quebec society.

Intertextuality

Chartrand presumably draws on the Commission's *Participant Guide to the Commission* (2007b). This ten-page guide outlines the purpose of the Commission and the methods of participation; it can be assumed that most participants would have at least skimmed the guide before submitting a brief. The Participant Guide recommends that participants read the Commission's *Consultation Document* (2007a) in order to be informed about the Commission topic; Chartrand perhaps also used this Document in the writing of his brief. Since these Commission texts likely informed Chartrand's writing, they form part of the context surrounding his brief. One of the main tenets of CDA is situating texts within their interdiscursive and intertextual contexts; thus, an understanding of the Document is essential to a more complete understanding of the context surrounding Chartrand's brief.

Life together

Chartrand begins his brief by thanking the Commission for the invitation to participate in this “débat crucial” that he argues will “undoubtedly” have a major impact on “le future de notre ‘vivre ensemble’” (lines 2-4). This reference to *vivre ensemble* (“life together”) draws specifically from the Consultation Document (2007a), which refers nine times to the *vivre ensemble* in Quebec.²⁴ The Consultation Document first refers to this term in its mandate, calling for both (legal) “reasonable accommodation” and (social) “concerted adjustments” that stem from the “ideal of the most harmonious possible management of our *life together*” (p. v).

The Consultation Document (2007a) explains that “life together” involves accommodating differences while respecting rights (p. vi); the relationship between cultures and “the nature of togetherness” are basic questions underlying accommodation (p. 3). It explains:

Almost all Western nations are facing the same challenge, that of reviewing the major code governing *life together* to accommodate ethnocultural differences while respecting rights.

(p. 5, my emphasis)

This point is in fact so important that it is stated once in the text of the Document, and it is then repeated in a highlighted caption box on the same page. “Life together” is governed by codes, and is a fine balance between accommodation and

²⁴ For this section of the analysis, I alternated between the English and French versions of the Consultation Document in order to accurately convey the full meaning of “vivre ensemble.” While the French document continues to use the same term, the English document alternates between different translations: “life together” (4 times), “living together” (3 times), and “togetherness” (2 times).

respect. The Document explains that accommodation and respect are not simply the responsibility of the Commission and the legal sphere; the harmony of “life together” is the responsibility of both the legal system and individual citizens.

In Part II, the Consultation Document provides “strictly factual and descriptive [contextualization]” that “is intended to provide general information on Quebec’s population and the basic norms that govern *living together* in our society” (p. 9, my emphasis). Here again we see that “living together” in Quebec is “governed” by established societal norms; that is, there is an established way of life in Quebec. The Document makes it clear that ethnocultural diversity and immigration are key components of modern Quebec, but while language and religion are diversified, French and Catholicism remain dominant (p. 10). Diversity works within Quebec’s “common civic framework or, in common parlance a “common public culture” that governs *living together*” (p. 11, my emphasis). Again, we see that “living together” is not a random occurrence; it is in fact “governed” (for the third time), by codes (p. 5), societal norms (p. 9), and civic framework (p. 11). The civic framework that governs living together in Quebec is composed of (1) Liberal democracy, (2) French as the common public language, and (3) Quebec’s integration policy (p. 12-14).

The final reference to *vivre ensemble* or “life together” is in reference to French as the common public language. The Document explains:

French is also the language of integration in Québec ... French-language Québec schools, attended by students of diverse origins, have become a crossroads of integration and learning

togetherness. The French language is the main medium that allows Quebecers of all origins to learn about each other, interact, cooperate and participate in the development of Québec society. (p. 14, my emphasis on “togetherness”)

The French language is a unifying factor for all those living in Quebec, and is reinforced as a civic value in the province. The Commission does not refer to the ethnocultural value of language, including the fact that French is part of the culture and linked to the ethnicity of the majority group in Quebec. Instead, the Document depicts language as a civic value, particularly with reference to “Quebecers of all origins” and with the reference to language education.

As a result, Chartrand’s adoption of the Commission’s term *vivre ensemble* was astute: the Commission indicates that Quebec’s *vivre ensemble* is governed by civic criteria (including language as a civic value); Chartrand draws on these criteria (especially language) and highlights their ethnocultural value. Chartrand achieves this, for example, by connecting the “valeurs fondamentales” of Quebec democratic society with the culture and history of the Quebec nation (lines 115-120).

The Quebec nation

As stated above, Chartrand begins his brief with reference to the future of life together in the “Quebec nation.” This is particularly relevant, because the Commission brief makes only one reference to the Quebec nation in the form of a question posed to Commission participants. This question acknowledges two competing discourses of French Canadian nationalism in Canada: traditional pan-

Canadian nationalism and modernizing, territorialist Québécois nationalism (Heller, 2003b):

Until the 1960s, French-Canadians perceived themselves as a nation that spanned Canada from sea to sea. Starting with the Quiet Revolution, another perception emerged and gradually gained importance, that of a French-speaking *Québec nation* confined to Québec's territory but encompassing all of its inhabitants. Do you agree with this conception? How do you justify your position? (p. 20, my emphasis)

This reference to “the Québec nation” is made less potent by its “framing” (Baker et al., 2008, p. 282) as a “perception” and a “conception,” and by casting doubt on it by following it with a question as to whether or not the participant agrees. The Commission Document makes no other reference to the Quebec nation *except* as alluded to in reference to other nations; this occurs thirteen times across the Commission Document, for example:

...affecting Québec alone but are apparent in the Western nations (p. vi)

Many nations are today facing the reaction of... (p. vi)

Like other Western nation, Québec must find a way... (p. vii)

Almost all Western nations are facing the same challenge... (p. 5)

...the Western nations have embraced this sensitivity... (p. 18)

...like many other Western nations, Québec, too, has... (p. 30)

Quebec is being explicitly linked with “other Western nations,” but not being clearly defined as a nation. The closest encounter with a clear definition of the nation is with reference to the 1981 action plan for cultural communities in Quebec, *Québécois – Each and Every One*. The Commission Document explains one of the highlights of the action plan: “Quebecers are defined as a French nation” (p. 14).²⁵ Still, by explicitly drawing this from an external text (“are defined [by the action plan] as”), the Commission’s stance on Quebec nationalism is not explicit: the stance is instead implicit in references and comparisons. Despite the lack of overt references to the specific term “Quebec nation,” Chartrand adopts the term in his brief, and clearly takes up a position on the Commission’s question on the existence of a French-speaking Quebec nation. It is unclear whether Chartrand’s conceptualization of the nation encompasses all the inhabitants of Quebec.

La groupe majoritaire

The central argument in Chartrand’s brief is for Québécois of “French origins” to affirm themselves as the “groupe majoritaire” in Quebec (lines 12-14). The Consultation Document also emphasizes the importance of Francophones as the majority group in the province. Francophones are the majority in Quebec (p. 11), but the minority in North America (p. 4; p. 5); the minority status in North America causes some insecurity to Québécois (p. 11). The Document also

²⁵ Interestingly, the French version of the Commission Document is slightly different: “Le peuple québécois y est défini comme une nation à caractère français” (p. 14).

explains the power of the majority in Quebec's liberal democracy: "majority rule rightly prevails in a democracy" (p. 12).

Chartrand emphasizes the rights and powers of a democratic society, where Québécois of "French origin" (in his terms) need to reassert their majority power in society. Still, the Document explains that majority rule is not all-powerful:

The Québec democratic regime is also liberal, since it protects rights and freedoms from possible abuse by the majority. No one would wish, for example, for a government, even a duly elected one, to flout the basic rights of a group of citizens in the name of the majority's interests. (p. 12)

In case there is any doubt over this matter, in a caption box, the Document highlights the basic rights and freedoms of all citizens in a liberal democracy (p. 12). Chartrand, too, emphasizes the rights and freedoms in Quebec democratic society, saying "ils [les autres] ont leur mot à dire puisque nous sommes une société démocratique et ouverte" (lines 116-7); however, this is followed by a request for these people to "s'intéresser à notre culture et à notre histoire" (line 118).

As explained above, the Document repeatedly emphasizes a civic (liberal/democratic) version of Quebec; Chartrand too stresses Quebec's civic side while repeatedly linking it to cultural values. Chartrand's blending of civic and cultural values is significant because it pertains directly to the role of the French language in both civic and ethnocultural constructions of the Quebec nation.

Le Français

One final intertextual term remains to investigate, and it is the most critical to this discussion: the French language. The Commission Document goes to great lengths explaining the latest reports on the status of the French language in Quebec; this includes information on ethnocultural diversity, immigrants' adoption of the French language, and the government's attempts at fostering language learning in the province. It also draws on the tenets of Quebec's liberal democracy, the Charter of the French language (Bill 101), and Quebec's integration policy. The Document clearly lists the values and rights of the province, which include the French language:

There is now a broad consensus on certain basic values that have pride of place in our society, in particular respect for individual freedoms, solidarity, civic participation, democracy, equality (particularly between men and women), pluralism, French as the common public language, secularism, and pacifism (antimilitarism and the peaceful resolution of conflicts). (p. 18)

The Commission's list of values and rights is clearly civic. Chartrand refers to these civic values and rights in his description of "nous" in the province. He refers to institutions and finances, but his emphasis is on cultural values, such as the importance of music and the historical significance of Catholicism in "our" identity. Chartrand's version of the province is more cultural than that of the Commission. It is also important that both the Document and Chartrand's brief emphasize importance of the French language. The Commission explicitly states the civic value of the French language, namely that it is "the main medium that

allows Quebecers of all origins to learn about each other, interact, cooperate and participate in the development of Québec society” (p. 14); Chartrand’s brief, however, contains more implicit references to the French language in relation to Québécois culture and history (i.e. lines 35-42).

Chartrand’s brief presents the French language as a symbol of Québécois identity, and so long as it is threatened by English, similarly, Québécois identity is threatened by external forces. If the French language dwindles, so, perhaps, does the status, culture, or population of the Québécois (of French-Canadian descent). This is explicit when Chartrand makes the forlorn prediction regarding future bilingualism in Montreal (lines 86-89). According to Chartrand, language is the symbol of Quebec identity; if it disappears, French Canadian culture as traditionally understood will have been extinguished all together.

Interdiscursivity

Chartrand’s brief can be classified within the modernizing discourse, with some elements of the traditionalist discourse. It is traditionalist in that it refers to “significant and historically continuous activities and values” (Heller, 2001, p. 123). For example, Chartrand emphasizes the need for affirmation of and continuity in the traditional identity in the province. He also makes explicit the need to recognize the historical origins of the “nation québécoise” (lines 31-32). Heller (2001) also explains that the content of the traditional discourse focuses in part on “the solidarity of a homogenous group understood as an organic body” (p. 123) based on a common ancestry or ethnic identity. This can be seen through Chartrand’s continued reference to “nous” as though it were a single

homogeneous entity instead of a group of 7 million individuals; it is also evident in certain examples where he depicts “nous” as a single living entity that needs to “catch its breath” (line 16). Still, Chartrand distances himself from the key content of the traditionalist discourse. Heller (2001) explains that in the traditionalist discourse, bilingualism is part of success: “English is about success in the material world, French is about community and family” (p. 123). Chartrand decries bilingualism, linking it to English dominance in Montreal as was the case in the 19th century. Chartrand’s brief focuses on the Quiet Revolution and draws on the discourse that emerged from that period in Quebec history: the modernizing discourse.

The modernizing discourse focuses on the “political, economic and social goal [of] gaining access, as francophones, to the resources controlled by Anglophones [... The discourse] is predicated on clear ethnolinguistic, or at least linguistic, separation of domains” (Heller, 2001, p. 124). In this discourse, bilingualism is largely rejected to ensure that Francophones have access, by speaking French alone, to the resources once controlled by Anglophones. Chartrand’s brief appears to align itself with the criteria of this discourse; bilingualism is rejected and access to valuable resources, referred to as “acceptable financial ease” (“aisance financière,” line 39), is discursively linked to the status of French and the French-speaking majority in Quebec.

Furthermore, since the emergence of the modernizing discourse coincides with the fragmentation of pan-French Canadian nationalism into territorial linguistic (“geolinguistic,” see discussion in Chapter 2) nationalism, Chartrand’s

call for sovereignty and his explicit choice of the identity term “les Québécois d’origine française” is evidence of modernizing discourse. The use of this term stresses Quebec identity with origins directly from France (“d’origine française”). By avoiding the identity label *Québécois d’origine Canadienne-française*, which is the label exclusively used by the Commission, Chartrand effectively bypasses the role of Canada, and perhaps even French Canada, in Québécois identity.

As for inclusion of “others” in this modernizing French Canadian identity discourse, Heller (2001) explains:

Modernizing values of democracy militate against too ethnic an interpretation ... but using language as a criterion of inclusion and exclusion accomplishes much the same goals of reproduction and protection of corporate interests, while appearing democratic. (p. 124)

This avoidance of purely ethnic criteria is clear in Chartrand’s brief. Although he explicitly states the origins of “nous” and emphasizes the cultural side of Quebec values, he does not portray Quebec as an ethnic nation. As Heller (2001) suggests, Chartrand’s brief includes implicit references to ethnicity while lauding Quebec’s democratic values (i.e., lines 115-117). With the modernizing discourse, Chartrand walks the fine line between ethnic and civic nationalism; he refers to civic values, namely language, and emphasizes the ethnocultural associations of these values in Quebec.

Summary

Chartrand's adoption of the modernizing discourse is an example of the ways in which participants in the Commission were able to position themselves in relation to available identity discourses. His brief constructs the Quebec nation as civic with ethnocultural associations; language, in particular, is of key importance both in civic society and with respect to the (ethnocultural) majority.

The analysis of the next French brief shows an entirely different perspective on nationalism in Quebec; indeed, the discursive construction of belonging in Denis Picard's brief uses different strategies to construct different in-groups and out-groups with the overall construction of a different nation within Quebec.

L'accommodement raisonnable, qu'en est-il?

The next brief (see Appendix XI) under analysis is Denis Picard's *L'accommodement raisonnable, qu'en est-il?* Picard self-identifies as a member of the First Nations Wendake community. This brief was not selected deliberately to contrast with any other brief. Rather, Picard's brief was one of the nine French briefs that had the most references to language; however in his brief, the language in question is not French.

Again following van Dijk's (2001) approach, I first examine which "topics of discourse" (p. 101) underlie Picard's brief. It does not contain any headings, but it does contain an alternative title: *Ou Les effets secondaires des accommodements*. With this title and its alternative, Picard begins his brief by questioning the value of accommodation and highlighting its potentially

detrimental effects. Picard's brief has been summarized by "macropropositions" (van Dijk, 2001) which encapsulate the meaning of each section of text:

- M1. The First Nations²⁶ situation has deteriorated since the arrival of Europeans
- M2. Restrictions have been placed upon the First Nations
- M3. The First Nations' situation continues today
- M4. "Our" language cannot be substituted with the colonizing language
- M5. The First Nations have a right to compensation
- M6. Accommodations are reasonable for the colonizer, not the "accommodated"

From this summary, we can already establish that the in-groups and out-groups in question are not the same as those discussed in Chartrand's brief. Here, we have a focus on the First Nations (who Chartrand referred to as "les autres") and their situation in North America since the arrival of Europeans. These macropropositions can be summarized by an overall macroproposition (van Dijk, 2001):

The First Nations have suffered because of forced "reasonable accommodation"; it is time for the First Nations to reclaim their rights and be compensated for their losses.

Let us now turn to the ways in which Picard discursively constructs the nation – or in this case, in the plural sense, the First Nations.

The discursive construction of national identity will again be broached from Wodak et al.'s (1999) framework. To facilitate comparison, the analysis of Picard's brief will highlight strategies used in the discursive construction of national identity and compare these strategies with those used by Chartrand.

