LANGUAGE AND ETHNICITY

LANGUAGE AND ETHNICITY:

A STUDY OF BILINGUALISM, ETHNIC IDENTITY, AND ETHNIC ATTITUDES

By

PAUL LAMY, B.A., M.A.

A Dissertation
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University
(February) 1976

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1976)
(Sociology)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Language and Ethnicity: A Study of Bilingualism, Ethnic Identity, and Ethnic Attitudes

AUTHOR: Paul Lamy, B.A. (McGill University)
M.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Peter C. Pineo

NUMBER OF PAGES: xiii, 242

LANGUAGE AND ETHNICITY:

A STUDY OF BILINGUALISM, ETHNIC IDENTITY, AND ETHNIC ATTITUDES

(Abstract)

Research on bilingualism in a number of social science disciplines has reported an association between bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes - causality has often been attributed to bilingualism. This research has been criticized on methodological grounds. There is a dearth of information concerning the relationship between bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes in specific communities, regions, or societies since there have been very few studies of the social psychological aspects of bilingualism based on survey research methods. Yet another critique of previous research is that the theoretical framework in which reported findings have been couched has remained untested or that they have remained implicit. These theoretical underpinnings are explored and assessed.

The data for the thesis came from a sample survey of greater Montreal conducted in 1973, from a survey of the Ottawa Census Metropolitan Area conducted by the York Survey Research Center in late 1974 and early 1975, and from a secondary analysis of the Ethnic Relations Study, carried out for the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in 1965. The analytic methods used are crosstabulation and partial correlation.

It was found in the analysis of all three surveys, which were carried out at different points in time and which used slightly different measures of the independent and dependent variable, that the association between bilingualism and ethnic identity is not strong, and that it varies from one mother tongue group to the other. This indicates that causality cannot be attributed to bilingualism. The analysis of the Ethnic Relations Study revealed that with intergroup contact and demographic context held constant, the relationship between bilingualism and ethnic identity is extremely weak. Bilinguals, it emerged, tend to identify with both language groups mainly where they are in contact with the other group and in contexts where the other group constitutes the demographic majority. With regard to the relationship between bilingualism and ethnic attitudes, it was found that there were weak associations between bilingualism and social distance, and bilingualism and ethnic prejudice. However, these all but disappeared when intergroup contact and demographic context were controlled.

The theoretical debate, which has continued over the past several decades, concerning whether or not causality of these relationships can be attributed to bilingualism may still continue; however, the evidence presented in the dissertation indicates that causality cannot be attributed to bilingualism. Further, unicausal social psychological theories attributing such findings to the effects of the internalization of a second linguistic system would seem to be manifestly inadequate. Future theoretical efforts in this area of research ought to be of the kind which span disciplinary boundaries, assume multicausality, and lend themselves to operationalization. It is suggested that group membership theory may provide a fruitful point of departure.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The patient and careful guidance of my supervisor, Dr. P.C. Pineo, and the emotional support he provided when it was needed, is most gratefully acknowledged. Dr. June Smith provided similar help and encouragement. The remaining members of my committee, Professors François-Pierre Gingras, Camille Legendre, and Peta Sherif suffered through and commented on the many revisions and are thanked for their perserverance.

The School of Graduate Studies of McMaster University provided financial support for the field work in Montreal, while the Ottawa survey was part of a larger project funded by the Ontario Ministry of Education. The analyses of the Ottawa survey, and of the Ethnic Relations Study were facilitated by awards from the Faculty of Social Sciences and the Rector's Fund of the University of Ottawa. Mr. Claude Bourbonnais provided invaluable help with the translation of the Montreal questionnaire, Mrs. Neena Barnes helped with many of the coding decisions, and John Maclaren typed the manuscript under conditions for which financial compensation was hardly adequate.

The Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Ottawa provided the funds for the typing and reproduction of the dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

BILINGUALISM AND IDENTITY: A REVIEW OF THE THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

Introduction

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine the relationship between bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes. There is a growing body of evidence from research on bilingualism from clinical, psychological, social psychological, anthropological, and sociological perspectives that bilingualism has an impact upon ethnic identity and ethnic attitudes. This research is characterized by two major shortcomings: the first is the situation of research findings within an implicit but untested theoretical framework; the second major shortcoming is methodological -- most of the evidence is from clinical or psychological studies, or in the case of research by anthropologists and sociologists, on participant observation. In nearly all of this research, controls were not implemented for other competing explanatory variables, and Diebold (1968: 219) voices the suspicion that:

> the majority of "somehow comparable" groups of monolinguals and bilinguals which have been compared as if bilingualism were the critical variable are in fact not "otherwise equally matched."

In attempting to formulate generalizations from this research, Diebold (1968: 236) laments that "there are no surveys to aid in formulating the generalizations." In short, to date, we have no information for any given community, region, or society as to whether or not there is a relationship

between bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes; whether this varies across age, sex, and social class categories; and whether this varies from one bilingual context to another.

At the theoretical level, three basic explanations are available to account for the reported association between bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes. The first, is that a language cannot be learned as an abstraction, but rather that language is a vehicle of culture or world view--the internalization of another linguistic system will therefore have an effect upon one's group belonging and upon ethnocentrism. A second explanation, which is offered in place of the first, attributes these effects to biculturalism rather than bilingualism, and proponents of this view seem to suggest, by implication, that if one could control for acculturation, the association between bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes would disappear. A third explanation is that bilinguals are less well anchored in their own cultural universe prior to becoming bilingual and that bilingualism merely accentuates this tendency. Each of these explanations will be dealt with in turn, and empirical research relevant to each viewpoint will be presented and assessed.

At this conjuncture, it must be mentioned that there is little consensus among those who do research on bilingualism as to how bilingualism ought to be defined. Indeed, most of the authors who will be referred to in this Chapter do not bother to define what it is they mean by "bilingualism." Formal definitions of the concept are, of course, extant in the literature but these are remarkably diverse. Van Overbeke (1972: 113-119) lists no less than twenty-one definitions of bilingualism and this list is far from being exhaustive. Such definitions range from that of Haugen, who views bilingualism as the ability to "produce complete, meaningful utterances in the

other language," to that of Bloomfield who would apply the term "bilingual" to those who manifest a "native-like control of two languages." Van Overbeke (1972) points out that different conceptual definitions emanate from different intellectual traditions. In view of this, there is little likelihood that a generally accepted conceptual definition will emerge in the near future. While the more empirically oriented researchers, such as Lieberson (1966: 269), bemoan the dearth of clear-cut operational definitions, this simply reflects problems at the conceptual and theoretical level. While the empirically-oriented cry out for a good mousetrap, the theoretically-oriented are still laboring to define a mouse, or worse still, are embroiled in arguments as to whether mice exist. Problems of conceptual definition and of operationalization are therefore endemic in this area of research. Van Overbeke's (1972: 65) phenomenologically-based conceptualization of bilingualism is adopted in this dissertation. These matters are given extensive attention in Chapter 11 and further discussion at this point is not essential to the substance of this Chapter.[1]

The "Linguistic System as a Vehicle of Culture" Explanation

The argument that internalization of a linguistic system has an impact upon one's perception of the world is most frequently associated with the linguistic relativity hypothesis of Sapir and Whorf. Sapir (1929: 209) argued that our perception of the "real world" is largely conditioned by the linguistic system we use; he asserted: "No two languages are ever

sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality." Whorf (1936: 130-131) took the view that language "is a classification and arrangement of the stream of sensory experience which results in a certain world-order." However, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis has been criticized on both logical and empirical grounds (Currie, 1970; Fearing, 1954; Hoijer, 1954; Houston, 1972; Tullio-Altan, 1969), and the evidence remains inconclusive. In addition, some further theoretical mechanics are necessary to base an explanation of the findings of empirical research on bilingualism on the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. One must assume that the bilingual does not have two separate identities corresponding to each linguistic system, but rather one which represents a synthesis of both. One must therefore posit a consistency model of psychological functioning.

Recent psycholinguistic research would seem to support such a model. Segalowitz (1974: 49) in reviewing recent psycholinguistic research, sees the evidence as suggesting that "the bilingual does not have separate memory systems for each language" and that "except at the level of speech output, there is little functional separation of the two languages in one brain" (Segalowitz, 1974: 54). Segalowitz (1974: 49) sees such research as evidence in favour of the hypothesis that there is "{in the brain} only one general meaning system," from which it follows that "a bilingual will not be able to activate the meaning system of only one of his languages since that meaning system is part of a greater representation subserving all meanings available to the brain." Segalowitz (1974: 85) theorizes that "the fully bilingual person may become more fully bicultural . . . evolving for himself a cultural position that represents a synthesis of

elements from both cultures." There is some evidence for this position. For instance, in attempting to validate the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis empirically, Brown and Lenneberg (1954: 461) found in comparing colour recognition among speakers of English and Zuni, that English speakers never confused yellow or orange, but Zuni speakers, whose lexicon does not distinguish between these colours could not identify orange or yellow; yet "bilingual Zunis who knew English fell between the monolingual Zuni and the native speaker of English in the frequency with which they made these errors {of identification}."

[redacted] theorists of a symbolic interactionist and phenomenological bent express viewpoints somewhat similar to those of Sapir and Whorf. Mead (1964: 33) maintained that "the human self arises through its ability to take the attitude of the group to which he belongs," and that (Mead, 1964: 35): "There is a common attitude, that is, one which all assume under certain habitual conditions." The "common attitude" is acquired through the use of language (Mead, 1964: 35):

> Through the use of language, through the use of the significant symbol, then, the individual does take the attitude of others, especially these common attitudes, so that he finds himself taking the same attitude toward himself that the community takes.

One cannot internalize the system of symbols of any "universe of discourse" without taking the attitude of the generalized other represented by this "universe of discourse" since all symbols are universal and "you cannot say anything that is absolutely particular; anything you say that has any meaning at all is universal" (Mead, 1964: 211). Mead (1964: 38) states that in human communication we are "pointing out something that is common

in meaning to the whole group and to the individual, so that the individual is taking the attitude of the whole group, so far as there is any definite meaning given."[2]

As far as bilingualism is concerned, Mead (1964: 258) made this statement:

> A person learns a new language and, as we say, gets a new soul. He puts himself into the attitude of those that make use of that language. He cannot read its literature, cannot converse with those that belong to that community, without taking on its peculiar attitudes. He becomes in that sense a different individual. You cannot convey a language as a pure abstraction; you inevitably in some degree convey also the life that lies behind it. And this result builds itself into relationship with the organized attitudes of the individual who gets this language and inevitably brings about a readjustment of views.

Mead, then, argues that a language cannot be conveyed as an abstraction and refers to the bilingual's taking on the attitudes of the other community such that he 'becomes in a sense a different individual.'

What is implied by the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, and which is explicitly stated by Mead is that language is a vehicle of culture and a second language cannot be internalized without having an impact on one's view of the world. This current of thought also emerges in Schutz (1964: 100) who states:

> Language as a scheme of interpretation and expression does not merely consist of the linguistic symbols catalogued in the dictionary and of the syntactical rules enumerated in an ideal grammar. . . . Every word and every sentence is . . . surrounded by 'fringes' connecting them, on the one hand, with past and future elements of the universe of discourse to which

> they pertain and surrounding them, on the other hand, with a halo of emotional values and irrational implications which themselves remain ineffable.

While Schutz has little to say on the topic of bilingualism, he does provide in a penetrating analysis of the stranger, the person seeking acceptance or toleration from a group having a different scheme of interpretation and expression, some useful insights relevant to bilingualism. Schutz (1964: 99) points out that upon approaching another group, the stranger finds himself unable to make use of his own group's cultural scheme of interpretation and expression since "for the members of the approached group, their cultural pattern fulfills the functions of such a scheme." The stranger must put aside his own group's scheme of interpretation if he is to make sense of the one of the group which he has approached. As the new scheme of interpretation and expression becomes part of the stranger's immediate environment and as its meaning is experienced in social situations, knowledge of the other group's scheme of interpretation and expression can reach the stage where the stranger may "adopt it as the scheme of his own expression" (Schutz, 1964: 100). If the stranger fails to "substitute the new cultural patterns for that of the home group," the stranger remains "a cultural hybrid on the verge of two different patterns of group life, not knowing to which of them he belongs" (Schutz, 1964: 104-105). Schutz, then, seems to imply that the internalization of two cultural schemes of interpretation and expression has an effect upon group identity, allegiance, and attitudes.

Berger and Luckmann, whose phenomenology has been much influenced by both the symbolic interactionism of Mead and the phenomenology of Schutz, take quite a different view of the effects of bilingualism upon identity than either Mead or Schutz. Berger and Luckmann (1967: 143-144) assert

that "it is rare that a language learned in later life attains the inevitable, self-evident reality of the first language learned in childhood." While Berger and Luckmann do not devote any further attention to bilingualism, their discussion of the effects of the internalization of discrepant realities seems to clarify their position. They argue (1967: 172) that in secondary socialization, the internalization of discrepant worlds "need not be accompanied by affectively charged identification with significant others," that is, "the individual may internalize different realities without identifying with them." A discrepant world appearing in secondary socialization may be opted for in a "manipulative manner," as a "reality to be used ... for specific purposes" (Berger and Luckmann, 1967: 172).

Regarding the internalization of discrepant realities in primary socialization, Berger and Luckmann (1967: 169) see such situations as involving the possibility of alternation "internalized as a permanent feature of the individual's subjective self-apprehension" in which the person has the choice between different worlds rather than different persons of the same world. Such persons are called "individualists," "a specific social type who has the potential to migrate between a number of available worlds and who has deliberately and awarely constructed a self out of the 'material' provided by a number of available identities" (Berger and Luckmann, 1967: 171).[3] Berger and Luckmann's overall position would appear to be that bilingualism, the internalization of a discrepant reality, does not necessarily have an effect upon ethnic identity and ethnic attitudes since, typically, the bilingual would adopt a "manipulative manner" towards the other universe of discourse, which would be seen as a "reality to be used . . . for specific purposes."[4]

The empirical research, however, reports an association between bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes; causality, concerning this association, has largely been attributed to bilingualism.[5] Negative findings have not been reported, and controls for other explanatory variables have not been implemented. From the research of anthropologists and sociologists, there emerges the consistent theme of the "marginality" of bilinguals; this theme occurs in a wide variety of works authored by scholars of many nationalities describing situations varying from immigrant adjustment, westernized colonial elites, minority language groups, to bilinguals generally. The meaning given to marginality in these writings is that given the concept by Ziller (1973: 47), who described the marginal individual as being "within the field of two opposing groups . . . unable or unwilling to relinquish membership in either;" it suggests "non-commitment, neutrality, non-alignment, avoidance of categorization, or even disinterest." For instance, Pieris (1951: 321-336), in referring to bilingualism among the westernized elite in Ceylon, argues that a "bare colloquial smattering of a foreign national language gives the speaker a sense of identification with the culture that language symbolizes" and that "many bilinguals are acutely conscious of their cultural marginality." Christophersen (1948: 8) maintains that "nobody can know a language perfectly without associating himself to a large extent with the people who speak it." Michels, writing on denationalization, sees sharing the same language with a group, or acquiring that language if different, and having positive feelings towards the other group, as among the principal factors hastening this process (Wood, 1937: 137).

In terms of the effects of bilingualism upon ethnic attitudes, sources as varied as an American sociologist (Johnson, 1951) in a study of Spanish-English bilinguals in the American Southwest, and a Russian sociologist studying Tatar-Russian bilinguals report that bilingualism is associated with lower ethnic prejudice. Guboglo (1974: 99) reports that "bilingualism helps to overcome ethnic prejudices" and that positive inter-ethnic attitudes were highest among those Tatars who were either fluent in Russian or who knew Russian and Tatar equally well. Meisel (1970) in a secondary analysis of a national sample study of voting behaviour found that those who used both Canada's official languages in two of three domains of languages use had different attitudes on a number of dimensions than their monolingual co-linguists; in their attitudinal orientations they tended toward a middle position on attitudinal continua on which both groups differed.

A second body of evidence is the research of a clinical or psychological nature conducted on child or adolescent bilinguals.[6] Diebold (1968: 236) in reviewing this research concludes:

> The literature abounds in evidence which purports to show that the early bilingual does not function as well as an older child or adult, and that he is especially subject to failures in conflict resolution characterized by a symtomatology for what we loosely call "alienation" or "anomie."

He sees this research as "immediately revealing of an essentially sociolinguistic basis for many of the observed . . . problems," and that the "anomie" and "alienation" found to be associated with bilingualism could be attributed to "a crisis in social and personal identity engendered by antagonistic acculturative pressures" (Diebold, 1968: 236). Diebold

criticizes this research for having erroneously attributed causality of these observed effects to bilingualism rather than to biculturalism. This argument will now be examined.

The "Biculturalism" Explanation

Diebold's (1968: 219) critique of the clinical and psychological studies of bilingualism on the grounds that this research has interpreted the "observed association in cause-and-effect terms" is well taken. Indeed, this research does attribute causality to bilingualism and little thought is given to possible intervening variables. This same critique had been made some years previously by Soffietti (1955: 226-227) who pointed out that individuals "learning a second language in a monocultural setting will not automatically learn a whole new set of cultural patterns and develop cultural conflicts." However, both Diebold and Soffietti attribute causality to biculturalism rather than bilingualism. These authors are saying, in effect, that if one controls for the level of acculturation, the association between bilingualism and identity will disappear.

The problem with this explanation is that it is to some extent tautological in that the dependent variables, ethnic identity, ethnic allegiance, and ethnic attitudes, and even the independent variable, bilingualism, are often used as measures of acculturation (cf. Richardson, 1967). Richardson (1967: 14) defines acculturation as "the adoption, by members of one group, of the attitudes, beliefs and behaviours of another group." Richardson's (1967: 17-19) six-item assimilation scale is composed of three measures of identification and three

measures of acculturation. The three measures of identification are comprised of an index of perceived similarity, a measure of whether the respondent feels more X than Y, and a measure of which side the respondent would support in an athletic event between the two groups. The measures of acculturation are knowledge of the other group's slang expressions, a measure of beliefs, and a measure of use of the other group's slang expressions. Certainly, ethnic identity, ethnic allegiance, and ethnic attitudes would correlate highly with any of the commonly used measures of acculturation.[7]

It is always risky to make inferences concerning what other researchers "really meant," however, in this instance it seems warranted. Soffietti seems to be calling our attention to the possible effects of exposure to the other culture as an intervening variable in implying that there will be no relationship between bilingualism and identity in monocultural settings. In operational terms, this suggests controls for demographic context and intergroup contact at one level, and within bilingual contexts, controls for intensity of use of the other language and breadth of exposure to the other culture (measured, for instance, in terms of the number of domains in which the other language is used). It could be argued that these constitute behavioural measures of biculturalism, whereas the dependent variables mentioned above constitute measures of psychological biculturalism. Certainly, contact has been used as an independent variable to predict ethnic and racial attitudes indicating that these dimensions are considered to be separate. Most studies in which contact has been used as an independent variable with ethnic and racial attitudes as dependent variables have been conducted in the U.S. "and almost

all of these have dealt with contact between the white majority group and a minority group, and, in most cases, the minority group members were Negroes" (Amir, 1969: 320). Such studies have concentrated on attitudinal change in contact situations and the evidence is inconclusive as to the direction of change (Amir, 1969). This would seem to indicate that these constitute different dimensions of "biculturalism."