²⁶ Picard uses the term "Nations amérindiennes" throughout his brief; I have translated this as "First Nations," although perhaps a more literal interpretation would be the translation "Amerindian Nations."

Strategies

From the “macropropositions,” we can see that Picard’s brief is considerably different in content from that of Chartrand. While Chartrand’s brief justifies the continued existence of the traditional Quebec nation, Picard’s brief transforms the traditional understanding of the Quebec nation in order to construct the national identity of the First Nations people. de Cillia et al. (1999) explain that transformation strategies can “attempt to transform the meaning of a relatively well-established aspect of national identity into another” (p. 161). Dismantling or destructive strategies “serve to de-mythologize or demolish existing national identities or elements of them” (p. 161). In contrast, constructive strategies are said to be those “linguistic acts which serve to ‘build’ and establish a particular national identity” (p. 160). Picard uses both “transformation” and “constructive” strategies in his brief. As he constructs the identity of the First Nations, he also uses dismantling strategies to recontextualize the mainstream understanding of the Quebec nation.

Contents/Topics

The national discourse constructed within Picard’s brief will again be considered through the five topics related to the discursive construction of national identity (see Appendix II). Critical to national identity is the idea of an “ideal identity” and the “other.”

Ideal national identity

The ideal national identity, in this case, is that of the First Nations people. Picard uses two different methods of referring to this “in-group”: first person plural

pronouns (*nous, notre, nos*), and “des Nations amérindiennes” (*les Nations, la Nation, leurs*). Within the first sentence of Picard’s brief, it becomes evident that these two sets of identity terms refer to the same group (lines 1-4). Picard argues that despite the promises and speeches made with regard to “us,” the situation of the First Nations has continued to deteriorate. The linkage between the two terms makes it easy to establish the in-groups and out-groups throughout the remainder of the brief. The in-group is the First Nations, who are characterized by their traditions (hunting and fishing), morals, language(s), cultural activities, customs and values. This is the “common culture” (Wodak et al., 1999).

The “other”

The First Nations are contrasted with “des Européens,” (line 1) also known as “ce pouvoir colonisateur” (lines 39-40). Picard uses the term “la colonisation européenne” (line 5) which links the terms “Européens” (as used in the first sentence of Picard’s brief) and “colonisateur” (the term used throughout the remainder of Picard’s brief) to indicate that the two terms indicate the same out-group throughout his brief. Although there are two main participants in Picard’s brief (the in-group and the out-group), the out-group is much more implicit than explicit. Explicit references to “the other” appear only five times within the brief; however, “the other” is present through passivation and nominalization, as explained below.

Picard begins his brief by establishing an explicit opposition between “nous” (“des Nations amérindiennes”) and “des Européens”. Picard achieves this by contrasting the arrival of the Europeans with the decline of the First Nations

(lines 1-4). The next reference to “the other” in Picard’s brief is implicit in the “passivation” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 145) of the First Nations. Fairclough (2003) explains that participants can be “activated” in language if they are the ones accomplishing actions; however, they can be “passivated” if they are ones affected by the actions of others (p. 145). Biber et al. (2002) explain that the “passive voice reduces the importance of the agent of the action and allows the receiver of the action to become the subject of the sentence” (p. 174). Passivation is used in Picard’s brief as the First Nations are continually affected by the actions of the Europeans, even if the Europeans are not explicitly mentioned (i.e., lines 5-13). Picard explains that the First Nations *were reduced*, almost eliminated, by illnesses from European countries. They *were parked* in reserves, and their rights *were reduced* and even *ignored* (lines 5-7).

Picard also uses nominalization to avoid directly mentioning Europeans; Fairclough (2003) explains that nominalization is the conversion of a process into an noun, where participants may be excluded and agency lost; nominalization is a “resource for generalizing” and abstracting (p. 143-144). Picard writes: “Evangelization was realized by blackmail, threats and explosions” (lines 7-8); he uses the nominalization “evangelization” and avoids mention of European colonizers once again. Even without explicit mention, the European “others” remain present throughout his brief. Picard explains how the Nations “were led” [by Europeans] to internecine wars and “taken hostage” [by Europeans] on reserves. They “were repeatedly threatened” [by Europeans] when they exercised their rights of living by hunting and fishing and according to their own morals.

Importantly, Picard explains that “it was forbidden” to speak one’s own language and practice cultural activities (lines 7-13). Again later, the European “other” is explicitly linked to an imposed language:

Aujourd’hui, une autre langue sort de notre bouche. Elle a été
imposée par le colonisateur. Notre langue a été interdite d’usage.

(lines 19-20)

The final three references to “the other” indicate the need for vindication of the First Nations and the end of colonial power (lines 34-6). Picard argues: “Le temps est venu de mettre fin à ce pouvoir colonisateur” (lines 39-40).

Picard has therefore constructed a clear distinction between an in-group and an out-group; one is constructed as a nation, the other is not. In this case, it is the First Nations who are constructed as a nation. Quebec is not constructed as a nation; indeed, Quebec is referred to only in terms of its colonial European history, and it is devoid of national attributes. As a result, the strategies in question in Picard’s brief include both constructive and transformative/destructive strategies. In the next section, I will examine how Picard constructs the First Nations, and moreover, how he constructs them as a single nation.

The discursive construction of La Nation/Les Nations amérindiennes

From the outset, Picard constructs the First Nations as a homogeneous and united group. I have discussed above the way Picard depicts the First Nations as a group with its own language(s), customs, culture, and values. This is part of the discursive construction of a “common culture” (de Cillia et al., 1999, p. 158). Some might argue, perhaps, that not all of the single nations included under the

umbrella of “First Nations” share a common culture. For example, according to Picard, language is one of the tenets of First Nations identity, but language is not common across the First Nations. Picard also constructs a “collective political history” (de Cillia et al., 1999) of suffering. Picard refers several times to the arrival of the Europeans in North American and their effect on the First Nations people. The First Nations people are therefore historically united by the effects of European colonization of North America; as the effects of the colonization continue to be felt to this day, the First Nations people continue to be united (lines 32-36).

As discussed above, Picard uses two methods of referring to the in-group: first person plural pronouns (*nous*, *notre*, *nos*), and “*les Nations amérindiennes*” (*les Nations*). In the first paragraph, both methods are used. In the second and third paragraph, Picard exclusively uses terms in reference to “*les Nations amérindiennes*”; he makes no reference to “*nous*.” In the fourth and fifth paragraphs, Picard uses the term “*nous*” again, with the exception of the last reference to *la Nation* (line 25). Note that whereas all of the previous references to the First Nations have been in the plural (“*les Nations amérindiennes*”), this reference is to the singular “*Nation*.”

In the sixth paragraph, Picard makes reference to the rights of “every nation.” Here the reference is no longer to the in-group of *nous/les Nations amérindiennes*, but an appeal to all nations. Using distributive logic, then, the rights of every nation refer to the rights of all nations; Picard effectively applies the same logic for the singular nation (*la Nation*) to the plural nations (*les Nations*

amérindiennes). Finally, in the seventh paragraph, Picard refers to both “les Nations amérindiennes” and “nous,” bringing the linkage between the terms full circle:

Paragraph 1: Nous = les Nations amériendiennes

Paragraph 2: les Nations amérindiennes = “them” (“leurs”)

Paragraph 3: les Nations amérindiennes = “them” (“leurs”)

Paragraph 4: Nous = *la Nation*

Paragraph 5: Nous = les Nations amériendiennes

Paragraph 6: Every first nation (implicit: “all First Nations”)

Paragraph 7: les Nations amériendiennes = Nous

Picard’s discursive strategy is astute: he constructs the First Nations as a singular group (one nation) because they share a common colonizing experience. This construction of a collective political history leads to the construction of a “common future” (de Cillia et al., 1999). Picard insists that the effects of colonization continue today, “encore, en ce jour” (line 14). Picard calls for action on the part of the First Nations to vindicate and claim national rights with compensations, to change the “hopeless” future (line 4).

Finally, Picard seems to emphasize the unity of the First Nations through personification and the metaphor of a “national body” (de Cillia et al., 1999, p. 158). Picard refers to “notre” identity, “notre” pensée, “nos” sentiments” and “notre” bouche (lines 26, 28, 19). According to Picard, the First Nations share common emotions, thoughts, and they are even of one mouth; a mouth, it seems,

through which Picard seems to be speaking, and a mouth that has lost its mother tongue.

Picard, therefore, discursively constructs the First Nations as a united Nation with an identity, a collective political history, a common culture, a collective present and future and a national body. Language is of particular importance to Picard's construction of the First Nations. Picard explains that "La langue, c'est notre identité et notre pensée qui s'expriment" (line 26). Language is the means by which "we" can express "our" thought, "our" emotions, "our" feelings, and also a source of pride and freedom: "La langue est source de fierté et de liberté" (line 30). Since Picard focuses more on language than any other aspect of First Nations culture, language is evidently critical in his understanding of First Nations identity.

The discursive dismantling of the Quebec nation

As discussed above, the French language is integral to identity discourses in Quebec. Picard's brief discursively "transforms" the French Canadian identity discourse, particularly the modernizing version of that discourse. He does not so much transform as he does recontextualize this discourse into his own identity discourse by subverting the "topos" (Wodak et al., 1999, p. 34) of the mainstream Quebec identity discourse. Specifically, Picard draws on the link between language and identity, which is the "common-sense" central argument within Quebec identity discourse, and subverting this argument by applying it to his own (nations') situation. Situating his argument within relevant interdiscursive and intertextual contexts helps explain how this subversion is accomplished.

Interdiscursivity

Picard is able to subvert the topoi of Quebec national identity by exploiting a weakness in the logic underlying Quebec identity discourse. As discussed above, the Consultation Document asserts that French is the common, public, official language and the language of integration in Québec (p. 14). The Document focuses on the civic importance of the French language in Quebec society, but avoids reference to *why* the French language is so important in Quebec society. One reason commonly given is that it should be preserved because it is the language of the French Canadian majority and strongly connected with their identity and culture (see also Heller, 1999; Heller & Labrie, 2003; Heller, 2003b; Henderson, 2007; Oakes & Warren, 2007; Pagé, 2006). However, a similar argument can easily be extended to other language groups in Quebec, particularly national minorities such as First Nations. Picard astutely takes up this line of reasoning by evoking the discourse of language as a human right (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006). He makes reference to the importance of language in the First Nations, explaining the “suffering” that is endured with the loss of the national language (lines 24-5), and arguing that it is the right of “any nation” to use its language (lines 11-13). In a way, he seems to be appealing to Québécois sentimentality regarding their own language in order to contextualize his nations’ loss in a way that would be understandable to Quebec nationalists (i.e., lines 26-31).

Intertextuality

Picard's brief makes explicit intertextual reference to the Commission's mandate to "take stock of accommodation practices in Québec; [and] formulate recommendations to the government to ensure that accommodation practices conform to Québec's values as a pluralistic, democratic, egalitarian society" (p. v). In other words, it is not a question of whether or not there should *be* accommodation practices, it is a question of *what* they should be. From the dual title of the brief (*L'accommodement raisonnable, qu'en est-il? Ou, Les effets secondaires des accommodements*), Picard takes issue with the very existence of reasonable accommodation. He asks what reasonable accommodation is, and then he redefines accommodation from a First Nations perspective, arguing that they have forcibly "been accommodated" through the imposition of the French language.

Picard's brief also draws intertextually on the Commission Document's explicit emphasis on the rights of linguistic minorities declared in a citation from the Preamble to the Charter of the French language:

"The National Assembly of Québec recognizes the right of the Amerindians and the Inuit of Québec, the first inhabitants of this land, to preserve and develop their original language and culture." (p. 13)

Despite such a declaration of principles, Picard argues that the colonizer's language has been imposed on the First Nations people (lines 19-25) and questions the "colonizer's" so-called efforts. Despite promises and "beautiful

speeches” that have been made in regard to the First Nations, the situation of First Nations has continued to decline (lines 1-4).

Picard then proceeds to list the steps that need to be taken in order to attain this respect. Remarkably, these steps are quite similar to the steps that Chartrand calls to be taken in the “affirmation” of Québécois identity. Chartrand called, for example, for the “réappropriation” of culture, history, identity, and values (lines 22-4). Picard, similarly, calls for the First Nations to take their place, exercise their rights, their morals, their customs, their language, and their values (lines 39-42).

Summary

Both Picard and Chartrand appeal to the same audience (the Commission co-chairs), and respond to a similar discursive space opened by the Commission Document. However, Picard seems to appeal to the role of language in national identity in order to underline the similarity between the First Nations’ national identity and Québécois national identity; in doing so, he transforms the traditional understanding of the Quebec nation by applying the criteria to his own nation(s).

Brief submitted to: Commission de consultation sur les pratiques d’accomodement reliees aux differences culturelles

The final brief under examination, submitted by Franco Capitina, is in English and it shows considerable differences from the previous two French-language briefs (see Appendix XII). This analysis will principally serve as a point of comparison for the other briefs. The overall “macroproposition” (van Dijk, 2001) of the brief is:

There must be a balance between reasonable accommodation and positive reinforcement of Quebec language and culture

Capitina's brief contains a new approach to reasonable accommodation; he does not refer to national identity, but emphasizes the role of Quebec's civic institutions in resolving issues of reasonable accommodation.

Strategies

The central strategy employed by Capitina throughout his brief is the "dismantling or destructive strategy" (de Cillia et al., 1999). He dismisses the value of finding unity in language and culture, and uses "negative other presentation" (de Cillia et al., 1999) to undermine ethnocultural nationalism in favour of civic society.

Capitina does not construct Quebec as a nation, and makes no reference to collective political history, or a common culture, present or future. He also does not refer to an in-group defined by "we." Capitina uses the first person plural only seven times, and each time his use is inclusive of Quebec society as a whole; its inclusiveness is emphasized by his reference to "all" (line 23). Furthermore, there is no clear reference to an out-group or "other" with which "we" are contrasted. Although Capitina names specific (minority) groups (i.e. line 30), these groups are included within the in-group: they must follow the laws like everyone else. Instead, in-groups and out-groups are constructed by "labeling social actors more or less positively or negatively, deprecatorily or appreciatively" (Baker et al., 2008, p. 282). Capitina negatively evaluates individuals who deviate from civic society. According to Capitina's logic, the "out-group" within Quebec society are

those who do not adhere to civic values. He negatively evaluates ethnocultural identities by using “intensification” (Baker et al. 2008, p. 282) and associating them with racism and bigotry. Capitina uses the “topos of threat” (Wodak et al., 1999) to imply that ethnocultural identities are at the base of problems in Quebec (lines 41-3; 54-5; 60-1). Capitina expresses no sympathy for Québécois fighting for linguistic and cultural rights; he explains that they should rely on the government, which is responsible for these issues (lines 43-6). While Chartrand and Picard called for the nation(s) to unite and to assert their nationhood, Capitina calls, instead, for the government to take action.

Capitina’s brief compares two societies, one driven by ethnicity, and the other driven by civic values; in one situation, the society “can never flourish successfully” (line 54); in the other, the society is a “happier place” (line 55) where “Quebec ... benefits” (line 53). This is the strategy of “discrediting certain pillars of identity” (Wodak et al., 1999) using the topos of comparison. Ethnicity and language, historically key pillars of French Canadian identity, are rejected as elements of an unsuccessful society.

Summary

Capitina’s brief shows that Quebec identity can be predominantly civic. Although Capitina respects the role of French in Quebec society, French is not as important as the rights and freedoms of Quebec citizens, and indeed, Capitina argues that English is also important in Quebec society.

Chapter 7: Discussion

To return to my initial research questions, I began by asking how identity is constructed in relation to language in Quebec popular discourse. This overarching question required an exploration of (1) the ways in which Quebec is constructed, (2) how different constructions of Quebec involve different versions of membership and (3) varying levels of emphasis put on language. I review my findings first from the corpus analysis and then by highlighting additional insights from the critical discourse analysis.