In summary, one can appreciate the analytical distinction made by Diebold and Soffietti though serious difficulties emerge at the more mundane level of measurement. The best that can be done is to control for contact, context, intensity of use of the other language, and breadth of exposure to the other culture. Unfortunately, any measure of "Frenchness" or "Englishness" in Canada, for instance, would have to include some variants of the dependent variables used in this study if the psychological dimension of biculturalism is to be measured. While one intuitively grasps what Diebold and Soffietti are getting at, a measure of it which would not overlap with the dependent variables would probably not constitute a valid measure of biculturalism in the social psychological sense, and to this extent, their argument is tautological.

The "Bilinguals Were Already That Way" Explanation

Gardner and Lambert (1972: 3) put forward what they modestly call a "theory" of second language learning:

> the successful learner of a second language must be psychologically prepared to adopt various aspects of behaviour which characterize members of another linguistic-cultural group. The learner's ethnocentric tendencies

> and his attitudes towards the other group are believed to determine how successful he will be, relatively, in learning the new language.

These authors seem to imply that bilinguals are less ethnocentric prior to learning the second language. Gardner and Lambert (1972: 3) differentiate between what they call an "instrumental" and an "integrative" orientation to the other language. An orientation is "instrumental" if the purposes of acquiring the second language are "utilitarian" such as getting ahead in one's occupation; an "integrative" orientation is characterized by a desire to learn the other language to "learn more about the other cultural community . . . to the point of eventually being accepted as a member of that other group." Those with an "integrative" motivation are said to learn a second language more rapidly and with a greater degree of fluency. However, Gardner and Lambert (1972: 3) also argue that "the more proficient one becomes in a second language, the more he (sic) may find his place in his original membership group modified since the new linguistic-cultural group . . . may, in fact, become a new membership group for him." They maintain (1972: 2) that bilingualism "could be accompanied by deep-seated and vague feelings of no longer fully belonging to one's own social group nor to the new one he has come to know." The essence of this explanation then, is that the tendency to identify with both groups and the tendency toward lower ethnocentrism is there prior to bilingualism; bilingualism accentuates these tendencies.

In terms of the empirical evidence relevant to the Gardner-Lambert theory, a ten-year longitudinal study of the learning of French in Great Britain (Burstall, et al, 1974) has yielded the following findings: (1) that which is most associated with success in French language learning is first experience of success; (2) "instrumental" motivation is as power-

ful if not more powerful than "integrative" motivation.[8] In Chapter 11, it will be pointed out that the "instrumental" and "integrative" distinction proved to be not very useful in terms of distinguishing between adult bilinguals in a natural context since the overwhelming majority of bilinguals could not be classified as having either one kind of orientation or the other.

However, the empirical research on bilingualism by Lambert and his associates is both relevant and interesting. In a study of Franco-American adolescents who had similar opportunities to learn both French and English at home, at school, and in the community, Lambert, Giles and Picard (1972: 3-4) found four basic identity groupings:

> 1 Those who preferred the American culture, who did not place much value in knowing French, and who were more proficient in English than French.
>
> 2 Those who wished to be identified as French and who showed greater proficiency in French.
>
> 3 Those who were "ambivalent about their identity and favored features of the French culture over the American and vice versa." This group was said to be "retarded in their command of both languages when compared to other groups."
>
> 4 Those who were "non-ethnocentric," "open-minded," with a "strong aptitude for language learning" and who become "skilled in both languages." This group were said to have achieved a "comfortable bicultural identity" and did not suffer from allegiance conflicts.

Of these identity groupings, one and two differ in content rather than type, as do three and four. These authors do not attempt to explain in theoretical terms how it is that despite similar language learning and

ethnic identification opportunities, individuals distribute themselves over these four categories. In a study of summer students enrolled in an intensive French language course, Lambert et al (1963) present data indicating that as the course advances, both elementary and advanced students become more "anomic," in terms of a feeling of not comfortably belonging in one social group or the other. The more proficient one becomes in another language, according to Lambert et al, the more one is subject to "anomie." They report that as students became proficient in French to the point of thinking and dreaming in French, feelings of "anomie" increased markedly. Lambert et al (1963: 363), conclude that their findings "strongly support the notion that students in a concentrated course of foreign language study may become psychologically marginal between two linguistic-cultural groups." These studies indicate that the tendency of bilinguals to become marginal to both groups varies positively with degree of bilingualism and that bilinguals are less ethnocentric.

From Theory and Previous Research to a Set of Testable Hypotheses

Of the three explanations for the association between bilingualism and identity reported in the research literature, only the first, which attributes causality to the internalization of a second linguistic system and of the cultural scheme of interpretation and expression of which it is the vehicle, is both logically sound and remains plausible in the light of the available empirical evidence. The second explanation, that the observed association is due to biculturalism rather than bilingualism is tautological in that the dependent variables constitute

commonly used measures of biculturalism and are likely to correlate highly with any valid measure of biculturalism. While the dependent variables in this study are never used in operational definitions of bilingualism, they are often included in operational definitions of biculturalism. There is a problem of collinearity however, since it seems almost inconceivable that those scoring high on bilingualism would score very low on any valid measure of biculturalism; likewise, if the cultures correspond to different language groups, it seems very unlikely that those scoring high on biculturalism would score very low on bilingualism. Despite this problem, bilingualism and biculturalism are analytically distinct and variation in the one can occur independently of the other.

As for the third explanation, that bilinguals have different identities and attitudes since those with such tendencies are more likely to become bilingual, which accentuates this tendency, this does not stand up under the available empirical evidence. The verification of such a hypothesis requires a longitudinal study, and an extensive ten-year study has resulted in evidence which indicates that an "instrumental" motivation is an equally good if not better predictor of success in second language learning than an "integrative" motivation, and neither of these is as good a predictor as *initial success* in second language learning (Burstall *et al.*, 1974).

The central theoretical issue pertaining to research on bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes is therefore that of the adequacy of the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation. If the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation of the association between bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes is adequate, the relationship between bilingualism and identity, and between bilingualism and ethnic attitudes

ought to vary in a linear fashion with degree of bilingualism. The theory that the association between bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes is due to the internalization of another linguistic system also implies that dominant language is the best predictor of ethnic identity. It would seem inconsistent to argue that bilingualism has an effect upon identity such that the bilingual identifies with both groups whose languages he speaks, without acknowledging that the loss of the first language learned, and its replacement by another, involves identification with the group whose language is now spoken. This is to say that dominant language is the best predictor of ethnic identity wherever there is language transfer. A further corollary of this explanation would appear to be that as bilingualism declines, the effects of bilingualism recede. That is, as people lose their fluency in the second language the effects which are attributed to the internalization of another linguistic system ought to wane.[9]

To determine the adequacy of the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation, the following hypotheses will be tested:

1 Dominant language is the best predictor of ethnic identity in Canada.

2.1 Bilinguals identify with both groups whose languages they speak.

2.2 Bilinguals take a neutral stance on ethnic issues.

2.3 Bilinguals manifest lower social distance and less prejudice towards the other language group.

2.4 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 vary positively with degree of bilingualism.

3 As bilingualism declines the effects of bilingualism recede.

The hypotheses might all be verified and yet the "language as a vehicle of

culture" explanation might still be inadequate. Since it is an unicausal explanation, it can be undermined if the hypothesized relationships are considerably weakened in holding any factor such as age, sex, education, or social class constant. Soffietti (1955) and Diebold (1968), proponents of the "biculturalism" explanation, direct our attention to more theoretically meaningful control variables. Soffietti (1955) seems to suggest that intergroup contact or demographic context might be important intervening variables. Diebold (1968) alludes to the effects of "antagonistic acculturative pressures." This would seem to suggest controls not only for intergroup contact and demographic context but for breadth of exposure to the other culture and for intensity of use of the other language.

In summary, if the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation is an adequate one, the relationship between bilingualism and the dependent variables ought to vary linearly with degree of bilingualism and ought not to be affected by controls for intergroup contact, demographic context, breadth of exposure to the other culture, intensity of use of the other language, or by controls for relevant background variables.