Quebec: ethnocultural and civic constructions

Quebec is predominantly discursively constructed in relation to civic and ethnocultural attributes. In both the FrenchBT corpus and the EnglishBT corpus, for example, the keywords *Québec/Quebec* have semantic preference for collocates relating to politics and institutions as well as core values. In both corpora, there is a discursive link between Quebec and society. This indicates a civic construction of Quebec, because society in both corpora is predicated on pluralist and democratic terms. Particularly in the FrenchBT corpus, references to Quebec society pertain to discussions of public civic life in Quebec. References to the core values of Quebec, on the other hand, evoke an ethnocultural understanding of the Quebec nation.

The contrast between ethnocultural national and civic societal constructions is most evident in the EnglishBT corpus. Here, Quebec is not constructed as a nation: there are few “core values” collocating with *Quebec*, particularly when compared with the FrenchBT corpus. Indeed, *nation* is not a

keyword in the EnglishBT corpus, and only collocates with *Quebec* eight times; of these eight times, only once does the collocate present Quebec as a nation (*diversity as a basic element of our Quebec nation*). Instead, the strong relationship between *society* and *Quebec* results in the positive discursive construction of Quebec as a civic society. Also, Quebec is often represented as part of the Canadian federation, which is not a trend followed in the FrenchBT corpus. Although the EnglishBT corpus primarily constructs Quebec as a civic society, it also includes numerous references to ethnocultural and ethnolinguistic “communities” within this society. These communities are constructed in terms of the language, origins, and religion of their members. Thus, the EnglishBT corpus does not overlook ethnicity and culture in Quebec; it simply uses different terms of reference to indicate where membership is civic (society) and where membership is ethnocultural (communities).

Examining membership through identity labels, the EnglishBT corpus sheds some light on the discursive construction of belonging in Quebec. The keyword *Quebecer* is more frequent than the keyword *Quebecois*. *Quebecer* is an identity label that tends to represent civic membership, even if this membership is often qualified by language (*English-speaking, French-speaking*). In contrast, the keyword *Quebecois* tends to refer to membership in an ethnocultural nation. This is because *nation* collocates with *Quebecois* but not *Quebec*, *Quebecer*, or *our*, which are primarily constructed as civic. Since *Quebecois* is a French term, when it is used in English it suggests the French language, and perhaps French Canadian identity. Therefore, the identity label *Quebecois* seems to have

ethnocultural nationalist associations when used in English. This further explains why most English briefs construct a relationship with Quebec civic society rather than the nation: the nation is perceived as French Canadian, ethnocultural, and exclusive.

Belonging in Quebec: in-group membership

Although the “in-group” (*nous/we*) is delineated by personal pronouns that can be adopted by a variety of individuals, in both the FrenchBT and EnglishBT corpora, the in-group is most often equated with “Quebec society.” This is a positive self-representation, because the examination of the keyword *société/society* in both corpora showed associations with positive civic attributes. Also, the strong link between the in-group, Quebec, and society suggests that a large majority of authors identify themselves as members of Quebec civic society. Still, identifying with civic society is not the same as identifying with the (ethnocultural) nation, and Quebec remains represented as both a nation and a society, each with its own connotations and different versions of membership.

Language as a criterion of membership: the modernizing discourse

Ethnocultural and civic nationalism are not mutually exclusive constructions; as Oakes (2001) argues, “it is rare that a nation finds itself at one extreme or the other” (p. 13). These two versions of nationalism in fact work together within the modernizing French Canadian identity discourse. The modernizing discourse emphasizes conditions of inclusion based on democratic values while continuing to recognize French Canadian ethnocultural heritage; therefore, identifying with civic Quebec still entails membership in what remains a largely ethnocultural

category (Heller, 2001). Historically, religion, ethnicity, and language were what united the French Canadian people in an ethnocultural nation. Today, Oakes and Warren (2007) argue that Quebec is evolving away from ethnicity and toward a civic version of membership; still, language remains of central importance. They explain: “the acceptance of French as the language of public life is the only one [principle] that is truly specific to Quebec’s distinct society” (p. 29). Since the ethnocultural nation and civic society are not mutually exclusive, in principle, individuals can be members of both the nation and civic society, and in both, language is a criterion of belonging. For example, corpus findings suggest that membership in the ethnocultural nation is relatively restricted, because the nation includes only those people of French Canadian heritage, part of which involves the French language. However, the vast majority of authors appear to identify with civic society, which seems to be more inclusive. The primary criterion of belonging to Quebec civic society is, then, the ability to participate in public life through the common public language.

In other words, the “topos” of ethnicity as a criterion of membership in Quebec is evolving; nowadays, language is widely accepted as a criterion of membership. Thus, membership is becoming – or is branded as – less exclusive. Frequent references to language education suggest a discourse in which civic democratic processes allow outsiders to access membership in Quebec civic society.

Whose language?

In both corpora, *langue/language* has primarily civic connotations. French is the common, public, official, and national language. References to education and language training highlight that language is accessible to all people in the province, irrespective of their origins. This is particularly evident in the EnglishBT corpus, and could be evidence of a “globalizing discourse,” where individuals justify their attempt to capitalize on their linguistic resources in order to succeed in the globalizing and multilingual reality of modern Quebec. Nevertheless, both corpora show that, for some, language remains linked to religion and culture and is used as a boundary marker allowing distinction between “us” and “them” (*notre* versus *leur* language). Furthermore, language is undoubtedly linked to identity: the term *French* frequently labels individuals both linguistically (*French-speaking Quebecer*) and ethnoculturally (*French Canadian Quebecer*, *French Québécois*, *Franco-Québécois*, *Québécois d’origine française*). Indeed, in the EnglishBT corpus, the primary means of identifying groups within Quebec is in relation to language (*English*, *French*, *-speaking*, *Francophone*).

Why identity labels matter

Belonging to Quebec takes discursive shape through largely ambiguous identity labels. These identity labels refer to different ways of belonging to different construals of Quebec (as a nation or as civic society). The examination of the identity label *Québécois*, in particular, reveals some of the complicated ways in which individuals discursively construct their identity. Although the FrenchBT corpus showed that *identité québécoise* was the most frequent “kind” of identity,

the term *Québécois* is ambiguous because, like perhaps many other identity labels, while denoting a resident of Quebec, it carries ethnolinguistic connotations. Because *Québécois* is ambiguous, popular discourse abounds with different identity labels and subcategories within these labels (i.e., hyphenated identity). These identity labels pinpoint the different ways in which individuals construct their belonging to the province.

Insights from critical discourse analysis

The discourse analysis of the three briefs, while not comprehensive enough to draw conclusions, sheds light on these corpus analysis findings. It shows three considerably different renditions of belonging in Quebec, and each one governed by language.

Chartrand's brief was useful to confirm assumptions regarding the modernizing discourse and the relationship between "language" and "our identity" in Quebec. Chartrand clearly emphasizes the ethnocultural heritage of the in-group (mostly referring to the French-speaking majority in Quebec) and the role that language plays in this identity. This supports corpus findings that point to a discourse of French Canadian ethnocultural nationalism. However, Chartrand also emphasizes the importance of language in public society; this reinforces the corpus findings that language features as an important role in civic society. Chartrand's call for Quebec sovereignty is presented as a solution for the terms and conditions of immigrant entry, because he argues that without sovereignty, immigrants aggravate the linguistic confusion ambient in Quebec.

Capitina, on the other hand, is not French Canadian, and does not draw on any French Canadian identity discourses; instead, he positively evaluates Quebec civic society. Capitina makes few connections between “identity” and “language,” but he respects religious and cultural rights so long as they do not infringe upon the requirements of civic structures. Importantly, Capitina construes those who are firmly attached to language and ethnicity as “others” because they do not adhere to Quebec’s civic values; indeed, neither language nor identity is as important as Quebec civic values. Capitina’s brief supports EnglishBT corpus findings: he refers to various ethnocultural communities (although he does not use this term) within Quebec, and Quebec is primarily constructed as a civic society.

Finally, Picard’s brief represents language as firmly linked to national identity, culture and history. Indeed, if Picard were French Canadian, his identity discourse might be called “traditionalist.” However, Picard is not French Canadian, and neither the nation nor the language in question is traditionally associated with French Canadian identity. The analysis of Picard’s brief uncovers some of the limitations of corpus analysis, because the singularity of his voice is evidently overrun in the corpus findings. In both the FrenchBT and the EnglishBT corpora, the majority of people in Quebec construct membership in relation to both the civic and ethnocultural nation; corpus analysis showed that both versions of membership rely on the French language in one way or another. However, these majority voices effectively drown minority voices, such as that of Picard. Within the overall topic of accommodation in Quebec, Picard’s brief contains a unique and invaluable perspective: the perspective of the “accommodated” and

not the “accommodator.” He exploits a potential weakness in the logic of accommodation, and argues that accommodation has not served to benefit or provide the First Nations people any sense of attachment to either civic or ethnocultural Quebec. Picard’s perspective is that of a minority: corpus analysis, which by default finds significance in frequent repetition, is prone to overlook such dissenting voices, because they are not evident in frequent patterns.

Summary

In sum, my research has shown that belonging to Quebec remains linked to the French language. Individual identity constructions are not predominantly ethnocultural; Quebec is overwhelmingly constructed as a civic society, and although identity within this society can take various shapes and forms, by and large individuals construct their identity in relation to membership in civic society.

Chapter 8: Conclusion

The goal of this research was to determine the ways in which belonging in Quebec is linked to the French language. The data for my research was drawn from 741 Bouchard Taylor Commission participant briefs. Due to the large amount of data, I required a powerful tool to find patterns in the data. At the same time, since expressions of belonging are open to interpretation, I required a methodology that would allow me to interpret the patterns that I uncovered. Therefore, I employed the CADS methodological framework, which combines corpus and discourse analysis. This framework allowed me both bottom-up and top-down perspectives on the briefs, and as a result, I was able to contextualize my data in and draw well-informed conclusions. I created two corpora for analysis: the primary corpus contained French-language briefs (the FrenchBT corpus); the secondary corpus contained English-language briefs (the EnglishBT corpus).

I first analyzed the FrenchBT corpus, and then the EnglishBT corpus. The next step was to downsample and select a small number of briefs for discourse analysis. I selected three briefs (two French and one English), and found that this discourse analysis was invaluable for the verification of my corpus results and for the contextualization of the Commission in general. Indeed, the discourse analysis sparked new questions with regard to the role of language in Quebec.

My analysis uncovered conflicting constructions of belonging. Research has suggested that French Canadian identity is constructed in three main discourses: traditionalist, modernizing, and globalizing (Heller, 2001). My

findings uncovered evidence of modernizing discourse; however, there were suggestions of globalizing identity discourse, particularly within the EnglishBT corpus. Evidence of these discourses emerged primarily from references to attributes of civic society that contrasted with the core values of an ethnocultural nation. Since both civic society and ethnocultural nationalism are blended within the modernizing discourse, it appeared that this discourse dominates the discursive scene in the Bouchard Taylor Commission. However, different emphasis is given to civic society and ethnocultural nationalism in each corpus; furthermore, the analysis of individual briefs using critical discourse analysis demonstrated that participants draw liberally from both ethnocultural and civic versions to construct their sense of belonging to the province. While the FrenchBT corpus contains the modernizing discourse to the extent that ethnic criteria of belonging seem largely masked through civic processes such as education (as seen in Chartrand's brief), in the EnglishBT corpus, access into Quebec civic society is described as achievable through education in the French language (which, incidentally, allows English-speakers to capitalize on the value of French). Therefore, although the overall dominant discourse appeared to be modernizing, it is not necessarily the same version of the modernizing discourse that is evident in each individual brief. Participants were able to construct their sense of belonging according to the civic or ethnocultural attributes they most valued. Perhaps unsurprisingly, there appears to be no consensus as to what Quebec is and who belongs, but more people seem to express a relationship with civic society and a desire for immigrants (in particular) to integrate into this

society; this society remains distinct largely because of its civic and ethnocultural emphasis on the French language.

Contributions of this study

This research has served to confirm a number of theories about belonging and identity in Quebec. There are indeed conflicting versions of membership in the province, but not without reason. Overall, these versions of membership tie together within a modernizing identity discourse, where individuals identify with one another through their common language. The strength of the modernizing discourse is perhaps in its polyvalency: members adopt and stress the civic or ethnocultural elements suitable to their identity needs.

In terms of methodology, this research contributes to the ever-expanding fields of discourse analysis and corpus linguistics. Since the usefulness of corpora in discourse analysis has only recently been explored, this research has demonstrated some of the ways in which discourse analysis can enhance corpus analysis – and vice versa. Namely, corpus analysis allows for data to be accessible and easily navigable. For example, corpus analysis tools ease the search for individual terms and how they are used; this is particularly useful if a researcher already has some intuition about individual words that could be important within a given topic. At the same time, corpora can reveal patterns that go against researcher intuition, and this can help overcome researcher bias.

This research has also shown the unquestionable importance of researcher input in corpus analysis. The CADS framework requires researcher input in the form of discourse analysis of individual texts. I have shown and underscored the

importance of the discourse analysis in the thorough understanding of corpus findings. The discourse analysis enhanced and deepened my understanding of the corpus data, and allowed me a more complete understanding of the way in which identity and membership is constructed by individuals.

Methodological advantages and limitations

The discourse analysis also highlighted challenges in corpus analysis. The strength of corpus analysis is the ability to find patterns across huge amounts of data; however, this increases the likelihood of overlooking examples that go against these patterns. McEnery and Wilson (2001) cite this as one of the original criticisms of corpus linguistics; Chomsky illustrated this failing when he pointed out that the sentence *I live in New York* was “fundamentally more likely than *I live in Dayton Ohio* purely by virtue of the fact that there are more people likely to say the former than the latter” (McEnery and Wilson, 2001, p. 10). This is a failing in corpus linguistics, because minority examples might be important considerations of the topic at hand. For this reason, researcher input is critical in the examination of corpus data. Only the researcher can situate data within its sociocultural and historical context; only the researcher can make sense of the data, infer results, and identify what is potentially missing from the corpus findings. Importantly, what is missing from the data can be as revealing as what is included and evident.

Baker et al. (2008) explain, “A traditional corpus-based analysis is not sufficient to explain or interpret the reasons why certain linguistic patterns were found (or *not* found)” (p. 293). To improve the explanatory power of corpus

analysis, Baker et al. (2008) call for the combined use of corpus and discourse analysis; this takes shape in the CADS combined approach. This framework allows for corpus findings to be verified through the detailed investigation of individual lexical samples in their various discursive and intertextual contexts; also, it allows for broad corpus findings to be compared with in-depth analysis of individual texts. As a result, the validity of corpus results can be verified and limitations can be identified.

In this study, the use of corpora in discourse analysis has yielded results that neither corpus nor discourse analysis would have likely uncovered on its own. The three briefs selected for discourse analysis were selected for the same reason: each brief had a high concentration of vocabulary relating to language. However, as we have seen, each brief contains a considerably different perspective on language and its role in Quebec: two briefs more or less confirm corpus findings, but one brief (that of Picard) goes against the grain of corpus findings. The discourse analysis of Picard's brief was able to uncover reasons behind his opposition, and it is unlikely that this would have shown on the radar of corpus analysis. The discourse analysis effectively provided contextual information that enriched the corpus findings. Baker et al. (2008) explain that a frequent criticism of corpus linguistics is that it tends to disregard context; indeed, this analysis showed some of the ways in which corpus analysis reduces context to co-text and thus overlooks important contextual dimensions such as the historical, interdiscursive and intertextual contexts beyond the corpus.

My in-depth discourse analysis exposed some of the context of each brief, which in turn exposed some of the large-scale social reality of Quebec. More specifically, the majority group in Quebec consists of French speakers of French descent, and this group holds power in the province. As shown above, the dominant modernizing identity discourse of this group springs forth from corpus data, and this discourse blends civic society and ethnocultural nationalism. The next largest group in Quebec consists of people of British heritage; this group continues to hold considerable power in the province, largely because of their historical role in Quebec and Anglophone majority rule in North America. The dominant discourse of this group is one emphasizing the role of language in Quebec civic society (perhaps a “globalizing discourse”): evidence of this discourse, too, springs forth from corpus data. The minority groups in Quebec, including the First Nations people, do not hold power, and no strong discourse emerges from them in the corpus. Their discourse(s) only become evident in the analysis of individual briefs, such as that of Picard. As Ricento (2003) finds, social power is the ability to produce and reproduce discourses that justify power structures. In other words, to have power is to be able to circulate and control discourses that legitimize and propagate that power. The French Canadian majority attempts to wield its power by reproducing nationalist and identity discourses that do not necessarily represent all those in the province. Heller (2001) argues that Canadian social power structures are connected with linguistic practices and discourses:

Language practices in Canada are primarily about struggles ... to produce discourses and to impose them, and to deal with discourses produced by others ... Language practices are also about discourses informed by interests, interests related to controlling access to the production and distribution of symbolic and material resources. (p. 120)

There is one dominant identity discourse in Quebec: the modernizing discourse. This discourse allows the people of Quebec the option of constructing their membership in relation to either a primarily ethnocultural nation or a civic society: in both cases, French is required. The modernizing discourse legitimates the interests of French speakers, facilitating their maintenance of a relatively high level of social power; non-French speakers can attain similar social power by learning French through civic structures, such as public education. The success of this discourse is such that the French language is effectively imposed in Quebec society; as a result, the linguistic rights and privileges of the First Nations are neutralized, even void. Picard's brief reveals an alternative perspective on language and identity in Quebec; this First Nations' perspective was not apparent through corpus analysis alone. Thus, discourse analysis contextualizes not only individual instances of language use, but also corpus findings as a whole.

Context in corpus analysis

Although I have argued for taking context into account, even more contextual information would have been valuable in the examination of the corpus data. For example, one limitation of this study is that minority voices appear to have been

drowned by majority voices. To remedy this, more context could have been useful. If I had had information concerning the authors of each brief, I might have been able to create different subcorpora in order to determine which authors were predominantly constructing which versions of membership. For example, if there had been a short survey attached to the submission of each brief, I might have been able to further contextualize my data in order to draw stronger results. The survey might have asked each participant in the Commission to self-identify according to identity terms such as the ones in Appendix VI, or the survey might have asked for them to use an identity term to label themselves. In this way, I could have grouped briefs together into subcorpora according to the identity assumed by each author, and further explored the semantics associated with each identity label by an analysis of each subcorpus. In this way, the voices of specific groups would not have been drowned by the majority of voices. I would have been able to determine how, and on what terms and conditions, each group constructed its membership within Quebec.

Another way to explore identity and belonging in Quebec would have been to create subcorpora according to the various regions from which individual Commission participants submitted their briefs. Since Montreal is by far the region of the province with the highest number of immigrants and minority groups, it might have been valuable to determine if and how voices in Montreal differ from the rest of the province. Overall, the creation of subcorpora might have helped overcome the daunting task of analyzing and comparing so much

data in one very large and one quite small corpus, particularly since they were in different languages.

Comparing corpora of different languages

Drawing on two corpora of different languages, I faced unforeseen problems when compiling and, later comparing, the keyword lists. These problems suggest the wealth of work that remains for French corpus linguistics before it will catch up with its English counterpart. Because there exist no large, representative French reference corpora (such as the BNC in English), both the EnglishBT and the FrenchBT keyword lists had to be compiled by using comparator corpora. Although the utmost care was taken in order to make these comparator corpora as reliable and, moreover, as similar in composition as possible, the problems I faced in these initial stages of corpus analysis show that much more research needs to be done in the area of comparative keyword lists and keyness, particularly across corpora of different languages.

Since I have attempted to investigate the constructions of belonging by all of Commission participants, it is perhaps a limitation that I was unable to compare the English and French corpora. Without the ability to systematically compare, my corpora remained largely disparate, and my evaluation of their respective content largely contrastive. However, even though I was not able to numerically compare the statistical significance of the keywords, salient identity constructions came across through the corpus analysis when enriched by the discourse analysis. Indeed, even the comparison between the FrenchBT and EnglishBT corpora allowed for some insight into identity constructions, because the EnglishBT

corpus analysis draws on texts that were written in English, and likely composed by minority communities. The most obvious minority community is the English-speaking community, but since many immigrant and minority groups were drawn to the English language prior to the French language legislation of the 1970s, it is therefore likely that many religious and/or cultural communities submitted briefs in English as well. Thus, the small-scale EnglishBT corpus has perhaps shed light on some of the minority voices in Quebec that would have been drowned (as explained above) if they had been examined within one, large, bilingual corpus.

Implications for further research

The use of CADS across languages breaks new ground, but highlights challenges that remain. My findings suggest that more research must be done in order to better mould corpus tools for discourse analysis. Keyness is a fundamental aspect of corpus analysis, but my procedure highlighted a number of inconsistencies when keyword lists are compiled with auxiliary corpora of different sizes. More research must be done to determine the baseline size of auxiliary corpora used in the compilation of keyword lists. Furthermore, research is lacking on the reliability of keyword findings resulting from the use of different auxiliary corpora. My comparison of two keyword lists, compiled from corpora of different languages and compiled using different comparator corpora, raised a number of methodological issues concerning the comparability of keyness across languages.

With regard to the specific subject of belonging and identity in Quebec, a logical extension of my research would be to examine the content of the Bouchard Taylor Commission final report. We saw that the authors respond to and position

themselves relative to the Consultation Document. It would be valuable to examine the next stage in this Bakhtinian dialogue and investigate how discourses of identity and belonging in Quebec evident in the briefs are taken up by the Commission's final report. This would also require an examination of the specific legislation and policies that resulted from the report. One result of the Commission already in effect is a "mandatory declaration" for immigrants to sign their commitment to respect Quebec's common values ("Immigrants must sign paper pledging Quebec values," October 29, 2008). What are these values, and are they the civic or "core" values explored throughout this research?

Finally, more research must be done on identity terminology. We have seen that *Québécois* is ambiguous when used either in English and in French, but what about the term *nation*? Does *nation* not too have certain connotations in English and French? There are differences between references to *nation* (singular) and *nations* (plural): in the singular, *nation* can denote different groups for various reasons, but in the plural, *nations* may refer to the First Nations of Canada, as seen in Picard's brief. Clearly, there are connotations associated with nationhood, not least of which ethnicity and culture.

To conclude, in an age when ethnocultural nationalism is largely misunderstood as archaic and even xenophobic, Quebec nationalism is often disdained, particularly in English-speaking Canada, regardless of whether it is expressed in civic or ethnocultural terms (for more discussion on the connotations of Quebec ethnocultural nationalism, see Oakes and Warren, 2007, chapter 2; for more on the role of language in identity politics and for an argument promoting

the formal inclusion of language and culture in the civic realm, see May, 2008, particularly the section on Quebec, pp. 224-235). It is hoped that research such as this will help to minimize misinformation surrounding Quebec nationalism. This misinformation perhaps fuels the fervour of debates, perpetuating the perception of “two solitudes.”

References

- Ager, D. (1996). *'Francophonie' in the 1990s: Problems and opportunities*. Bristol, PA: Multilingual Matters.
- Ager, D. (1999). *Identity, insecurity and image: France and language*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Anctil, P. (2007). Sortie de crise linguistique au Québec. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 41(2), 185-221.
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anderson, W. J. (2006). *The phraseology of administrative French: A corpus-based study*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Ashforth, A. (1990). Reckoning schemes of legitimation: On commissions of inquiry as Power/Knowledge forms. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 3(1), 1-22.
- Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. London & New York: Continuum.
- Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., Khosravini, M., Krzyżanowski, M., McEnery, T., & Wodak, R. (2008). A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press. *Discourse & Society*, 19(3), 273-306.
- Bauer, M. W. & Aarts, B. (2000). Corpus construction: A principle for qualitative data collection. In M. W. Bauer & G. Gaskell (Eds.), *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound* (pp. 19-37). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Beauchemin, J. (2006). La protection de la langue et de l'identité collective comme enjeu au sein de la conscience historique québécoise. In M. Pagé, & P. Georgeault (Eds.), *Le Français, langue de la diversité québécoise: Une réflexion pluridisciplinaire* (pp. 131-151). Montréal: Québec Amérique.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Leech, G. (2002). *Longman student grammar of spoken and written English*. Essex: Longman.
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Billig, M. (2002). Language and Nation/nationalism/national identity. In M. J. Toolan (Ed.), *Critical discourse analysis: Critical concepts in linguistics* (pp. 59-97). New York: Routledge.

- Bishop, H. & Jaworski, A. (2003). 'We beat 'em': Nationalism and the hegemony of homogeneity in the British press reportage of Germany versus England during Euro 2000. *Discourse & Society*, 14(3), 243-271.
- Bleich, E. (1999). Re-imagined communities? Education policies and national belonging in Britain and France. In A. Geddes & A. Favell (Eds.), *Politics of Belonging: Migrants and Minorities in Contemporary Europe* (pp. 60-75). Brookfield, USA: Ashgate.
- Blommaert, J. (2006). Language policy and national identity. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy* (pp. 238-254). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Blommaert, J. & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 29, 447-466.
- Boudreau, A. & Dubois, L. (2007). *Français, Acadien, Acadjonne*: Competing discourses on language preservation along the shores of the Baie Sainte-Marie. In A. Duchêne, & M. Heller (Eds.), *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages* (pp. 99-120). New York: Continuum.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical reason: On the theory of action*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Brady, M. J. (2007). Agnostic democracy and Canada's linguistic duality. In M. Howard (Ed.), *Intercultural dialogue: Canada and the other* (pp. 1-16). Ottawa, Canada: Ottawa University Press.
- Cardinal, L. (2004). The limits of bilingualism in Canada. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 10(1), 79-103.
- Cardinal, L. (2005). The ideological limits of linguistic diversity in Canada. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 26(6), 481-495.
- Cartwright, D. (2006). Geolinguistic analysis in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy* (pp. 194-209). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Consultation Commission on Accommodation Practices Related to Cultural Differences. (2007a). *Consultation Document. Accommodation and differences. Seeking common ground: Quebecers speak out. Consultation Commission on Accommodation Practices Related to Cultural Differences*. Retrieved on March 26, 2009, from <http://www.accommodements.qc.ca/documentation/document-consultation-en.html>

- Consultation Commission on Accommodation Practices Related to Cultural Differences. (2007b). *Participation Guide. Accommodation and Differences. Seeking common ground: Quebecers speak out. Consultation Commission on Accommodation Practices Related to Cultural Differences*. Retrieved on March 26, 2009, from <http://www.accommodements.qc.ca/documentation/guide-participation-en.html>
- Consultation Commission on Accommodation Practices Related to Cultural Differences. (2008). *Final report: Building the future, a time for reconciliation*. Retrieved on March 26, 2009 from <http://www.accommodements.qc.ca/index-en.html>
- Crowley, J. (1999). The politics of belonging: Some theoretical considerations. In A. Geddes & A. Favell (Eds.), *The Politics of Belonging: Migrants and Minorities in Contemporary Europe* (pp. 15-41). Brookfield, USA: Ashgate.
- de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (1999). The discursive construction of national identities. *Discourse & Society*, 10(2), 149-173.
- Djite, P. G. (2006). Shifts in linguistic identities in a global world. *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 30 (1), 1-20.
- Edwards, J. (2004). Ecolinguistic ideologies: A critical perspective. In M. Pütz, J. Neff-van Aertselaer & T. van Dijk (Eds.), *Communicating ideologies: Multidisciplinary perspectives on language, discourse, and social practice* (pp. 273-279). New York: Peter Lang.
- Eggins, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nd Ed.). New York: Continuum.
- Erfurt, J. (1999). Le changement de l'identité linguistique chez les Franco-Ontariens: Résultats d'une étude de cas. In N. Labrie, & G. Forlot (Eds.), *L'enjeu de la langue en ontario français* (pp. 59-77). Ottawa, Canada: Prise de parole.
- Fägersten, K. B. (2008). A corpus approach to discursive constructions of a hip-hop identity. In A. Ädel, & R. Reppen (Eds.), *Corpora and discourse: The challenges of different settings* (pp. 211-240). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2006.). *Language and globalization*. Abingdon, OX & New York, NY : Routledge.

- Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258-284). London: Sage.
- Heller, M. (1999a). Heated language in a cold climate. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language ideological debates* (pp. 143-170). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heller, M. (1999b). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. London & New York: Continuum.
- Heller, M. (1999c). Quel(s) français et pour qui? Discours et pratiques identitaires en milieu scolaire franco-ontarien. In N. Labrie, & G. Forlot (Eds.), *L'enjeu de la langue en ontario français* (pp. 129-165). Ottawa: Prise de parole.
- Heller, M. (2001). Critique and sociolinguistic analysis of discourse. *Critique of Anthropology*, 21(2), 117-141.
- Heller, M. (2003a). Discourse and interaction. In D. Schrifin, D. Tannen & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 250-264). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Heller, M. (2003b). Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(4), 473-492.
- Heller, M. & Labrie, N. (2003). Langue, pouvoir et identité: Une étude de cas, une approche théorique, une méthodologie. In M. Heller, & N. Labrie (Eds.), *Discours et identités: La francité canadienne entre modernités et mondialisation* (pp. 9-39). Rennes: Proximités: Editions Modulaires Européennes (E.M.E).
- Henderson, A. (2007). *Hierarchies of belonging: National identity and political culture in Scotland and Quebec*. Montreal, QC & Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Immigrants must sign paper pledging Quebec values*. (2008, October 29). Retrieved March 26, 2009, from <http://www.cbc.ca/canada/montreal/story/2008/10/29/mtl-immigrationdeclaration1029.html>
- Ivanic, R. (1998). *Writing and identity*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Jaffe, A. (2007). Discourses of endangerment: Contexts and consequences of essentializing discourses. In A. Duchêne, & M. Heller (Eds.), *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages* (pp. 57-75). New York: Continuum.
- Jenson, J. (1994). Commissioning ideas: Representation and Royal Commissions. In S. D. Phillips (Ed.), *How Ottawa spends 1994-5* (pp. 39-70). Ottawa, Canada: Carleton University Press.

- Joseph, J. E. (2004). *Language and identity: National, ethnic, religious*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kasuya, K. (2001). Discourses of linguistic dominance: A historical consideration of French language ideology. *International Review of Education*, 47(3-4), 235-251.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Labelle, M. (2004). The "language of race," identity options, and "belonging" in the Quebec context. In F. Devine, & M. C. Walters (Eds.), *Social inequalities in comparative perspective* (pp. 275-291). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Labelle, M. & Salée, D. (2001). Immigrant and minority representations of citizenship in Quebec. In T. A. Aleinikoff, & D. Klusmeyer (Eds.), *Citizenship today* (pp. 278-315). Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Lee, D. Y. W. (2008). Corpora and discourse analysis: New ways of doing old things. In V. K. Bhatia, J. Flowerdew & R. H. Jones (Eds.), *Advances in discourse studies* (pp. 86-99). London & New York: Routledge.
- Létourneau, J. (2000). *Passer à l'avenir: Histoire, mémoire, identité dans le Québec d'aujourd'hui*. Montréal: Boréal.
- Létourneau, J. (2001a). Digging into historical consciousness, individual and collective. overview of a research trajectory. Paper presented at the *Canadian Historical Consciousness in an International Context: Theoretical Frameworks*, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC. Retrieved March 26, 2009, from <http://www.cshc.ubc.ca/pwias/viewabstract.php?9>
- Létourneau, J. (2001b). Which history for which future of Canada? Paper presented at the *Canadian Historical Consciousness in an International Context: Theoretical Frameworks*, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC. Retrieved March 26, 2009, from <http://www.cshc.ubc.ca/pwias/viewpaper.php?9>
- Létourneau, J. (2004). Le Québec d'aujourd'hui: Défis et possibilités pour une (petite) collectivité francophone d'Amérique du nord. In Rocheron, & Rolfe (Eds.), *Shifting frontiers of France and Francophonie* (25-63). Bern: Peter Lang.
- Létourneau, J. (2006). La langue comme lieu de mémoire et lieu de passage. In M. Pagé, & P. Georgeault (Eds.), *Le Français, langue de la diversité québécoise: Une réflexion pluridisciplinaire* (pp. 194-210). Montréal: Québec Amérique.