Summary

The empirical research on bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes has been reviewed and the various theoretical explanations of these findings have been assessed in terms of their logical consistency and their compatibility with the available findings. Only one of the three explanations examined, the "language as a vehicle of culture" theory, is both logically consistent and not controverted by the available evidence. This explanation holds that the association between bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes is due to the internalization of another linguistic system and of the cultural scheme of interpretation and expression

of which it is the vehicle. The implications of this theory have been developed and a set of hypotheses which would constitute a test of it have been put forward. The theory has remained untested in this area of research by default--previous research has either not reported the results of such a test or has not included variables permitting one. Yet there are more than a score of sociological and anthropological studies and literally hundreds of clinical and psychological studies which attribute, as Diebold (1968) has pointed out, causality to bilingualism and which invoke either explicitly or implicitly the theoretical explanation which will be tested here. For example, Christophersen (1948: 8-9), whom Diebold (1968: 236) appraises as making "the better of the bad pronouncements on these matters," argues that "language . . . embodies a community's general mode of thought, its code of behaviour, its emotional attitude to things, its temperament so to speak;" hence "(i)f a person has two languages belonging to communities with widely differing temperaments, he must himself to some extent have those temperaments."[10]

A peculiarity of this theory is that it is social psychological, yet is more readily tested by sociological methods. It would be pointless to take clinical practitioners and psychologists to task for failing to be good sociologists; the fault lies not so much in any trained incapacity on their part but with the small number of cases their intensive studies involve, the use of children and adolescents as subjects, or clinical case histories as data sources. Under such conditions, sociological variables cannot be varied in any meaningful way. In fact, it will become apparent to the reader in the data chapters, that the *N*'s required to vary both level of bilingualism and the values of the dependent variables, even when dichotomous variables are involved, are simply enormous if one wishes to be able to generalize one's results to a specific population. That this

should occur in the use of a national sample survey with a case base of 4071 in an officially bilingual country gives one a good idea of the problems involved. It is not surprising, then, that research on bilingualism is still, relatively speaking, in the horse and buggy era. With the exception of research on second language learning, and studies of a linguistic nature, research on the social psychological and sociological consequences of bilingualism is both theoretically impoverished and methodologically suspect.[11]

The minimal contribution of this dissertation will be to rectify Diebold's (1968) lament that "there are no surveys to aid in formulating the generalizations." Three surveys--two sample surveys of bilingual communities, and a national sample survey will be used here. From these studies will emerge, at least for Canada, an idea of the strength of the relationship between bilingualism and identity, and of the effects of various intervening variables--intergroup contact, demographic context, breadth of exposure to the other culture, intensity of use of the other language, and the usual sociological background variables. The theoretical paradigm within which previous research results have been made meaningful will be given a thorough test.

NOTES

1. Van Overbeke (1972: 65) suggests that a person be considered "bilingual" when the second language has been assimilated "à la satisfaction de son entourage immédiat." In Chapter 11, it is argued that this implies that there are modal conceptions of bilingualism in bilingual communities and perhaps in bilingual societies. On the basis of an empirical study in Montreal, it is argued that a modal conception of bilingualism exists among adults in greater Montreal and that this can be used both as a working definition of bilingualism and to obtain a valid measure of bilingualism.

2. These views appear to have made their way into the mainstream of contemporary sociological theory. John Rex (1974: 27), for instance, states:

> ... the use of language implies the shared acceptance, by its users, of a particular normative order and, since the evaluative and cognitive elements in language are difficult to separate from one another, there is a sense in which all users of the same language are caught up in a normative order. Moreover, beyond this again, the naming of objects might imply a reference to action, to social relations and roles, so that to use the language already implies being committed to a certain conception of normal action and social order.

Certainly this statement is in the spirit of Mead and Schutz.

3. A problem here is that of accounting for the process by which such "individualists" manage to go about in childhood awarely constructing a self out of a number of available identity options; secondly, there is a lack of reference to the typical outcomes of this process (and dealing in typification is the stock-in-trade of the phenomenologist). This appears to reflect a shortcoming handed down from the phenomenology of Husserl, who restricted his interest to the consciousness of the 'normal' adult. Schutz, like Husserl, does not provide an account of the genesis of subjective consciousness and of the development of identity. Indeed, the major contribution of Berger and Luckmann may have been to integrate into a rendition of Schutz's phenomenology, Mead's theory of the development of self, adapting it in such a way as to provide at least a preliminary account of the genesis of subjective consciousness.

4. This seems compatible with Weinreich's (1968) contention that an affective attachment is formed towards one's mother tongue which is rarely transferred to other languages learned later in life.

5. Weinreich (1968) presents a review of earlier research and Diebold (1968), a review of more recent research.

6. Weinreich (1968) reviews the earlier research whose findings are in the same direction as those of the later research reviewed by Diebold (1968). However, the earlier studies are methodologically unsound and do not warrant particular mention.

7. The literature on acculturation and assimilation is simply enormous and Richardson (1967) is referred to simply because of the typicality of his particular approach.

8. A study of the teaching of French as a foreign language in secondary schools in eight countries (Caroll, 1975) found that the time devoted to learning French is the major factor in student achievement in that subject.

9. Lieberson (1970: 101) presents data indicating that bilingualism in Canada does, in fact, decline longitudinally with age among both anglophones and francophones.

10. While these views are more extreme than those of Mead or Schutz, they are quite similar in direction.

11. It is unfortunate that empirical research on the social psychology of bilingualism was not conducted for the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Throughout its final report, the Commission makes a number of assertions concerning the effects of bilingualism: for instance, that "working in a second language is a handicap to almost everyone" (Book III: 4); that "(t)here is often a psychological effect on the person trying to function in a language not his own . . . he becomes self-conscious, which in turn leads him to withdraw from events in which he might otherwise have taken an active part" (Book III: 4); and finally, that francophones who become proficient in English and who "still maintain their culture and the use of French in their family and social lives . . . are the exceptions" (Book III: 6). Taken together, such statements throughout the report constitute an implicit but untested social psychology of bilingualism.

CHAPTER II

METHODS AND MEASUREMENT: THE MONTREAL AND RECURRENT EDUCATION STUDIES

Introduction:

Three sets of data are used in various parts of this dissertation. The first, which will be referred to as the Montreal Study, was carried out by the researcher. It was the Montreal Study that provided the *verstehen* of the phenomena which are analyzed in the dissertation; it also provided the invaluable experience of conducting and handling all phases of a major field study oneself, from the pre-testing and sampling to the drudgery of keypunching, coding, and verifying. This provides a 'feel' for one's data that is rarely approximated in secondary analysis or even in the analysis of field studies conducted for a researcher by a survey institute. Montreal was chosen as a site for a number of reasons. Firstly, it is Canada's largest 'bilingual community' (both proportionally and in terms of absolute numbers there is a high incidence of bilingualism among both anglophones and francophones); moreover, both languages can be used in a wide sphere of social activity; and, of the sites to which the researcher had access (which were few due to severe budgetary restrictions), Montreal appeared to be the most desirable, given the access it provides to anglophone bilinguals.

In the process of carrying out the otherwise useful research in Montreal, the researcher became aware that this study could not provide answers to the questions which appeared to be central to this area of research.

There were a number of deficiencies which emerged *ex post facto*. While ethnic allegiance was measured, ethnic stereotypes were not. The anglophone case base was very small.

What about the effects of demographic context? While the numerous language questions included in the interview schedule, many of them open-ended, and the copious field notes permitted a very detailed, qualitative view of bilingualism in Montreal, of the social atmosphere surrounding bilingualism in this community, of how bilinguals perceive themselves and of how others perceive bilinguals, of the linguistic behaviour of bilinguals, of their awareness of linguistic interference, of differences between the languages they use and so forth; and while one day this may be written up, the study simply does not answer the questions the researcher came to consider as crucial.[1] For this reason, the secondary analysis of a major national survey plays a larger role in this dissertation.[2] However, the Montreal Study was important in that it focussed attention on the central issues and the important variables. The study also permitted the construction of a valid independent variable used in secondary analysis.[3] It is more than a pre-test for further analysis and is used in Chapters VI, VII, and VIII.

Sampling and Related Research Procedures for the Montreal Study

A sample of 234 addresses was drawn from the Montreal City Directory which covers the City of Montreal, Côte St. Luc, Montreal West, Outremont, St. Laurent, the Town of Hampstead, Town of Mount Royal, Verdun,

and Westmount. The Directory was used to provide the sampling universe since the addresses listed in this Directory have been accumulated over the years and are checked every year, thereby providing an accurate listing of addresses in greater Montreal. The addresses were selected by placing a perforated card over every *n*th page of the Directory with nine addresses selected from each page. The address appearing in the perforation and each third address above and below the perforation were included in the sample (commercial addresses were, of course, skipped), and the procedure ended when nine addresses were selected. The page at which the procedure was started was determined by the random selection of a one digit number. Since the sample size (234) and the number of addresses to be selected from each page had already been determined, the pages from which the addresses were to be selected were determined by calculating the interval between pages necessary to cover the entire Directory from the first randomly selected page, which would yield a sample of 234 by means of 9 addresses per page. This procedure permitted the necessary degree of areal clustering in research done by one interviewer, since the addresses were arranged by street number.

The list of addresses thus compiled was then numbered and it was decided that the male head of household would be interviewed at all odd-numbered addresses and the female head of household would be the designated respondent at even-numbered addresses. Where several persons of the same sex inhabited a dwelling, the oldest person at the address was substituted for the male head of household, and the second oldest for the female head of household. Where an address was found to be uninhabited, the next address to the right was always substituted, as an arbitrary substitution

process. This sampling procedure was followed to obtain a representative sample of adult bilinguals in greater Montreal, though it does have the following limitations: young adults, the unmarried, boarders, and married persons living with their parents or in multi-family dwellings were either excluded or greatly under-represented. A further limitation was introduced in the door-step exclusion of potential respondents on grounds of linguistic background. If the designated respondent spoke, or had ever spoken, a language other than English or French, he or she was not interviewed since not only are the hypotheses not applicable to multilinguals, but the specific questions asked in the interview schedule would make little sense to them.