- Létourneau, J., Aronoff, P., & Scott, H. (2004). *A history for the future: Rewriting memory and identity in Quebec*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Létourneau, J. & Moisan, S. (2004). Young people's assimilation of a collective historical memory: A case study of Quebecers of French-Canadian heritage. In P. C. Seixas (Ed.), *Theorizing historical consciousness* (pp. 109-128). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Létourneau, J. & Ruel, J. (1994). Nous autres les Québécois. In K. Fall, D. Simeoni & G. Vignaux (Eds.), *Mots, représentations* (pp. 283-307). Ottawa, Ont.: Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa.
- Lévesque, R. (1997). *René Lévesque: Mot à mot*. (Citations colligées par Rémi Maillard). Montreal: Les Éditions internationales Alain Stanké.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2005). Globalisation and national communities of communication. *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 29(2), 109-133.
- MacLure, J. (2003). *Quebec identity*. Montreal/Kingston: McGill-Queen's University press.
- Mautner, G. (2008). Analyzing newspapers, magazines and other print media. In R. Wodak, & M. Krzyzanowski (Eds.), *Qualitative discourse analysis in the social sciences* (pp. 30-53). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- May, S. (2008.). *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language*. New York: Routledge.
- McAndrew, M. (2008). *Reasonable accommodation in public institutions: Is the Bouchard-Taylor report a realistic option?* Powerpoint Presentation, Metropolis Armchair Discussion, Ottawa, June 27, 2008.
- McEnery, T. & Wilson, A. (2001). *Corpus Linguistics: An introduction*. 2nd Edition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Meinhof, U. H. & Galasiński, D. (2005). *The language of belonging*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Moïse, C. (2007). Protecting French: The view from France. In A. Duchêne, & M. Heller (Eds.), *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages* (pp. 216-241). New York: Continuum.
- Muehlmann, S. (2007). Defending diversity: Staking out a common global interest? In A. Duchêne, & M. Heller (Eds.), *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages* (pp. 13-34). New York: Continuum.

- Oakes, L. (2006). Le défi de l'ethnicité: Modèles de nation et politique linguistique au Québec et ailleurs. In M. Pagé, & P. Georgeault (Eds.), *Le Français, langue de la diversité québécoise: Une réflexion pluridisciplinaire* (pp. 107-129). Montreal: Quebec Amérique.
- Oakes, L. (2007). Whose French? Language attitudes, linguistic insecurity and standardisation in Quebec. In M. Howard (Ed.), *Language issues in Canada* (pp. 64-85). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Oakes, L. & Warren, J. (2007). *Language, citizenship and identity in Quebec*. Basingstoke, England & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Office of the Prime Minister. (2006). *PM declares that the Québécois form a nation within a united Canada*. Retrieved September 20, 2008, from <http://pm.gc.ca/eng/media.asp?category=2&id=1415>
- Pagé, M. (2006). Propositions pour une approche dynamique de la situation du Français dans l'espace linguistique québécois. In M. Pagé, & P. Georgeault (Eds.), *Le Français, langue de la diversité québécoise: Une réflexion pluridisciplinaire* (pp. 27-76). Montreal: Québec Amérique.
- Patrick, D. (2007). Indigenous language endangerment and the unfinished business of nation states. In A. Duchêne, & M. Heller (Eds.), *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages* (pp. 35-56). New York: Continuum.
- Renan, E. (1896). *Poetry of the Celtic races and other essays*. London: W. Scott.
- Ricento, T. (2003). The discursive construction of Americanism. *Discourse & Society*, 14(5), 611-637.
- Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Salée, D. (2007). The Quebec state and the management of ethnocultural diversity: Perspectives on an ambiguous record. In K. G. Banting, T. J. Courchene & F. L. Seidle (Eds.), *Belonging? Diversity, recognition and shared citizenship in Canada* (115-145). Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy/Institut de recherche en politiques publiques.
- Scott, M. & Tribble, C. (2006). *Textual Patterns. Key words and corpus analysis in language education*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Scott, M. (2004-2005). *Oxford WordSmith Tools Manual*. Version 4.0. www.lexically.net/wordsmith/
- Scott, M. (1997). PC analysis of key words--and key key words. *System*, 25(2), 233-245.

- Seale, C. (2003). Methodology versus scholarship? Overcoming the divide in analysing identity narratives of people with cancer. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 2(2), 289-309.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2006). Language policy and linguistic human rights. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy* (pp. 273-291). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Statistics Canada (2006). <http://www40.statcan.gc.ca/l01/cst01/demo11b-eng.htm>
- Stubbs, M. (1996). *Text and corpus analysis: Computer-assisted studies of language and culture*. Oxford, UK & Cambridge, USA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Stubbs, M. (1997). Whorf's children: Critical comments on critical discourse analysis (CDA). In A. Ryan, & A. Wray (Eds.), *Evolving models of language: Papers from the annual meeting of the British association for applied linguistics held at the University of Wales, Swansea, September 1996* (pp. 100-116). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Stubbs, M. (2001). Texts, corpora, and problems of interpretation: A response to Widdowson. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(2), 149-172.
- Stubbs, M. (2003). Computer-assisted text and corpus analysis: Lexical cohesion and communicative competence. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 305-320). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Stubbs, M. (2007). An example of frequent English phraseology: Distributions, structures and functions. In R. Facchinetti (Ed.), *Corpus linguistics: 25 years on* (pp. 89-105). New York: Rodopi BV.
- Toolan, M. (1997). What is critical discourse analysis and why are people saying such terrible things about it? *Language and Literature*, 6 (2), 83-103.
- van Dijk, T. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 95-120). London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. (2003). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2000). On the limitations of linguistics applied. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(1), 3-25.
- Williams, C. H. (2003). Language policy and planning issues in multicultural societies. In P. Larrivée (Ed.), *Linguistic conflict and language laws:*

Understanding the Quebec question (pp. 1-56). Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wodak, R., de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M. & Liebhart, K. (1999). *The discursive construction of national identity* (A. Hirsch, R. Mitten Trans.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wodak, R. (2001a). The discourse-historical approach. In M. Meyer, & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 63-94). London & Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Wodak, R. (2001b). What CDA is about - a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In M. Meyer, & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1-13). London & Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wright, S. (2004). *Language policy and language planning: From nationalism to globalisation*. Houndmills, UK & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Appendix I: Guide to Collocational Analysis

Adapted from Baker (2006), p. 119-120

1. Build or obtain access to a corpus
2. Decide on a search term, using a lemma to find various wordforms.
3. Obtain a list of collocates.
4. Decide how many collocates you want to look at. You may decide to 'clean' the collocates list by removing proper nouns or grammatical words.
5. Can the collocates be grouped semantically, thematically or grammatically? Use this as a basis for the order in which you analyse the words in more detail.
6. Obtain concordances of the collocates and look for patterns within the context. This should enable you to uncover dominant discourses surrounding the subject.
7. Consider contesting discourses – concordance lines which go against or question the dominant reading of a term.
8. Look at concordance lines of the search term that do not contain collocates. What discourse prosodies are present there? Do they support or contradict those found in the analysis of the collocates?
9. How do the collocates relate to each other? Try building a first or second-order collocational network.
10. Attempt to explain why particular discourse patterns appear around collocates and relate this to issues of text production and reception and/or etymologies of particular words.

Appendix II: Categories and sections for analysis of the Discursive Construction of National Identity

Adapted from De Cillia et al. (1999), pp. 157-163

Categories:

- 1) Contents/topics
- 2) Strategies
- 3) Linguistic means and forms of realization

Category (1) may be broken down into further “semantic macro-areas” in the discursive construction of identity and nation (p. 158):

- a) the idea of a ‘*homo austriacus*’ (ideal identity) and a ‘*homo externus*’ (the other)
- b) the narrative of a collective political history
- c) the discursive construction of a common culture
- d) the discursive construction of a collective present and future
- e) the discursive construction of a ‘national body’.

Section (a) can be identified with the help of the following criteria (p. 158):

- i) one’s emotional attachment to the nation
- ii) alleged national mentality and supposed national behavioural dispositions/habits
- iii) various aspects of the biological genesis of national identity/nationality (destiny, chance, origin, place of birth, place of upbringing and place of residence, socialization)
- iv) the ‘activation’ of national identity in a certain situation (for instance, while abroad, in a foreign country).

For category (2), Strategies, the authors distinguish between four types of *macro-strategies* (p. 160):

- a) constructive (national identity-building) strategies
- b) perpetuation and justification (maintain, support, reproduce, --defend, preserve narratives of-- national identity) strategies
- c) transformation (of the meaning of established aspects of national identity into another) strategies
- d) dismantling or destructive (de-mythologize or demolish existing national identities or elements of them) strategies.

Tactics in this section are *presupposing intra-national sameness or similarity; emphasizing national singularity; presupposition or emphasis of differences between nations; positive self-representation.*

Finally, category (3), Linguistic means and forms of realization, the authors focus primarily on: a) lexical units, b) argumentation schemes, and c) syntactical means that express unity, sameness, difference, singularity, continuity, change, autonomy, heteronomy (p. 163).

Appendix III: Tools in Discourse-Historical Critical Discourse Analysis

Adapted from De Cillia et al. (1999) and Wodak et al. (1999)

Methods of inclusion/exclusion in the discursive construction of national identity

Example: personal pronoun “we” (De Cillia et al., 1999, p. 164-5):

i)	I + you	partially/totally addressee-inclusive
ii)	I + he/ I + she	addressee-exclusive
iii)	I + you (plural)	partially/totally addressee-inclusive
iv)	I + they	addressee-exclusive
v)	I + you + he/she	partially/totally addressee-inclusive + ?
vi)	I + you (plural) = he/she	partially/totally addressee-inclusive + ?
vii)	I + you (plural) + they	partially/totally addressee-inclusive + ?

Appendix IV: French Corpus Frequency List (top 100 words)

N ²⁷	Word ²⁸	Freq. ²⁹	% ³⁰	Texts ³¹	% ³²
1	DE	127741	4.803	701	99.72
2	LA	82376	3.097	699	99.43
3	ET	66884	2.515	701	99.72
4	LES	56449	2.122	701	99.72
5	L	52095	1.959	676	96.16
6	DES	52025	1.956	698	99.29
7	À	51049	1.919	694	98.72
8	LE	47450	1.784	697	99.15
9	#	47355	1.780	675	96.02
10	D	41887	1.575	681	96.87
11	QUE	31379	1.180	697	99.15
12	EN	30880	1.161	698	99.29
13	UNE	27418	1.031	690	98.15
14	EST	27245	1.024	693	98.58
15	UN	26346	0.991	696	99.00
16	DANS	24534	0.922	695	98.86
17	QUI	24108	0.906	700	99.57
18	DU	23632	0.888	690	98.15
19	POUR	19814	0.745	694	98.72
20	IL	18701	0.703	687	97.72
21	NOUS	17181	0.646	668	95.02
22	AU	16120	0.606	691	98.29
23	PAS	15774	0.593	689	98.01
24	CE	15027	0.565	682	97.01
25	PAR	14960	0.562	681	96.87
26	A	14856	0.559	686	97.58
27	NE	13331	0.501	685	97.44
28	SUR	13112	0.493	681	96.87
29	OU	12226	0.460	672	95.59
30	QU	11960	0.450	648	92.18
31	QUÉBEC	11497	0.432	659	93.74
32	PLUS	11036	0.415	673	95.73
33	SE	10347	0.389	675	96.02
34	S	9878	0.371	640	91.04
35	ON	9674	0.364	635	90.33

²⁷ N: The rank of the word (i.e. 1 = the most frequent word)

²⁸ Word: Word in frequency list

²⁹ Freq: The frequency of the word (number of occurrences) in the corpus

³⁰ %: This percentage of the total number of words in the corpus composed by this single word (i.e. *de* comprises 4.8 % of the total words in the entire corpus)

³¹ Text: The total number of individual texts in which this word appears

³² %: The percentage of texts that contain this word.

36	AUX	9405	0.354	670	95.31
37	SONT	9320	0.350	674	95.87
38	N	8273	0.311	632	89.90
39	LEUR	8147	0.306	654	93.03
40	ÊTRE	7462	0.281	659	93.74
41	COMME	7457	0.280	648	92.18
42	CETTE	7436	0.280	649	92.32
43	SOCIÉTÉ	7413	0.279	607	86.34
44	C	6814	0.256	632	89.90
45	JE	6806	0.256	465	66.15
46	NOTRE	6672	0.251	627	89.19
47	AVEC	6537	0.246	655	93.17
48	MAIS	6495	0.244	649	92.32
49	ONT	6438	0.242	655	93.17
50	CES	6413	0.241	642	91.32
51	MÊME	5885	0.221	637	90.61
52	Y	5449	0.205	632	89.90
53	RELIGION	5430	0.204	573	81.51
54	QUÉBÉCOIS	5235	0.197	572	81.37
55	DROITS	5176	0.195	514	73.12
56	TOUT	5110	0.192	644	91.61
57	FAIT	5048	0.190	632	89.90
58	SON	5000	0.188	612	87.06
59	ILS	4927	0.185	619	88.05
60	ELLE	4841	0.182	598	85.06
61	AUTRES	4748	0.179	638	90.75
62	SI	4597	0.173	634	90.18
63	ENTRE	4559	0.171	582	82.79
64	THE	4545	0.171	90	12.80
65	FAIRE	4544	0.171	633	90.04
66	BIEN	4527	0.170	627	89.19
67	NOS	4433	0.167	574	81.65
68	TOUS	4404	0.166	617	87.77
69	PEUT	4381	0.165	609	86.63
70	SES	4184	0.157	577	82.08
71	QUÉBÉCOISE	4155	0.156	540	76.81
72	ACCOMMODEMENTS	4144	0.156	591	84.07
73	SA	4099	0.154	594	84.50
74	VALEURS	4089	0.154	516	73.40
75	RELIGIEUX	4052	0.152	514	73.12
76	IMMIGRANTS	4036	0.152	513	72.97
77	LEURS	3830	0.144	583	82.93
78	FEMMES	3802	0.143	449	63.87
79	AUSSI	3739	0.141	603	85.78
80	INTÉGRATION	3696	0.139	439	62.45
81	NON	3664	0.138	594	84.50
82	COMMISSION	3629	0.136	593	84.35
83	DROIT	3556	0.134	498	70.84
84	CULTURE	3498	0.132	519	73.83

85	SANS	3424	0.129	590	83.93
86	DOIT	3336	0.125	568	80.80
87	AUTRE	3244	0.122	584	83.07
88	PERSONNES	3219	0.121	476	67.71
89	OF	3069	0.115	88	12.52
90	ÉTAT	3063	0.115	446	63.44
91	VIE	2885	0.108	564	80.23
92	PERSONNE	2796	0.105	510	72.55
93	LIBERTÉ	2795	0.105	436	62.02
94	OÙ	2781	0.105	549	78.09
95	ÉTÉ	2754	0.104	546	77.67
96	J	2730	0.103	399	56.76
97	AINSI	2718	0.102	532	75.68
98	PAYS	2710	0.102	513	72.97
99	LANGUE	2708	0.102	444	63.16
100	ÉGALITÉ	2666	0.100	413	58.75

Appendix V: French Corpus Keyword List (top 125 words)

N ³³	Key word ³⁴	Freq. ³⁵	% ³⁶	RC. Freq. ³⁷	RC. % ³⁸	Keyness ³⁹
1	L	52095	1.96	5239	0.30	27423
2	D	41887	1.57	3683	0.21	23627
3	QU	11960	0.45	955	0.05	7022
4	QUÉBEC	11497	0.43	922	0.05	6736
5	SOCIÉTÉ	7413	0.28	362	0.02	5217
6	S	9878	0.37	983	0.06	5185
7	DES	52025	1.96	19313	1.11	4972
8	RELIGION	5430	0.20	92		4708
9	N	8273	0.31	732	0.04	4621
10	EST	27245	1.02	8334	0.48	4193
11	ACCOMMODEMENTS	4144	0.16	3		4133
12	IMMIGRANTS	4036	0.15	10		3946
13	QUÉBÉCOISE	4155	0.16	67		3623
14	VALEURS	4089	0.15	64		3578
15	RELIGIEUX	4052	0.15	60		3568
16	QUÉBÉCOIS	5235	0.20	318	0.02	3429
17	COMMISSION	3629	0.14	74		3069
18	NOUS	17181	0.65	4883	0.28	3050
19	INTÉGRATION	3696	0.14	93		3024
20	ACCOMMODEMENT	2645	0.10	0		2665
21	LAÏCITÉ	2546	0.10	0		2565
22	ÉGALITÉ	2666	0.10	16		2520
23	LA	82376	3.10	40163	2.31	2486
24	NOTRE	6672	0.25	1090	0.06	2446
25	IMMIGRATION	2471	0.09	4		2438
26	CULTURELLES	2507	0.09	13		2387
27	C	6814	0.26	1170	0.07	2383
28	RAISONNABLES	2313	0.09	5		2268
29	LES	56449	2.12	26173	1.50	2252
30	CULTURE	3498	0.13	232	0.01	2217
31	RELIGIEUSE	2415	0.09	44		2074
32	DROITS	5176	0.19	769	0.04	2062

³³ N: Rank of keyword on keyword list

³⁴ Keyword: Statistically significant word

³⁵ Freq: Frequency of keyword in corpus

³⁶ %: Percentage of total corpus this word composes

³⁷ RC Freq: Frequency of word in Reference Corpus (RC) (or in this case, comparator corpus)

RC %: Percentage of total Reference Corpus (RC, or in this case, comparator corpus) this word composes

Keyness: The score obtained when a corpus is compared against a reference or comparator corpus and each word is statistically tested (with chi square or log likelihood test). The higher the score, the stronger the keyness of the word.

33	ÉTAT	3063	0.12	201	0.01	1949
34	UNE	27418	1.03	11227	0.64	1875
35	IDENTITÉ	2244	0.08	51		1866
36	OU	12226	0.46	3777	0.22	1835
37	CHARTÉ	2006	0.08	26		1791
38	PRATIQUES	2281	0.09	81		1743
39	FEMMES	3802	0.14	475	0.03	1729
40	LANGUE	2708	0.10	179	0.01	1718
41	DIVERSITÉ	1954	0.07	30		1713
42	COMMUNAUTÉS	1866	0.07	29		1634
43	SONT	9320	0.35	2722	0.16	1567
44	RELIGIONS	1737	0.07	22		1554
45	LIBERTÉS	1611	0.06	10		1520
46	PERSONNES	3219	0.12	398	0.02	1474
47	LIBERTÉ	2795	0.11	287	0.02	1439
48	ÊTRE	7462	0.28	2029	0.12	1431
49	LEUR	8147	0.31	2345	0.13	1409
50	AUTRES	4748	0.18	965	0.06	1384
51	CULTURELLE	1581	0.06	26		1375
52	MÉMOIRE	2183	0.08	151		1360
53	CONSULTATION	1444	0.05	16		1308
54	DIFFÉRENCES	1614	0.06	43		1307
55	DOIT	3336	0.13	512	0.03	1292
56	GROUPE	1757	0.07	76		1278
57	POPULATION	1805	0.07	87		1274
58	INSTITUTIONS	1733	0.07	73		1270
59	NOS	4433	0.17	916	0.05	1267
60	MAJORITÉ	1640	0.06	59		1249
61	FRANÇAIS	2443	0.09	259	0.01	1235
62	ARRIVANTS	1304	0.05	10		1215
63	RAISONNABLE	1427	0.05	38		1155
64	DISCRIMINATION	1305	0.05	22		1131
65	CITOYENS	1837	0.07	137		1109
66	ONT	6438	0.24	1884	0.11	1078
67	PUBLIQUE	1665	0.06	109		1060
68	SOCIALE	1598	0.06	98		1043
69	CERTAINS	2093	0.08	229	0.01	1038
70	LOI	1931	0.07	186	0.01	1030
71	COMMUNAUTÉ	1450	0.05	69		1027
72	MINORITÉS	1054	0.04	3		1026
73	RELIGIEUSES	2032	0.08	221	0.01	1011
74	QUESTION	2325	0.09	314	0.02	999
75	AUX	9405	0.35	3384	0.19	971
76	RESPECT	1692	0.06	156		924
77	CULTURES	1013	0.04	11		919
78	DOIVENT	1531	0.06	119		908
79	EXEMPLE	1844	0.07	205	0.01	905
80	ENSEMBLE	2023	0.08	268	0.02	881
81	À	51049	1.92	26923	1.55	856
82	ORIGINE	1250	0.05	67		854
83	IMMIGRANTES	829	0.03	0		835
84	THE	4545	0.17	1268	0.07	832

85	SERVICES	1808	0.07	222	0.01	832
86	EMPLOI	1088	0.04	39		829
87	CROYANCES	966	0.04	18		827
88	VIVRE	1754	0.07	211	0.01	818
89	ENTRE	4559	0.17	1292	0.07	811
90	RELIÉES	813	0.03	2		795
91	ÉDUCATION	1483	0.06	145		785
92	PAYS	2710	0.10	556	0.03	781
93	DÉBAT	1275	0.05	92		781
94	CATHOLIQUE	984	0.04	31		771
95	ESPACE	1267	0.05	93		770
96	FRANÇAISE	1384	0.05	130		748
97	ÉGLISE	949	0.04	30		743
98	CULTUREL	917	0.03	25		739
99	MUSULMANS	852	0.03	16		728
100	ÉCOLE	1505	0.06	176	0.01	715
101	DEMANDES	889	0.03	25		713
102	TRAVAIL	2283	0.09	441	0.03	705
103	SOCIAL	1319	0.05	128		701
104	INDIVIDUS	973	0.04	48		682
105	IMMIGRANT	699	0.03	3		671
106	PERSONNE	2796	0.11	661	0.04	669
107	CERTAINES	1382	0.05	158		666
108	CHARTES	672	0.03	1		664
109	PUBLIC	2063	0.08	387	0.02	658
110	MONTREAL	2048	0.08	385	0.02	652
111	MULTICULTURALISME	691	0.03	5		646
112	PUBLIQUES	969	0.04	56		645
113	CAS	1956	0.07	357	0.02	642
114	AUTRE	3244	0.12	870	0.05	636
115	ACCUEIL	1598	0.06	239	0.01	633
116	DROIT	3556	0.13	1013	0.06	626
117	QUE	31379	1.18	16192	0.93	626
118	LAÏQUE	664	0.02	6		611
119	MEMBRES	1444	0.05	199	0.01	611
120	AILLEURS	1323	0.05	163		607
121	NATION	960	0.04	64		607
122	SOCIAUX	1000	0.04	74		606
123	MUSULMANE	596	0.02	1		587
124	INTÉGRER	690	0.03	14		584
125	ET	66884	2.51	37603	2.16	579

Appendix VI: Identity labels in current use in Quebec

<u>ENGLISH</u>	<u>FRENCH</u>
<u>Ethnic identity labels</u>	<u>Ethnic identity labels</u>
Québécois	Québécois
French Canadian	Canadien français
French Canadian Québécois	Québécois Canadien français
“Old stock” Québécois	Québécois de souche
“Pure wool” Québécois	Québécois pure laine
Francophone Québécois	Québécois francophone
Québécois of French-Canadian origins	Québécois d’origine canadienne française
French Québécois	Québécois d’origine française
	Franco-Québécois
 <u>Linguistic identity labels (French)</u>	 <u>Linguistic Identity labels (French)</u>
Québécois	Québécois
French-speaking Canadian	Franco-Québécois (?)
French-speaking Québécois	
French Quebec(k)er (?)	
Francophone	Francophone
Francophone Québécois	Québécois Francophone
 <u>Linguistic identity labels (English)</u>	 <u>Linguistic identity labels</u>
Quebecer	
Quebecker	
English-speaking Quebec(k)er	Anglo-Québécois (?)
Anglophone	Anglophone
Anglophone Quebec(k)er	Québécois anglophone
 <u>Immigrants/ newcomers to Quebec</u>	 <u>Immigrants/newcomers to Quebec</u>
Immigrant	Immigrant
Newcomer	Nouveaux-arrivants
New-Québécois	Néo-Québécois
 <u>Civic identity labels</u>	 <u>Civic identity labels</u>
Québécois	Québécois
Quebec(k)er	
Citizen	Citoyen

**Appendix VII: French Corpus R1 collocates with leur and
notre/nos: Categories of unique collocates**

	Leur R1 collocates		Notre/nos R1 collocates
Work	COMPÉTENCES PROFESSION COLLÈGUES COMPÉTENCE QUALIFICATIONS EMPLOYÉS	Nation	PATRIMOINE IDÉAUX PATRIE
		Territory	RÉGION VILLE VILLES FRONTIÈRES VILLAGES
Processes	INTÉGRATION ARRIVÉE INSERTION APPLICATION	Civic	ORGANISME CIVILISATION MODÈLE CONSTITUTION DÉMOCRATIE GOUVERNEMENT PROVINCE LAÏCITÉ TOLÉRANCE ÉLUS GOUVERNEMENTS POLITICIENS DIRIGEANTS
Education	FORMATION ÉTUDES DIPLÔMES SCOLARITÉ ENSEIGNEMENT ÉLÈVES APPRENTISSAGE DIPLÔME SALUT		
Family	MARIS MARI		
Modulation /modality	PERMETTRE PERMETTANT PERMET OBLIGATIONS POUVOIR IMPOSER PERMETTE ACCORDE EXIGENCES PERMETTRA PERMETTENT		
Religion	CONFESSION VOILE DIEU RITES DOGMES SPIRITUALITÉ	Temporal	ÉPOQUE ÈRE GÉNÉRATION CONTINUITÉ
		Verbal	AVIS PENSÉE RECOMMANDATIONS PROPOSITIONS PRÉJUGÉS PAROLES
Verbal	DEMANDES DEMANDER DIT		
Others: SEXE, RACE, ÂGE			

Appendix VIII: English Corpus Frequency List (top 100 words)

N ⁴⁰	Word ⁴¹	Freq. ⁴²	% ⁴³	Texts ⁴⁴	% ⁴⁵
1	THE	5603	5.45	38	100.00
2	OF	3698	3.60	38	100.00
3	TO	3175	3.09	38	100.00
4	AND	3152	3.06	38	100.00
5	IN	2281	2.22	38	100.00
6	#	1968	1.91	36	94.74
7	A	1926	1.87	38	100.00
8	THAT	1633	1.59	38	100.00
9	IS	1301	1.26	38	100.00
10	AS	797	0.77	38	100.00
11	WE	787	0.77	37	97.37
12	FOR	777	0.76	37	97.37
13	IT	712	0.69	38	100.00
14	ARE	708	0.69	37	97.37
15	BE	687	0.67	37	97.37
16	I	668	0.65	30	78.95
17	NOT	665	0.65	37	97.37
18	QUEBEC	633	0.62	35	92.11
19	THIS	590	0.57	37	97.37
20	OUR	586	0.57	34	89.47
21	ON	547	0.53	37	97.37
22	OR	540	0.52	37	97.37
23	WITH	525	0.51	37	97.37
24	THEIR	508	0.49	36	94.74
25	HAVE	504	0.49	37	97.37
26	BY	495	0.48	37	97.37
27	WAS	428	0.42	30	78.95
28	SOCIETY	425	0.41	30	78.95
29	FROM	413	0.40	37	97.37
30	ALL	387	0.38	37	97.37
31	THEY	346	0.34	35	92.11
32	AN	327	0.32	38	100.00
33	AT	320	0.31	36	94.74
34	HAS	312	0.30	34	89.47
35	RELIGIOUS	285	0.28	29	76.32

⁴⁰ N: The rank of the word (i.e. 1 = the most frequent word)

⁴¹ Word: Word in frequency list

⁴² Freq: The frequency of the word (number of occurrences) in the corpus

⁴³ %: The percentage of the total number of words in the corpus composed by this single word (i.e. *de* comprises 4.8 % of the total words in the entire corpus)

⁴⁴ Text: The total number of individual texts in which this word appears

⁴⁵ %: The percentage of texts that contain this word.

36	MY	284	0.28	23	60.53
37	DE	276	0.27	17	44.74
38	ONE	274	0.27	37	97.37
39	WILL	270	0.26	32	84.21
40	WOULD	265	0.26	34	89.47
41	BUT	247	0.24	36	94.74
42	LA	235	0.23	10	26.32
43	OTHER	232	0.23	34	89.47
44	WHO	232	0.23	36	94.74
45	WHICH	219	0.21	34	89.47
46	THERE	218	0.21	33	86.84
47	RELIGION	216	0.21	25	65.79
48	S	216	0.21	21	55.26
49	RIGHTS	212	0.21	28	73.68
50	CAN	208	0.20	34	89.47
51	CULTURAL	205	0.20	30	78.95
52	ITS	203	0.20	31	81.58
53	WHAT	200	0.19	32	84.21
54	SHOULD	194	0.19	34	89.47
55	THESE	193	0.19	32	84.21
56	IMMIGRANTS	192	0.19	29	76.32
57	SUCH	189	0.18	31	81.58
58	MORE	188	0.18	29	76.32
59	FRENCH	186	0.18	27	71.05
60	WOMEN	186	0.18	16	42.11
61	ACCOMMODATION	185	0.18	27	71.05
62	PUBLIC	184	0.18	25	65.79
63	CANADA	183	0.18	27	71.05
64	NO	181	0.18	30	78.95
65	IF	175	0.17	35	92.11
66	PEOPLE	175	0.17	30	78.95
67	WERE	175	0.17	24	63.16
68	COMMUNITY	173	0.17	24	63.16
69	ENGLISH	172	0.17	20	52.63
70	BEEN	167	0.16	31	81.58
71	DO	167	0.16	33	86.84
72	HE	165	0.16	16	42.11
73	LANGUAGE	165	0.16	22	57.89
74	WHEN	164	0.16	31	81.58
75	VALUES	162	0.16	27	71.05
76	SO	160	0.16	35	92.11
77	SOME	154	0.15	30	78.95
78	ABOUT	148	0.14	33	86.84
79	THEM	147	0.14	32	84.21
80	MANY	145	0.14	33	86.84
81	INTO	144	0.14	31	81.58
82	ONLY	143	0.14	34	89.47
83	HAD	138	0.13	20	52.63