The sample was selected from the 1972 edition of the Montreal City Directory, and interviewing was conducted from January to early April of 1973. Thirty-two respondents were not interviewed because they spoke or had spoken a language other than English or French; there were 54 refusals; five respondents could not be located after three call-backs (this is low, probably because of the substitution procedure and the season). This process yielded 143 interviews. Both the completion and refusal rate should be calculated on a total of 202, since 32 cases were successfully contacted but were ineligible respondents. The completion rate is thus 71%, the refusal rate 27%, plus 2%, no-contacts.[4] It is difficult to give a detailed breakdown of reasons for refusals, or for refusals by sex or estimated age, since a significant minority of those who 'refused' simply motioned the interviewer away through the window, or told him to go away through the apartment building intercomm. The interviewer was unable to ascertain whether he had reached the designated respondent or not.[5] From the

field notes, it would appear that women, and non-bilinguals generally, were less interested in being interviewed. These impressions will be corroborated in subsequent pages by the comparison of the sample characteristics with those of 1971 census data for the same geographic area.

Slightly over half of the 84 items addressed to the respondent in the structured interview schedule used in the interviewing (see Appendix A) consisted of self-rating scales of linguistic and ethnic attitudes and language behaviour: subjective ethnic identity, language proficiency, language use, and language preference scales. Numerous other questions were included to elicit detailed information on the respondent's language background and past and present contact with the other language. About 40% of the questions on the interview schedule were open-ended and dealt with linguistic interference, feelings of ethnic belonging and allegiance, language learning, perception of one's ethnic identity on the part of others, feelings associated with using both languages, perceived differences in the languages and cultures, positive and negative aspects of bilingualism, and other questions relating to language use and ethnic issues. The Census mother tongue and official languages questions were included and a number of language proficiency rating scales were adapted from a study for the Gendron Commission by Serge Carlos (1973).[6] However, the questions used most extensively in the analysis of the Montreal Study are the ones which were drawn up by the researcher. The way in which particular items of the interview schedule are related to the measurement of specific hypotheses is elaborated in subsequent pages. Many of the questions asked were not related to the hypotheses put forward; a number were asked to provide relevant background material and necessary qualitative

data relevant to the central topic; others were asked to gain insight into the social atmosphere surrounding bilingualism in Montreal. These latter questions were supplemented by extensive field notes taken in the course of the interviewing, which will be referred to on occasion in the text.

The interview schedule was pre-tested in Montreal on 14 bilinguals and unilinguals of both French and English mother tongues. The final version was back-translated by two Montreal bilinguals (laymen, not sociologists) to ensure equivalence of meaning in both languages. The coding, keypunching, and verifying was done by the researcher and the coding of open-ended questions was double-checked by a colleague. The print-out of the keypunched cards was checked against the original coding sheets. A further check was conducted by cross-tabulating many of the questions with each other. Anomalies such as more respondents claiming bilingual or unilingual spouses than there were married respondents were thus corrected by referring back to the original interview documents. All self-rating scales of language proficiency, for instance, were cross-tabulated with each other and apparent inconsistencies were checked against the original documents. It was thus possible to check on most of the variables used in this study.

A Description of the Sample and a Comparison with 1971 Census Data

A special tabulation was acquired from Statistics Canada for the area corresponding exactly to that covered by the City Directory. Hence it is possible to obtain an accurate picture of some of the basic departures of the sample characteristics from those of the general population which

it represents. The special tabulation consisted of a cross-tabulation of mother tongue by age, by sex and by 'official language'; these results are presented in Tables II.1 and II.2. Those of 'other' mother tongue have been dropped from the Census tabulation since all those who spoke or had ever spoken a language other than English or French were not interviewed in the Montreal Study. However, persons who had one of the official languages as their mother tongue but who had or have a knowledge of a non-official language remain included in the the census data. If such persons are less likely to have a knowledge of the other official language, this might account for part of the discrepancy between the proportion of bilinguals in the census data vis-à-vis the Montreal Study, which is referred to below.

Tables II.1 and II.2 seem to reveal a lot about the systematic bias introduced into the interviewing process when a young, male, bilingual interviewer with a perceptible English accent in French is set loose in Montreal. From Table II.1 it can be seen that the proportion of those of French mother tongue in the sample is slightly less than their proportion in the general population corresponding to the sampling universe (71% versus 75%) and those of English mother tongue are slightly over-represented (29% versus 25%). Females are under-represented, confirming the impressions recorded in the field notes, with only 48% females in the sample as compared to 54% in the general population. The representation of each age category in the sample corresponds well with their representation in the general population. Unilinguals are under-represented, again confirming the impressions recorded in the field notes. It is particularly the unilingual French who are under-represented in the sample as compared to their proportion in the general population (25% versus 37%). This seems to indicate that the English accent did have an effect on the

TABLE II.1

COMPARISON OF SAMPLE CHAPACTERISTICS WITH

1971 CENSUS DATA FOR MONTREAL C.M.A. (in %)

	Sample	Census
Mother Tongue		
French	71	75*
English	29	25*
Total	100***	100*
Sex		
Male	52	46*
Female	48	54*
Total	100***	100
Age		
under 25	--**	--**
25-34	28	25*
35-44	24	21*
45-64	33	38*
65 and over	15	16*
Total	100***	100*

*Those of other mother tongue were dropped from the Census tabulation and the results reported are for those of French and English mother tongue 25 years of age and older.

**The 'under 25' category in the Montreal Study is not comparable with that of the Census. The Montreal Study includes only those under 25 who were not living at home.

***The N is 143.

Source: Statistics Canada, Special Tabulation no. 8884 B.

TABLE II.2

BILINGUALISM AS MEASURED BY THE 1971 CENSUS OFFICIAL LANGUAGES QUESTION IN THE SAMPLE AND IN MONTREAL C.M.A. BY AGE (in %)

Sample	Speaking Proficiency in Other Language			
	Speaks both French & English	Speaks French only	Speaks English only	Total
Montreal Sample				
under 25	55	30	15	100
25 - 34	67	24	9	100
35 - 44	68	18	14	100
45 - 64	58	30	12	100
65 and over	61	17	22	100
Montreal Census				
under 25	--	--	--	---
25 - 34	49	38	13	100*
35 - 44	50	38	12	100*
45 - 64	51	34	15	100*
65 and over	36	40	24	100*

*Those of other mother tongue were dropped from the Census tabulation and the results reported are for those of French and English mother tongue 25 years of age and older.

Source: Statistics Canada, Special Tabulation no. 8884 B.

response rate, though, according to the field notes, unilinguals generally showed less interest in being interviewed. Unilinguals are also under-represented because there were more refusals from females, who are less likely to be bilingual.[7] The fact that the interviewer explicitly stated that he was conducting a study of bilingualism and language attitudes was not, in retrospect, conducive to the creation of much enthusiasm among unilinguals; especially since the results of the study showed that being bilingual is viewed as an asset in Montreal, and those who are bilingual seem to regard unilinguals as less advantaged--even unilinguals see themselves as less advantaged.

Such are the negative aspects of 'one-man' survey research--the introduction of systematic bias into the process by respondent reaction to the personal characteristics of the interviewer, which one can do very little about. In research conducted by a number of professional interviewers, such biases are likely to cancel each other out, thus introducing less systematic bias into the interviewing process. The bias introduced into the Montreal Study was in the direction of over-representing bilinguals; under-representation of unilinguals and females is unfortunate but illustrates not only the effects of gender of the interviewer (and of age), but also the difficulties involved in interviewing in a bilingual milieu. The way in which the research is presented and the characteristics of the interviewer are likely not only to introduce a systematic bias into the research process but, perhaps, to introduce different systematic biases from one linguistic group to another. This problem has been under-researched in Canada and it is not the intention here to make an explicit contribution in this regard.

Measuring the Major Independent Variable

Since the central hypotheses of this study concern the relationship between bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes, the independent variable is degree of bilingualism. There were two basic ways in which bilingualism was measured in this study--through respondent self-ratings and the rating made on the same scales by the researcher. It was decided not to use these latter ratings as a measure of bilingualism since the use of other data sets in this dissertation requires that the various measures of the independent variable be as comparable as possible. These studies measure bilingualism by means of respondent self-ratings, as have all sample surveys in Canada in which second language proficiency has been measured.

The selection of a measure of the independent variable and the appraisal of its validity is complicated by a lack of consensus concerning how bilingualism should be measured or, indeed, what bilingualism is. Van Overbeke (1972) suggests that such a consensus is unlikely to emerge given the different conceptions of bilingualism emanating from different intellectual traditions. Van Overbeke (1972: 113-119) lists twenty-one definitions of bilingualism ranging from that of Haugen, who sees bilingualism as the ability to "produce complete, meaningful utterances in the other language," to that of Bloomfield who refers to bilingualism as the "native-like control of two languages." Attempts have been made to measure bilingualism through speed and content

of response on word-association tests, on speed of translation tests, and the like. These all share the same problem -- the problem of validity. These tests simply do not constitute tests of that which we mean in everyday life by "bilingualism." The only criterion for the validity of such tests can be the degree to which they correspond to the person's ability to have himself considered bilingual by others in his social world. Any other definition or test of bilingualism makes little sense. It is for this reason that Malherbe (1969: 50) states:

> It is doubtful whether bilingualism *per se* can be measured apart from the situation in which it is to function in the social context in which a particular individual operates linguistically.

After several decades of research on language measurement, the best that can be said is the following (Macnamara, 1969: 90):

> To sum up, the psychologist who wishes to obtain subjects of a certain degree of bilingualism in order to study some aspect of bilingual behavior is best advised to measure degree of bilingualism with those very skills which he wishes to manipulate in the course of his investigation. As a rough screening device he will probably find self-ratings and speed of reading aloud . . . the most satisfactory indirect measure.