84	ET	137	0.13	7	18.42
85	ALSO	136	0.13	31	81.58
86	CANADIAN	136	0.13	29	76.32
87	ANY	133	0.13	29	76.32
88	ME	133	0.13	16	42.11
89	WELL	127	0.12	32	84.21
90	DIVERSITY	126	0.12	20	52.63
91	THAN	126	0.12	32	84.21
92	COMMISSION	124	0.12	28	73.68
93	US	122	0.12	29	76.32
94	SCHOOL	120	0.12	19	50.00
95	MUST	119	0.12	27	71.05
96	WHERE	119	0.12	28	73.68
97	HOW	117	0.11	28	73.68
98	BECAUSE	116	0.11	26	68.42
99	REASONABLE	116	0.11	26	68.42
100	BETWEEN	115	0.11	27	71.05

Appendix IX: English Corpus (TYPE) Keyword List (top 125 words)

N ⁴⁶	Key word ⁴⁷	Freq. ⁴⁸	% ⁴⁹	RC. Freq. ⁵⁰	RC. % ⁵¹	Keyness ⁵²
1	QUEBEC	633	0.615	4		637.2
2	SOCIETY	425	0.413	18	0.025	336.4
3	DE	276	0.268	4		260.6
4	RELIGIOUS	285	0.277	6		257.3
5	CULTURAL	205	0.199	0		219.4
6	LA	235	0.228	8	0.011	195.3
7	IMMIGRANTS	192	0.187	1		194.8
8	OUR	586	0.570	135	0.186	170.1
9	RELIGION	216	0.210	12	0.016	158.3
10	ACCOMMODATION	185	0.180	7		150.2
11	ET	137	0.133	0		146.6
12	COMMUNITY	173	0.168	6		143.2
13	VALUES	162	0.157	4		142.7
14	WOMEN	186	0.181	9	0.012	142.0
15	FRENCH	186	0.181	11	0.015	133.6
16	DES	113	0.110	0		120.9
17	COMMISSION	124	0.121	2		115.7
18	LES	108	0.105	0		115.6
19	DIVERSITY	126	0.122	3		111.6
20	LANGUAGE	165	0.160	13	0.018	106.4
21	WE	787	0.765	282	0.388	105.9
22	RIGHTS	212	0.206	28	0.038	103.3
23	INTEGRATION	111	0.108	2		102.2
24	SCHOOLS	90	0.087	0		96.3
25	BELIEFS	90	0.087	0		96.3
26	MONTREAL	110	0.107	3		95.3
27	SOCIAL	100	0.097	2		90.8
28	EQUALITY	98	0.095	2		88.8
29	IN	2281	2.218	1159	1.593	88.4

⁴⁶ N: Rank of keyword on keyword list

⁴⁷ Keyword: Statistically significant word

⁴⁸ Freq: Frequency of keyword in corpus

⁴⁹ %: Percentage of total corpus this word composes

⁵⁰ RC Freq: Frequency of word in Reference Corpus (RC) (or in this case, comparator corpus)

RC %: Percentage of total Reference Corpus (RC, or in this case, comparator corpus) this word composes

Keyness: The score obtained when a corpus is compared against a reference or comparator corpus and each word is statistically tested (with chi square or log likelihood test). The higher the score, the stronger the keyness of the word.

30	IMMIGRATION	87	0.085	1		83.9
31	REASONABLE	116	0.113	7		82.7
32	GROUPS	97	0.094	3		82.1
33	CULTURE	111	0.108	6		82.0
34	DISCRIMINATION	76	0.074	0		81.3
35	ARE	708	0.688	270	0.371	81.2
36	MUSLIM	95	0.092	3		80.1
37	MINORITIES	74	0.072	0		79.2
38	EDUCATION	99	0.096	4		79.2
39	PUBLIC	184	0.179	29	0.040	78.5
40	QUEBECERS	111	0.108	7		78.0
41	CHARTER	80	0.078	1		76.6
42	QUEBECOIS	71	0.069	0		76.0
43	SCHOOL	120	0.117	10	0.014	75.5
44	SIKH	70	0.068	0		74.9
45	COMMUNITIES	83	0.081	2		73.4
46	FREEDOM	92	0.089	4		72.2
47	ENGLISH	172	0.167	28	0.038	71.4
48	QUE	65	0.063	0		69.5
49	PRACTICES	73	0.071	1		69.3
50	CANADA	183	0.178	34	0.047	67.3
51	THEIR	508	0.494	183	0.252	67.3
52	LE	86	0.084	4		66.3
53	RESPECT	97	0.094	7		64.8
54	MINORITY	59	0.057	0		63.1
55	SPEAKING	78	0.076	3		63.1
56	IDENTITY	87	0.085	5		63.1
57	FUNDAMENTAL	58	0.056	0		62.1
58	NEWCOMERS	58	0.056	0		62.1
59	EN	56	0.054	0		59.9
60	HUMAN	99	0.096	9	0.012	59.8
61	NON	82	0.080	5		58.3
62	THAT	1633	1.588	842	1.158	57.9
63	INSTITUTIONS	79	0.077	5		55.4
64	IMMIGRANT	58	0.056	1		53.7
65	FREEDOMS	63	0.061	2		53.1
66	EXPERIENCE	80	0.078	6		52.6
67	CULTURES	49	0.048	0		52.4
68	BELIEVE	87	0.085	8	0.011	52.3
69	R	62	0.060	2		52.1
70	OF	3698	3.595	2163	2.974	51.6
71	ETHNIC	48	0.047	0		51.4
72	POPULATION	61	0.059	2		51.1
73	HAS	312	0.303	105	0.144	48.3
74	NEED	115	0.112	19	0.026	47.1
75	RELIGIONS	51	0.050	1		46.4
76	SECULAR	56	0.054	2		46.0
77	INTEGRATE	42	0.041	0		44.9
78	BELIEF	54	0.052	2		44.0

79	UNE	41	0.040	0		43.9
80	SECULARISM	41	0.040	0		43.9
81	S	221	0.215	66	0.091	43.3
82	GIRLS	40	0.039	0		42.8
83	DEBATE	56	0.054	3		41.5
84	MAJORITY	56	0.054	3		41.5
85	ACCOMMODATE	46	0.045	1		41.3
86	OU	46	0.045	1		41.3
87	V	63	0.061	5		40.5
88	CULTURALRENEWAL	37	0.036	0		39.6
89	TRADITIONS	37	0.036	0		39.6
90	ISSUES	54	0.052	3		39.6
91	GROUP	82	0.080	11	0.015	39.5
92	UNDERSTANDING	49	0.048	2		39.1
93	CITIZENS	61	0.059	5		38.7
94	SUR	36	0.035	0		38.5
95	HIJAB	36	0.035	0		38.5
96	MÉTIS	36	0.035	0		38.5
97	CHILDREN	89	0.087	14	0.019	38.0
98	PROCESS	60	0.058	5		37.7
99	SPECIAL	35	0.034	0		37.4
100	DANS	35	0.034	0		37.4
101	EST	42	0.041	1		37.2
102	MEDIA	55	0.053	4		36.6
103	MANY	145	0.141	37	0.051	36.6
104	MODEL	46	0.045	2		36.1
105	ROLE	46	0.045	2		36.1
106	MULTICULTURALISM	33	0.032	0		35.3
107	QC	33	0.032	0		35.3
108	QUI	33	0.032	0		35.3
109	BASED	64	0.062	7		35.1
110	INDIVIDUAL	64	0.062	7		35.1
111	EXAMPLE	67	0.065	8	0.011	34.9
112	TO	3175	3.087	1899	2.611	34.8
113	PAS	32	0.031	0		34.2
114	STATE	78	0.076	12	0.016	33.9
115	IMPORTANT	72	0.070	10	0.014	33.8
116	PLURALISM	31	0.030	0		33.2
117	AREA	38	0.037	1		33.1
118	DIRECTOR	47	0.046	3		32.9
119	STUDENTS	61	0.059	7		32.5
120	INCLUSIVE	30	0.029	0		32.1
121	CROYANCES	30	0.029	0		32.1
122	SIKHS	30	0.029	0		32.1
123	CANADIAN	136	0.132	37	0.051	31.1
124	FRANCOPHONE	36	0.035	1		31.1
125	SYSTEM	45	0.044	3		31.0

Appendix X: AFFIRMATION ET OUVERTURE

MEMOIRE A LA COMMISSION BOUCHARD-TAYLOR

PAR YVES CHARTRAND

Octobre 2007

1. INTRODUCTION

2. Je remercie la commission de me permettre d'exprimer mon point de vue sur ce débat
3. crucial en cours actuellement au sein de la nation québécoise, débat qui aura sans doute
4. un impact majeur sur le futur de notre " vivre ensemble ". Le débat portait au départ sur
5. les accommodements raisonnables et vous avez décidé à juste titre de l'élargir à
6. l'ensemble de nos préoccupations, ce avec quoi je suis bien d'accord.

7. L’AFFIRMATION

8. Il n'est pas anodin que j'ai décidé de parler d'affirmation avant de parler d'ouverture,
 9. même si ce double mouvement fait partie de notre quotidien et que les composantes
 10. soient inséparables. Je parle d'abord d'affirmation, car l'ouverture a prédominé à
 11. Montréal au cours des dernières décennies. Je parle aussi d'abord d'affirmation car je
 12. pense que les Québécois d'origine française (je préfère le terme à celui de Canadiens
 13. français que vous employez monsieur Bouchard) avons besoin de nous affirmer
 14. collectivement présentement comme groupe majoritaire parmi l'ensemble des Québécois.
-
15. Nous avons besoin de le faire, car notre société, comme la planète entière, évolue très
 16. rapidement, et que nous avons besoin de reprendre notre souffle et de tout d'abord faire le
 17. point sur notre identité au sein du groupe majoritaire. Cette démarche actuelle, mal
 18. comprise par plusieurs compatriotes de d'autres origines, ne se fait aux dépens de
 19. personnes, du moins dans mon esprit, si cela peut les rassurer. Nous avons besoin de le
 20. faire, car depuis la révolution tranquille et tous les changements qui ont suivi, le
 21. développement de l'immigration, et la mondialisation, tout a été vite, trop vite sans doute.
 22. Nous avons besoin de reprendre pied, et de nous réapproprier notre espace, notre culture,
 23. notre histoire, bref notre identité, de réaffirmer nos valeurs collectives, et ensuite de
 24. revoir notre relation avec l'autre.

25. L’IDENTITE

26. Notre espace géographique est immense. J'ai eu l'occasion cet été de visiter la Basse-
 27. Côte-Nord, le pays des Innus, et de se rendre à la frontière orientale du Québec, dans le
 28. golfe Saint-Laurent, à 90 minutes en bateau du Labrador. J'y ai découvert en tant que
 29. Montréalais un autre monde, un autre Québec, majestueux et silencieux, au pays des
 30. Innus. J'ai alors pris conscience de l'immensité et de la diversité du territoire québécois.
 31. Nous sommes environ près de 7 millions de descendants des premiers colons Français,
 32. isolés sur un continent amérindien, anglais et espagnol. Nous avons bâti une société ni
 33. tout à fait américaine, ni tout à fait européenne, un riche croisement entre les deux, et
 34. enracinée en terre amérindienne.
-
35. Notre langue est le français. Elle est à la fois forte et fragile, marginale qu'elle est sur ce
 36. vaste continent. Notre religion a été le catholicisme, et le demeure dans notre culture,
 37. même si une minorité de gens la pratiquent aujourd'hui. Notre musique est traditionnelle
 38. et en santé avec tous les jeunes groupes émergents. Nos institutions sont uniques. Notre
 39. créativité est sans limite. Notre aisance financière pour la majorité d'entre nous est

40. devenue acceptable, mais comme toutes les sociétés modernes l'individualisme et le
 41. matérialisme nous isolent les uns des autres, et affairés dans notre vie personnelle au
 42. quotidien, nous sommes en manque de projets collectifs.
43. Nous sommes aussi malheureusement un peuple suicidaire. Nous avons l'un des plus bas
 44. taux de natalité dans le monde, et à l'inverse, l'un des taux de suicide les plus élevés.
 45. L'immigration s'impose alors comme seule solution pour maintenir notre population,
 46. mais nous avons des problèmes d'intégration. Nous sommes tentés par les solutions de
 47. facilité, le conservatisme, et le repli sur soi. Nous sommes confus et désorientés.

48. LA CONFUSION

49. Notre langue commune est le français, mais bien des gens communiquent publiquement
 50. en anglais, ou sont même invités à le faire aux audiences de votre commission. Le
 51. français est la langue de travail mais l'anglais devient obligatoire pour travailler à
 52. Montréal. Nous privilégions une immigration francophone et nous leur disons que le
 53. Québec est français, mais ces immigrants doivent également parler anglais pour travailler
 54. Montréal. Notre langue est le français, mais la majorité des nouveaux arrivants se
 55. dirigent vers l'anglais comme deuxième langue. Notre langue est le français, mais la
 56. majorité des enfants d'immigrants vont au cégep en anglais.
57. Notre langue commune est le français mais une multitude de services gouvernementaux
 58. et communautaires sont dispensés en anglais, et pas seulement aux Québécois d'origine
 59. britannique, mais également aux immigrants d'arrivée lointaine ou récente. Les
 60. circulaires de nos grandes chaînes et les programmes de nos activités sont de plus en plus
 61. bilingues. Les affiches en anglais foisonnent sur les poteaux de Montréal. Notre langue
 62. est française, mais les noms de nos entreprises, de nos bannières commerciales portent de
 63. plus en plus des noms anglais. Les vêtements que nous portons sont tapissés de mots
 64. anglais. Nous nous adressons souvent aux immigrants en anglais, et nous passons
 65. facilement à l'anglais en présence de Québécois d'origine britannique ou immigrante qui
 66. sont plus à l'aise en anglais, ou préfèrent converser en anglais.
67. Que le gouvernement du Québec soit libéral ou péquiste, on assiste à la même
 68. déresponsabilisation au nom de préserver la sacro sainte paix sociale. A moyen terme, ce
 69. laissez aller favorise la division, l'affrontement et éventuellement la violence, comme
 70. d'autres régions du monde nous en donnent un triste exemple.
71. La source de la confusion, c'est que nous habitons deux maisons en même temps. Une
 72. maison, le Québec, emboîtée dans une maison plus grande qui est le Canada, comme
 73. pour les poupées russes. D'où les doubles messages constants aux immigrants. Une
 74. maison, le Québec, où la seule langue officielle et commune est le français, une autre où
 75. il y a deux langues officielles, l'anglais majoritaire, et le français.
76. Les immigrants immigrer au Canada, avant d'immigrer au Québec. Un grand nombre
 77. d'entre eux viennent de pays colonisés par L'Angleterre, où l'anglais est la deuxième
 78. langue. Ils viennent ici en percevant l'anglais comme la langue de l'argent et du pouvoir.
 79. Certains sont même méprisants pour la langue française, langue des '' indigènes ''. Au
 80. bout de trois ans, ils peuvent demander à devenir citoyens canadiens. La citoyenneté
 81. québécoise n'existe pas encore. Le Québec ne contrôle que la moitié de son immigration,
 82. les immigrants indépendants et la source francophone semble se tarir. L'autre moitié
 83. constituée de réfugiés et de familles réunifiées relève d'Ottawa et des Nations-Unies.
84. Avec le faible taux de natalité chez les Montréalais d'origine française, le processus
 85. d'immigration et le glissement linguistique vers l'anglais est amplifié par le phénomène
 86. de la mondialisation, à plus ou moins long terme Montréal passera du bilinguisme actuel

87. la prédominance de l'anglais comme c'était le cas au 19^e siècle. Les autres régions du
 88. Québec deviendront folkloriques sur le plan linguistique. La cassure sera consumée entre
 89. Montréal et le reste du Québec.

90. D'où l'insécurité, l'inquiétude ambiante chez certains d'entre nous à Montréal, et d'un
 91. très grand nombre dans les autres régions, qui ne se reconnaissent plus dans ce qu'est
 92. devenue la ville de Montréal. Tant que le peuple québécois ne fera pas son indépendance
 93. politique, nous nagerons dans la confusion, et ne pourrons envoyer un message clair aux
 94. nouveaux arrivants. Cette indépendance est évidemment inclusive de tous les Québécois
 95. quelle que soit leur origine ethnique, leur langue maternelle, leur religion etc.

96. **L'OUVERTURE**

97. Après avoir parlé d'affirmation, nous pouvons maintenant parler d'ouverture; ouverture
 98. aux autres ici, ouverture sur le monde. Un peuple c'est comme un individu. S'il ne se
 99. connaît pas et ne se respecte pas, il ne peut entrer sainement en rapport avec l'autre.
 100. Contrairement à la perception de certains, il n'y a aucune opposition entre le fait d'être
 101. profondément québécois et citoyen du monde. Pour rayonner dans le monde, il nous faut
 102. des racines quelque part sur la planète terre.

103. Les autres, ce sont d'abord les peuples autochtones, les premiers habitants du territoire
 104. québécois. Nous avons conquis leur espace; nous leur devons le plus grand respect et
 105. viser à long terme une bonne entente avec eux. Ce sont ensuite les Québécois d'origine
 106. britannique. Les Anglais nous ont conquis sur les Plaines d'Abraham, et nous ne pouvons
 107. refaire l'histoire. Cette dernière a fait en sorte que les Québécois d'origine britannique
 108. ont bâti le Québec avec nous. N'oublions pas que même la ville de Québec dont nous
 109. fêterons le 400^e anniversaire en 2008 était majoritairement anglaise au 19^e siècle.

110. Ceux qui sont venus ou arrivent encore aujourd'hui de d'autres pays viennent se greffer
 111. au noyau initial pour poursuivre l'histoire avec nous. Ils viennent parfois par gaieté de
 112. cœur, souvent par obligation. Ils ont souvent le mal du pays. Nous leur demandons
 113. comme nouveaux résidents dans notre maison, de respecter nos us et coutumes, de parler
 114. notre langue et de s'intégrer parmi nous.

115. Nous sommes prêts à accepter leur différence, en autant, qu'elle ne contrevient pas à nos
 116. valeurs fondamentales. Ils se doivent de respecter nos choix collectif et ils ont leur mot à
 117. dire puisque nous sommes une société démocratique et ouverte. Nous leur demandons de
 118. s'intéresser à notre culture et à notre histoire. A cette seule condition, nous pouvons nous
 119. ouvrir à eux, à leur culture, à leurs coutumes, à leur histoire, et apprécier leur apport au
 120. Québec que nous construisons et vivons ensemble. Plusieurs communautés ethniques
 121. suivent le chemin de l'intégration. Nous invitons celles qui sont plus réfractaires, ou
 122. même choisissent malheureusement la ghettoïsation de faire de même. Le Québec n'en
 123. sera que plus riche et plus vivant.

124. **QUELQUES RECOMMANDATIONS**

125. Accroître les mesures financières et autres favorisant l'accroissement de la natalité
 126. au Québec

127. Rendre obligatoire la connaissance du français pour immigrer au Québec, et
 128. exceptionnellement, dans le cas où cela n'est pas possible, rendre obligatoire dès
 129. leur arrivée les cours de français aux immigrants en leur assurant un support
 130. financier pendant cette période

131. Fixer les mêmes règles d'accès aux études collégiales en anglais que celles

132. existantes aux niveaux primaire et secondaire
133. Faire en sorte que les services publics soient offerts en anglais au Québec, et en
134. particulier à Montréal, uniquement aux Québécois d'origine britannique
135. Que les services publics soient offerts sur une base temporaire de six mois pour les
136. nouveaux arrivants dans leur langue en présence d'un traducteur. Par la suite,
137. les services leur seront uniquement offerts en français
138. Que le gouvernement du Québec resserre l'application et renforce les dispositions
139. de la Loi 101 pour faire en sorte que l'on travaille, que l'on étudie, que l'on
140. affiche, et que l'on vive en français à Montréal et au Québec.
141. Que le gouvernement du Québec adopte une constitution et une citoyenneté
142. québécoise

143. **CONCLUSION**

144. Nous devons nous reprendre en mains. Le temps presse. Nous risquons de disparaître à
145. plus ou moins long terme si nous ne réussissons pas le défi de l'immigration et de
146. l'intégration. Camille Laurin, notre psychiatre national, et René Lévesque nous ont
147. permis de faire un bon bout de chemin. Colonisés dans nos têtes que nous étions, et
148. sommes trop encore aujourd'hui, ils nous ont indiqué le chemin de la fierté, de la
149. confiance en soi, et de l'émancipation. Nous devons profiter de l'occasion de votre
150. commission pour reprendre courage et pousser plus loin notre expérience collective et
151. véritablement devenir un peuple autonome, mature, et souverain. A cette seule condition
152. tous les Québécois, de quelque origine qu'ils soient, pourront vivre en harmonie et
153. développer ce coin de terre ensemble.
154. Pour ce qui est de votre mandat, vous avez un grand défi à relever : soit réconcilier le
155. peuple et l'élite. L'élite québécoise d'origine française, parfois bien pensante, fait
156. souvent preuve d'une ouverture béate à l'égard des autres cultures, alors que le peuple
157. fait souvent preuve de frilosité. Une ouverture béate engendre l'intolérance
158. et la xénophobie, et peut menacer la paix sociale. La boîte de pandore ouverte, il faut
159. savoir quoi faire ensemble avec son contenu étalé sur le plancher. A vous de nous
160. indiquer le chemin...

Appendix XI: L'accommodement raisonnable, qu'en est-il?

Ou

Les effets secondaires des accommodements.

(by Denis Picard)

1. Depuis l'arrivée des Européens en Amérique et malgré toutes les promesses et les beaux discours qu'ils ont tenus et qu'ils osent tenir encore à notre égard, il est clair que depuis
2. les quatre cents dernières années la situation des Nations amérindiennes s'est détériorée
3. et continue dans le même sens, sans espoir d'amélioration à l'horizon.
- 4.
5. Dès le début de la colonisation européenne, les Nations amérindiennes ont été diminuées,
6. voire éliminées, par des maladies venues des pays européens. Elles ont été parquées
7. dans des réserves; leurs droits ont été diminués et même ignorés. L'évangélisation s'est
8. réalisée par la force du chantage, des menaces et des expulsions. Les Nations ont été
9. entraînées dans des guerres intestines et prises en otages dans des réserves. A plusieurs
10. reprises, on les a menacées lorsqu'elles exerçaient leurs droits de vivre de la chasse et de
11. la pêche et de vivre selon leurs mœurs. Il était interdit de parler sa langue pour en
12. imposer une autre. Interdit aussi de pratiquer les activités culturelles propres à chaque
13. nation.
14. Encore, en ce jour, les membres des Nations amérindiennes sont brimés dans l'exercice
15. de leurs droits, de leurs mœurs et de leurs coutumes. Leurs revendications traînent depuis
16. plus de trente ans et rien n'indique qu'elles seront reconnues dans les prochaines trente
17. années...et lorsqu'elles seront reconnues, elles le seront à la baisse et au détriment des
18. Nations impliquées.
19. Aujourd'hui, une autre langue sort de notre bouche. Elle a été imposée par le
20. colonisateur. Notre langue a été interdite d'usage. Plus possible de vivre nos émotions et
21. d'exprimer nos sentiments dans notre langue. Les mots d'aujourd'hui rendent –ils ce
22. que nous voulons exprimer, comme l'aurait fait notre propre langue? Les mots entendus
23. produisent –ils les mêmes émotions et les mêmes réactions que les mots de notre propre
24. langue? Cela constitue une partie de ce que nous avons perdu et c'est une souffrance et
25. une privation de ne pouvoir vivre et utiliser la langue de la Nation.
26. La langue, c'est notre identité et notre pensée qui s'expriment et nous en sommes privés
27. depuis les débuts de la colonisation. Privés de notre langue maternelle, nous devons
28. exprimer notre pensée, nos émotions et nos sentiments dans une autre langue qui est le
29. français ou l'anglais. Communiquer dans notre propre langue donne plus de valeur à ce
30. qui est exprimé. La langue est source de fierté et de liberté. C'est de cela que les Nations
31. sont brimées et le ou les coupables sont connus.
32. Pour toutes les brimades, les privations, les interdits, les souffrances endurées, les
33. épreuves, les persécutions, les plaisanteries, les railleries, les tourments et les
34. vexations, il est grand temps de passer à l'action afin d'exiger le respect inconditionnel
35. auquel a droit chaque nation et de réclamer compensations pour toutes ces souffrances
36. passées et qui perdurent encore après quatre cents ans de colonisation.
37. Pour cela, un recours collectif s'impose-t-il? Depuis plus de quatre cents ans, les
38. Nations amérindiennes se sont accommodées malgré elles et les effets secondaires sont
39. bien connus des uns et ignorés des autres. Le temps est venu de mettre fin à ce pouvoir
40. colonisateur et de prendre notre place, d'exercer nos droits, nos mœurs, nos coutumes
41. sans contrainte et de redécouvrir, si possible, notre langue pour vivre enfin dans le respect
42. et la liberté. La dignité passe par le respect de nos valeurs et par la reconnaissance de nos

- 43. droits, de nos mœurs et de nos coutumes.
- 44. Denis Picard, le 10 septembre 2007, soit après quatre cents ans d'accommodements dits
- 45. raisonnables pour le colonisateur.
- 46. Denis Picard
- 47. Wendake

Appendix XII: Brief submitted to: Commission de consultation sur les pratiques d'accommodement [sic] reliées aux différences culturelles

By: Mr. Franco Capitina

1. In looking at the different public comments being made at the public hearings over the
2. past few months I decided to submit my own brief. This brief is submitted in English
3. because I chose to do so. I am born in Quebec, went to school in English all my life and
4. therefore I have a right to express myself in the language that the Public School system of
5. Quebec taught me.
6. I believe that the current questions revolving around reasonable accommodation is the
7. result of
8. 1. trying to be too tolerant to Immigrants
9. 2. wanting a totalitarian state in which everyone conforms to the will of the majority
10. (ie.: French Speaking).
11. 3. Permitting Racism & Bigotry
12. The above points are damaging the very fabric of peoples interactions in the Quebec
13. the image that the Quebec holds with the rest of the Country as well as other
14. Countries. I provide in the words below my opinions & thoughts about how to fix the
15. situation.

16. **Regarding those who want to be too tolerant to Immigrants**, I would say that there is
17. a balance to be found. That is, our society should be able to request everyone to clearly
18. identify themselves by showing their faces at public & Government Institutions, such as
19. when voting, at Canada Customs, SAAQ & other Government Institutions and also when
20. boarding a plane, purchasing insurance from an insurance firm. For Religious reasons it
21. should also be deemed acceptable for Immigrants to wear Head Scarves or to cover their
22. faces in Public. However this same tolerance should not permit the wearing of a Kirpan
23. or other objects which can be used as a weapon. In our society we should make all efforts
24. to prevent weapons from being carried by everyone other than the Public Security forces.
25. One has to wonder if Muslims can wear a Kirpan, then what prevents a refugee from
26. carrying a knife. The defense being that his/her life is in danger. You see that you really
27. cannot determine where do you draw the line? Similarly setting aside religions prayer
28. rooms in public or private locations should also not be permitted. The reason is because
29. you again do not know where you draw the line. That is, do you set aside one room for
30. Muslims? Why not Catholics, Protestants, Buddhists, & Hindus? Then why only stop at
31. Religion ? why not have rooms for different Language groups, Gays & Lesbians, et
32. cetera. Again where do you draw the line? Regarding the language of communication, all
33. efforts should be made to communicate in the Official Languages for the Land. That is,
34. French & English. Courses & specialized training should be made available to any
35. Immigrant for them to choose the training. This training should not be forced on any
36. Immigrant, but rather positively encouraged.

37. **Regarding those want a totalitarian state in which everyone is only French**, I would
38. say that laws should be enacted in Quebec so that discrimination & racist comments
39. against sexual orientation, gender, Language & Religion are not permitted. How could a
40. society permit such public bashing based on people's Language, Religion, Sexual
41. Orientation & Gender. Permitting this bashing has the effect of the Minority groups in the
42. Province to feel alienated & consequently do not integrate themselves into the majority
43. very easily. Instead if the Government would instead focus on positive reinforcement of
44. the French Language, Quebec culture, & its unique place in North America, then there

45. would be a much more accepting view of the will of the majority thereby resulting in a
46. much better integration of Immigrants. This view is practiced by the Scandinavian
47. Countries of Europe the result is very positive. In addition, the Government has to realize
48. that promotion of both French as well as English in Quebec is a good thing and not a
49. threat. The French language & culture will survive no matter what other minority group
50. exists. The Quebec Government almost seems embarrassed to admit that there is a large
51. Anglophone & Allophone population in Montreal & surrounding areas. Instead this
52. multiculturalism in and around Montreal should be admitted, encouraged & permitted to
53. flourish. In the end it will be Quebec that benefits.

54. **Regarding racism & Bigotry**, no society can flourish successfully if it permits this kind
55. of behavior from taking place. Quebec would be a much happier place without this type
56. of behavior. Sometimes I get the feeling that we should not be questioning the reasonable
57. accommodation of Immigrants, but rather the reasonable accommodation of Racist &
58. Bigots. If this is not taken care of, one has to wonder what will happen if one day
59. Immigrants can no longer find jobs in Quebec. Will we be looking at Riots like we see in
60. France today ? History has shown us that whenever Democratic values are not upheld but
61. trumped on then problems are certainly will surface...one day.

62. Thank You !
63. Franco Capitina, Engr, PMP

Appendix XIII: Understanding Collocate Tables

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
N	Word	Total	Total Left	Total Right	L5	L4	L3	L2	L1	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5
7	QUÉBÉCOISE	1574	55	1519	7	17	19	10	2	1477	14	15	9	4
10	NOTRE	1107	1052	55	18	15	23	5	991	5	21	10	11	8
19	ACCUEIL	583	9	574	3	1	3	2	0	0	568	1	3	2
24	VALEURS	322	271	51	33	114	120	4	0	0	1	11	16	23
33	LAÏQUE	262	15	247	1	1	7	5	1	183	18	14	16	16
34	QUÉBEC	259	179	80	33	40	82	21	3	0	9	28	10	33
35	LEUR	246	174	72	22	72	2	8	70	2	13	24	19	14
43	CIVILE	200	14	186	0	9	5	0	0	183	0	0	1	2
45	INTÉGRATION	187	158	29	47	13	93	1	4	0	3	6	7	13
51	ENSEMBLE	152	109	43	15	7	81	6	0	0	0	20	8	15
53	PLURALISTE	148	9	139	1	0	8	0	0	90	13	21	8	7
60	OUVERTE	120	8	112	1	2	4	1	0	46	27	19	11	9
68	IMMIGRANTS	111	83	28	15	10	55	3	0	0	2	4	9	13

FrenchBT corpus collocates of interest with société(s)

1: N=	The rank of the collocate (1 = most frequent collocate)
2: Word =	The collocate
3: Total =	Total number of collocations with search term
4: Total Left =	Total number of collocations on left side of search term
5: Total Right =	Total number of collocations on right side of search term
6: L5=	Collocation 5 word-spaces to the left of the search term
7: L4=	Collocation 4 word-spaces to the left of the search term
8: L3=	Collocation 3 word-spaces to the left of the search term
9: L2=	Collocation 2 word-spaces to the left of the search term
10: L1=	Collocation 1 word-space to the left of the search term
11: R1=	Collocation 1 word-space to the right of the search term
12: R2=	Collocation 2 word-spaces to the right of the search term
13: R3=	Collocation 3 word-spaces to the right of the search term
14: R4=	Collocation 4 word-spaces to the right of the search term
15: R5=	Collocation 5 word-spaces to the right of the search term