The point is, that the most elaborate and "scientific" of tests yet developed has yet to prove its value as a "rough screening device" of greater validity than self-ratings. If the validity of objective measures of language achievement must finally be rooted in the reality of the social world, and such an objective measure has yet to be developed, the question arises as to the validity of self-ratings.

There are three basic problems with all self-ratings of bilingualism: to what extent is the respondent capable of accurately assessing his own second-language proficiency, to what extent are responses to self-ratings distorted (perhaps deliberately) for various reasons, and to what extent does the self-rating measure used constitute a valid and reliable measure of second-language proficiency? The major obstacle to coming to grips with any of the above issues has been, as Lieberson (1966: 269) has pointed out, "the lack of a clear-cut operational definition of ability to speak a given tongue." There is, in other words, a lack of consensus among 'experts' as to what constitutes "bilingualism." While Lieberson (1966; 1969) has been an astute critic of self-rating measures of bilingualism used in censuses, he has also been a user of census data (cf. 1965; 1970). Lieberson (1970: 18-19) sidesteps the problem in making the following assumption:

> Residents of multilingual communities receive sufficient exposure and contact with speakers of both tongues that they may rapidly find out if they can indeed communicate in French and/or English. In other words, in cities such as Montreal, no matter how isolated the resident, he will learn in short order whether he can communicate in these tongues.

This assumption must be made by both census-takers and census-users, and by all social scientists using self-rating scales as measures of second language proficiency. The key aspect of Lieberson's assumption is that it implicitly dispenses with the need for professional agreement on the meaning and measurement of bilingualism. This Lieberson does in assuming that residents of multilingual communities can accurately appraise their knowledge of both languages in the light of feedback received in the course of living their lives in such communities. This, in turn, assumes that such

feedback is relatively consistent -- that there is modal conception of bilingualism in multilingual communities. Van Overbeke (1972: 65) suggests that in everyday life a person is considered to be bilingual when he has assimilated the second language *"à la satisfaction de son entourage immédiat."* To be bilingual from this perspective is to be proficient enough in the other language to satisfy the requirements of one's immediate environment. This approach would suggest that modal community or societal conceptions of bilingualism be used to define bilingualism and against which respondents' abilities to rate themselves, and self-rating scales could themselves be appraised.

The first and most important question for the validation of Lieberson's assumption (and the census official languages question) is that of the existence of modal conceptions of bilingualism in bilingual communities. Table II.3 reveals that there appears to be such a modal conception of bilingualism in greater Montreal. Bilingualism is generally conceived of in terms of an undefined ability to speak the other language which was minimally defined by some respondents as the ability to 'get by' (*se débrouiller*) in the other language. The meaning typically given bilingualism in this community appears to be that of being able to cope with the normal situations of everyday life in the other language. While the proportion of respondents sharing this modal conception of bilingualism varied according to mother tongue, still, over half the respondents of both French and English mother tongue subscribed to this conception: fifty-six percent of the French and 71% of the English respondents conceived of bilingualism as the simple ability to speak the other language. Those of French mother tongue tended to be stricter than those of English mother tongue in their

TABLE II.3

CONCEPTIONS OF BILINGUALISM IN MONTREAL (in %)

"what does being bilingual mean in your opinion?"	Sample Characteristic		
	Montreal	French	English
To speak both languages	60	56	71
To speak both languages well	29	36	10
To speak both languages and to have a knowledge of both cultures	11	8	19
Total	100	100	100
N	(143)	(102)	(41)

conception of bilingualism. While 40% of the total sample perceived bilingualism as the ability to speak both languages *well* or to speak both languages *and* have a knowledge of both cultures, 44% of those of French mother tongue as compared to 29% of those of English mother tongue defined bilingualism in this way (Table II.3).

Conceptions of bilingualism differ markedly according to self-rated degree of bilingualism (Table II.4). The more fluent bilinguals espouse a stricter conception of bilingualism whether they are of French or English mother tongue. Seventy-three percent of the unilinguals in the sample, 62% of unilinguals of French mother tongue and 95% of unilinguals of English mother tongue, defined bilingualism as the simple ability to speak the other language. However, only 52% of bilinguals, those who speak both languages but who are more fluent in their mother tongue shared this view of bilingualism; still fewer equilinguals (47%) subscribed to this conception. Despite these variations, there does appear to be fundamental agreement as to the nature of bilingualism in greater Montreal. While subscription to the modal definition varies significantly with degree of bilingualism, with fluent bilinguals holding more restrictive conceptions, and while there are less significant variations according to mother tongue, this modal conception still persists. Variation across age, sex, and social class categories were less important than variations according to mother tongue.

The census official languages question would therefore appear to have face validity as a measure of bilingualism in Montreal. The question put to respondents in the 1971 census was "Can you speak English or French well enough to conduct a conversation?" This seems to be a measure of the

TABLE II.4

CONCEPTIONS OF BILINGUALISM IN MONTREAL BY DEGREE OF BILINGUALISM (in %)

"What does being bilingual mean in your opinion?"	Degree of Bilingualism		
	Unilingual	Bilingual	Equilingual
		Montreal	
To speak both languages	73	52	47
To speak both languages well	24	37	16
To speak both languages and to have a knowledge of both cultures	3	11	37
Total	100	100	100
N	(59)	(65)	(19)
		French	
To speak both languages	62	50	56
To speak both languages well	35	46	13
To speak both languages and to have a knowledge of both cultures	3	4	31
Total	100	100	100
N	(40)	(46)	(16)
		English	
To speak both languages	95	58	--
To speak both languages well	0	16	--
To speak both languages and to have a knowledge of both cultures	5	26	--
Total	100	100	--
N	(19)	(19)	(3)

simple ability to speak the other language, which is what is stressed by Montrealers.

If the census official languages question constitutes a valid measure of bilingualism, it was reasoned, there ought to be a close correspondence between considering oneself to be bilingual and claiming an ability to conduct a conversation in the other official language. These data are presented in Table II.5 and they lend strong support to this aspect of the validity of the census official languages question. For the total sample, only 9% of those who considered themselves to be 'not bilingual' claimed an ability to conduct a conversation in both official languages. Everyone who claimed to be bilingual also claimed to be able to conduct a conversation in both official languages. The discrepancy between the responses to both questions exists only among those of French mother tongue. As has been pointed out, the French mother tongue group tends to hold a slightly more restrictive conception of bilingualism than the English. While all bilinguals of French mother tongue claimed an ability to conduct a conversation in both official languages, 12% of those of French mother tongue who rated themselves as 'not bilingual' claimed an ability to conduct a conversation in both official languages.

A further check on the validity of the census question was provided by the comparison of the respondent's self-ratings to those made by the interviewer (who was following the instructions accompanying the 1971 census form).[9] Table II.6 reveals a high correspondence between respondent self-ratings and those of the interviewer. For the total sample, the interviewer ranked 12% of respondents claiming an ability to conduct a conversation in both official languages as being able to conduct a conversation

TABLE II.5

BILINGUALISM BY ABILITY TO CONDUCT A CONVERSATION IN THE NON-MOTHER TONGUE (in %)

Census Official Languages Question	Not Bilingual	Bilingual
	Montreal	
Can Conduct a Conversation in Mother Tongue Only	91	0
Can Conduct a Conversation in Both Official Languages	9	100
Total	100	100
N	(59)	(84)
	French	
Can Conduct a Conversation in Mother Tongue Only	88	0
Can Conduct a Conversation in Both Official Languages	12	100
Total	100	100
N	(40)	(62)
	English	
Can Conduct a Conversation in Mother Tongue Only	100	0
Can Conduct a Conversation in Both Official Languages	0	100
Total	100	100
N	(19)	(22)

TABLE II.6

SELF-REPORTED ABILITY TO CONDUCT A CONVERSATION IN THE NON-MOTHER TONGUE BY INTERVIEWER RATINGS (in %)

Census Official Languages Question	Observer Ratings: Can Conduct a Conversation in Mother Tongue Only	Observer Ratings: Can Conduct a Conversation in Both Official Languages
	Montreal	
Can Conduct a Conversation in Mother Tongue Only	88	4
Can Conduct a Conversation in Both Official Languages	12	96
Total	100	100
N	(58)	(85)
	French	
Can Conduct a Conversation in Mother Tongue Only	92	3
Can Conduct a Conversation in Both Official Languages	8	97
Total	100	100
N	(36)	(66)
	English	
Can Conduct a Conversation in Mother Tongue Only	82	5
Can Conduct a Conversation in Both Official Languages	18	95
Total	100	100
N	(22)	(19)

in one official language only. On the other hand, the interviewer rated 4% of those who claimed that they could *not* conduct a conversation in both official languages as, in fact, being able to do so. The interviewer rated 18% of the English who claimed to be able to conduct a conversation in both official languages as being capable of conducting a conversation in their mother tongue only. By this same measure, only 8% of those of French mother tongue over-report. Paradoxically, a slightly higher proportion of anglophones under-report their proficiency in the other official language. The interviewer rated 5% of the English who claimed not to be able to conduct a conversation in the other official language as being able to do so; only 3% of those of French mother tongue who claimed not to be able to conduct a conversation in both official languages were rated as being able to do so. By this measure, both over- and under-reporting is more frequent on the part of the English.

While the census question, a simple self-rating scale of language proficiency, seems to be a reasonably valid measure of what is minimally meant by bilingualism in Montreal, it appears subject to error of both under- and over-reporting, and especially of the latter. The self-rating scale of language proficiency developed for this study seems a better one for our purposes in sorting respondents into two categories -- 'bilingual' and 'unilingual'. No respondent in the sample who claimed to be bilingual claimed not to be able to conduct a conversation in both official languages, whereas 9% of the sample who claimed to be able to conduct a conversation in both official languages claimed not to be bilingual. Since over-reporting as measured by the interviewer ratings was 12% for the Montreal sample on the census measure, the question arises as to whether over-report-

ing on the measure of bilingualism used in this study was any less. As can be seen from Table II.7, over-reporting in terms of the interviewer ratings declines, for the total sample, to 6% from 12% on the census question; however, under-reporting goes up from 4% to 15%. The main point of disagreement here between the ratings of the respondent and those of the interviewer was on whether the respondent should have claimed to be bilingual with the qualification that he spoke his mother tongue 'much better.' The respondents seemed to have been less lenient than the interviewer in interpreting this question. Since over-reporting declines considerably with the use of this measure, it seems more suitable.

While thus far the validity of self-rating measures in terms of their ability to distinguish between bilinguals and unilinguals in the sample population has been discussed, a further distinction must be introduced if it is wished to vary degree of bilingualism. The question asked respondents (responses to which constitute the measure of bilingualism) was: "Which of these statements regarding degree of bilingualism in English and French best describes *you*?" there were six options -- the respondent could indicate that he was not bilingual, that he spoke his mother tongue a little more or much more fluently, or that he spoke both languages equally well; alternately, he could indicate that he was much more or slightly more fluent in the other official language. Since no one of either French or English mother tongue in the sample indicated that his fluency was greater in the other official language, these latter categories are superfluous. The remaining four categories were collapsed into three by placing those who indicated that they spoke their mother tongue "much better" or a "little better" into the same category. Given the small num-

TABLE II.7

SELF-RATINGS OF BILINGUALISM BY INTERVIEWER RATINGS OF BILINGUALISM (in %)

Self-Reported Bilingualism	Interviewer Ratings			
	Not Bilingual	Bilingual	Total	N
			Montreal	
Not Bilingual	85	15	100	(59)
Bilingual	6	94	100	(84)
			French	
Not Bilingual	85	15	100	(40)
Bilingual	3	97	100	(62)
			English	
Not Bilingual	84	16	100	(19)
Bilingual	14	86	100	(22)

ber of cases and the necessity of distinguishing between the French (*N:* 102) and the English (*N:* 41), this was necessary if a quantitative analysis was to be carried out. Theoretically, it seemed more meaningful to distinguish between those who are equally fluent in both languages, and those who are bilingual but whose mother tongue is dominant. Guboglo (1974) distinguishes between Tatar-Russian bilinguals who know both languages equally well, those who are fluent in both but who have one language in which they are more fluent, and unilinguals.

It can be seen from Table II.8 that the addition of a further distinction in the level of second language proficiency resulted in a greater degree of dissensus between respondent and interviewer ratings than was the case in simple dichotomous ratings. While on both the census self-rating question and the measure of the independent variable in this study, there is a high degree of agreement between respondent and interviewer ratings in terms of sorting people out into two categories, bilingual and non-bilingual; this agreement evaporates in distinguishing between bilinguals and equilinguals. While there is a high degree of agreement between the respondents and the interviewer on the rating 'not bilingual' (85%), and on the rating 'bilingual but more fluent in the mother tongue'(94%), on the rating 'speaks both languages equally well,' the respondents and the interviewer agreed only 37% of the time. The interviewer in making his ratings was heavily influenced by notions of equilingualism (which is held to be almost non-existent) in linguistics. Consequently, the respondent had to approach the standards of a Trudeau or a Spicer to gain such a rating from the interviewer. It is apparent that the respondents had a different image in mind of what it is to be *parfait bilingue.*

TABLE II.8

SELF-RATINGS OF DEGREE OF BILINGUALISM BY INTERVIEWER RATINGS (in %)

Self-Reported Degree of Bilingualism	Interviewer Ratings				
	Not Bilingual	Bilingual	Equilingual	Total	N
			Montreal		
Not Bilingual	85	15	--	100	(59)
Bilingual	6	94	--	100	(65)
Equilingual	--	63	37	100	(19)
			French		
Not Bilingual	85	15	--	100	(40)
Bilingual	4	96	--	100	(46)
Equilingual	--	62	38	100	(16)
			English		
Not Bilingual	84	16	--	100	(19)
Bilingual	11	89	--	100	(19)
Equilingual	--	67	33	100	(3)

The issue then becomes not whether the interviewer was right and the respondents wrong, but whether the distinction made by the respondents is a meaningful one, and, if so, whether this distinction suits our theoretical purposes. From the field experience, it was evident that those who claimed to be equally fluent in both languages differed as a group in degree of fluency in the non-mother tongue than those who claimed to be bilingual at a lesser degree of proficiency. This is indicated by the higher proportion of the group claiming to be equally proficient in both languages who espouse a stricter conception of bilingualism than other respondents, a finding already mentioned in previous pages. Also, a higher proportion of this group on another self-rating measure claimed to speak the other language 'very well' and to think in the other language when they spoke it. Since it is hypothesized that the effects of bilingualism will differ according to degree of bilingualism, and since the distinction made by the respondents on this question seemed to be meaningful and valid, it was decided that this measure of the independent variable suited both the theoretical purpose which lay behind the attempt to sort respondents according to degree of fluency in the other language, and the characteristics of the sample.

Measuring Intervening Variables

The intervening variables in the Montreal Study are intensity of use of the other language, breadth of exposure to the other culture, and perceived identity in the eyes of others when the second language is used. As a measure of intensity of use of the other language, the frequency with

which the respondent spoke, read, and wrote the other language was used. A distinction was made between those who spoke or read the other language every day or every second day and those who spoke or read the other language less often. A similar distinction was made between those who wrote in the other language every week or more frequently, and those who wrote in the other language less often than every week. A scored variable of intensity of language use was then created. Breadth of exposure to the other culture was measured by means of a scored variable which measured the breadth of language use in three domains. Regarding domains of language use, Fishman (1964: 37) writes:

> Thus far this topic has been of systematic concern only to a very few linguists, anthropologists and sociologists. Their interest has not yet led to the construction of measuring or recording instruments of wide applicability in contact settings that appear to be very different from one another. One of the major difficulties in this connection is that there is little consensus concerning the definition and classification of the domains of language behavior in bilingual communities.

Fishman (1964: 38) notes that Schmidt-Rohr enumerated nine domains of use: the family, the playground and the street, the school, the church, literature, the press, the military, the courts, and the governmental bureaucracy. Barker, and Barber, in studies of populations undergoing acculturation use four domains: familial, informal, formal, intergroup (Fishman, 1964: 38). As Fishman (1964: 38) states, "there is no empirical evidence concerning the adequacy of these domains." It seemed more appropriate for the purposes of this study to utilize the following domains of use: home, education, work, recreation, friendship, and the mass media.

Language of exposure to the mass media is a scored variable of exposure to radio, television, magazines, newspaper, movies, and theatre in the other language. In constructing a scored variable for breadth of exposure to the other culture, items which correlated very highly with each other were dropped. Language use in the domains of recreation and friendship correlate very highly with language spoken at home in the case of both mother tongue groups, therefore only language use in the home was included (Table II.9). The scored variable for breadth of exposure to the other culture is therefore comprised of the following variables: language use in the home, language use at work, and language of exposure to the mass media. These three variables distinguished between those who spoke their mother tongue only or mostly in that domain, those who spoke both languages equally, and those who spoke the other language mostly (the same kind of coding was used for the mass media items).

Whether or not one is perceived as a member of the other group when one uses the other language was measured by means of a question which asked: "Is your (other language) so good that most people think it is your mother tongue?" This is the question that is used in the data chapters although a second question was asked: "Has it ever happened that when you speak (your other language) people have thought that you were (a member of the other ethnolinguistic group)?" Basically, the idea was to discover with what degree of frequency the respondent was able to "pass".

TABLE II.9

INTERCORRELATIONS OF MEASURES OF LANGUAGE USE

Montreal French

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Language use at home	...	.77	.56	-.10	.12
2. Language use with friends		...	.42	.06	.11
3. Language use in recreation			...	.24	.09
4. Language use at work				...	.22
5. Language of exposure to mass media					...

Montreal English

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Language use at home	...	.88	.79	.30	-.01
2. Language use with friends		...	.90	.45	-.02
3. Language use in recreation			...	.38	-.04
4. Language use at work				...	.23
5. Language of exposure to mass media					...

Finally, a failure to measure an intervening variable adequately must be reported. It was initially intended to control for whether or not a respondent had an *instrumental* or *integrative* orientation toward the other language, given the emphasis Gardner and Lambert (1972) place on this distinction (Berger and Luckmann seem to make a similar distinction). In an attempt to measure whether a respondent had an *instrumental* or *manipulative* attitude toward the other cultural scheme of interpretation and expression, two open-ended questions in sequence were asked. The first question asked: "What do you think are the advantages of knowing (the other language)?" The second asked: "Has what (other language) you know helped you in life?" It was intended to code the respondent as having an *instrumental* or *manipulative* orientation if the respondent linked his knowledge of the other cultural scheme of interpretation and expression to the work world, to getting ahead in his job, to instrumental aspects of social interaction, and so forth. If the respondent linked his knowledge of the other language to appreciation of the other culture and its people, it was intended to code the respondent as having an *integrative* or *non-manipulative* attitude. However, nearly everyone mentioned some combination of the *instrumental* and the *integrative*. These were clustered around four themes: work, social interaction ("friends","parties","girl friends of the other language," etc.), travel, and culture (everything from newspapers and magazines to movies, records, and theatre). The coding of these four basic items and their combinations ran into double columns. Sorting the respondents into the three categories of *instrumental*, *integrative*, and *mixed* was attempted and abandoned since it could not be done without 'forcing' the data. This was not, after all, research carried out among students in a program of second language instruction but among practising bilinguals in a bilingual community.

It could be argued that such orientations are indeed 'out there' but that the researcher failed to devise an adequate measure of these concepts. To this it could be responded that a clear conceptual definition of the concepts of *instrumental* or *manipulative* is lacking in the works of those who use these terms (Lambert, and Berger and Luckmann). All that can be said is that in the Montreal Study, very few respondents gave evidence of a purely *instrumental* or purely *integrative* attitude towards their other language; it is a matter of *more or less instrumental* and *more or less integrative*. This would suggest that a considerable amount of research must be invested in conceptualization, operationalization, and measurement before this distinction can be of much use in research on bilingual communities.[10] It would appear that some form of standardized scale might be more successful at differentiating between bilinguals on this dimension.

The Dependent Variables

The dependent variables are ethnolinguistic identity and ethnic allegiance. The way in which these variables were measured will be taken up in turn. As Enloe (1973: 16) points out:

> . . . ethnicity depends on self-identification, not on objective categorization, although the way an individual defines himself is partly a response to other people's perception of him.

The way in which ethnic identity is measured here is very similar to the way in which subjective social class has been measured since Centers' (1949) classic study. However, it is now well known that responses to such

subjective identification questions are influenced by the number and kind of response categories presented the respondent. In this study, an attempt was made to minimize such problems by measuring ethnic identity on questions very similar to those used in the study of subjective social class but using two questions with different numbers and kinds of response categories and including an open-ended response category in each instance. The first question presents seven options to the respondent, the last one of which is open-ended. These provide a variety of regional, national, and ethnic identity options. The second question, asked in a different portion of the interview, provides only two ethnic categories, and a category "belongs to both groups," in addition to an open-ended option. It was intended as an open-ended "forced choice" question. These questions proved quite unproblematic for all respondents in the sample.

Whether or not one took a neutral stance in ethnolinguistic disputes was determined by responses to the following question:

> When important issues arise between the English and French in Montreal or in Quebec over such things as the role of the French language in business and in the school system, and the role of the provincial government in Quebec society, do you find that you are more on the French side, more on the English side, or what?

Another question asked only of those who claimed to be bilingual was:

> It is said about bilinguals that they sometimes feel caught in the middle when disputes arise between French and English. Does this happen to you or do you find no trouble siding with one group or the other?

The reader might rightly object at this point that the second question is "loaded." But, whereas the first question was intended for quantitative analysis (where it is used), the second was intended, rather, to elicit emotional reactions -- 'feelings', 'self-perceptions' -- and proved, during the interviewing, to be quite successful in doing just that. There was a fundamental difference in the responses of bilinguals to the latter question: some said either that they sided with the mother tongue group or that the statement was true of them; others said it was not true of them, but they did know some bilinguals like that. Moreover, the question educed verbalizations of what is meant by various identity labels. These responses will be referred to in Chapter VI. It should be noted that these questions attempted to measure 'ethnic allegiance' which implies commitment, non-neutrality and non-objectivity in matters between membership groups. This refers in large part to an affective rather than a cognitive dimension of attitude. Research on ethnic relations in Canada has tended to focus on cognitive rather than affective dimensions of attitude, especially in survey research studies, and the particular questions used here were formulated without the benefit of the research experience of others. An effort was therefore made to use questions which appeared to have face validity and which would be contextually relevant to respondents. While the researcher's M.A. thesis (Lamy, 1969) constituted an attempt to measure affective dimensions of ethnic attitudes (by means of the semantic differential), the technique used did not lend itself readily to incorporation into the interview schedule.

Standard Control Variables

Standard controls for age, sex, education, and occupation are used in the analysis. Education is measured in terms of numbers of years of formal education. Given the small size of the sample, a dichotomous control for education was created which distinguished between those having twelve years or less and those having thirteen years or more of formal education. The respondent was asked for as much specific information as possible concerning his occupation, and in the case of housewives, concerning the occupation of their spouse. Each occupation was assigned a prestige rating based on the Pineo-Porter (1967) rankings of occupational prestige. Since 102 of the 143 respondents were of French mother tongue, the French prestige scores were used in the ratings, though this is not of great import since the French and English prestige scores correlate so highly (.97). The scores were rounded to a one-digit number since finer distinctions were neither necessary nor advisable given the small case base. A minority of the occupations coded did not correspond exactly to those for which prestige rankings were available. In such cases, the rounded prestige score of the most comparable occupation for which there were such scores was assigned. Decisions made in these instances were double-checked by a colleague.

The Recurrent Education Study

To complement the Montreal Study and to provide a check on the effects of breadth of exposure to the other culture, and of the effects of being perceived as a member of the other group when the second language is

used, a number of questions were included in a survey carried out for another project in Ottawa of which the researcher was principal investigator. The Recurrent Education Study was conducted in Ottawa between November, 1974, and February, 1975, by the York Survey Research Center. The sample was selected by means of a multi-stage, stratified, clustered procedure. The target population was those persons 18 and over in the Census Metropolitan Area of Ottawa. The census tracts of the Ottawa C.M.A. were stratified according to the proportion of francophone head of households, and the strata were substratified to ensure regional coverage within the C.M.A.. Two samples of households were selected by a procedure which ensured that each household would have approximately the same final probability of selection. Within each household, one person was selected from a list of household members 18 years of age or over, and then the households were further stratified into sub-strata. The first sub-stratum consisted of all the households where the person selected was of French mother tongue and the second sub-stratum consisted of all the households where the person selected had a mother tongue other than French. Since the number of respondents to be interviewed was set at approximately 500, and this to include an approximately equal number of anglophones and francophones, there was a constant sub-sampling ratio of francophones, and a sub-sampling ratio that allowed proportionate sampling of those of other mother tongue. Finally, census enumeration areas were used as clusters. These procedures yielded 401 interviews with 202 persons of French mother tongue and 199 of other mother tongues. Since a complex weighting procedure is involved, which inflates the case base to astronomical proportions, the sample size was brought back down to its original size by dividing the

number of weighted cases into the number of original cases and multiplying the weight of each case by the product.

Bilingualism, the independent variable, was measured by means of a question which asked: "How well do you speak (the official language)? Very well, well, with difficulty or not at all?" In response to this 67% of the sample of English and French mother tongue indicated that they did not speak the other language at all or spoke the other language with difficulty (these two categories have been collapsed); 13% claimed to speak the other language well, and 20% claimed to speak the other language very well (Table II.10). It was decided to consider those who claimed to speak the other language well or very well to be bilingual, since by this measure 33% of the total sample of those of French and English mother tongue would be classified as "bilingual" which compares well with the proportion of bilinguals in the population twenty and over in the Ottawa Census Metropolitan Area (31%).[11] While by this measure 90% of the sample of French mother tongue are bilingual (Table II.10) unilinguals are actually overrepresented since only 2% of the Ottawa C.M.A. population over twenty-years old speaks French only. Since there is little choice, the three categories used to vary degree of bilingualism distinguishes between those who are not bilingual (those who did not speak the other language at all or who spoke the other language with difficulty), those who spoke the other language well, and those who spoke the other language very well. This measure of bilingualism is less restrictive than the measure used in the Montreal Study in that proportionately fewer respondents were classified as bilingual in that study than would have been the case if the census question had been used. In the Ottawa sample, since the proportion of those classified

TABLE II.10

SPEAKING PROFICIENCY IN THE OTHER LANGUAGE
IN THE RECURRENT EDUCATION STUDY (in %)

Sample Characteristic	Speaking Proficiency in the Other Language				
	Not at all or with Difficulty	Well	Very Well	%	N
English Mother Tongue	86	07	07	100	267
French Mother Tongue	10	30	60	100	84
Total Sample	67	13	20	100	351

as bilingual on the measure slightly exceeds the proportion of those in the Ottawa C.M.A. population claiming an ability to converse in the other language, the measure is less restrictive.

The dependent variable, subjective ethnic identity, was measured by means of a question which asked: "Do you feel you have more in common with English-speaking Canadians or French-speaking Canadians?" The responses were coded "more in common with English-speaking Canadians," "more in common with French-speaking Canadians," "as much in common with both." The dependent variable, it could be argued, does not constitute a measure of the same dimension of ethnic belonging as the dependent variable in the Montreal Study. As Schutz (1964: 251) points out with regard to the sometimes ambiguous concept of ethnic belonging:

> The subjective meaning of the group, the meaning a group has for its members, has frequently been described in terms of a feeling among the members that they belong together, or that they share common interests.

The dependent variable provided by the Recurrent Education Study, a measure of how much in common the respondent feels he has with each group, should be affected by bilingualism in much the same way as it affects ethnic identity as measured in the Montreal Study.

In terms of intervening variables, the Recurrent Education Study permits controls for both breadth of exposure to the other culture and perceived identity by others when the second language is used. The respondent was asked whether he spoke English, mostly English, both languages equally, mostly French, or French only at work and at home the day previous to the interview. The respondent was also asked what language or languages were

used in the last conversation held with a close friend. A scored variable was then created based on language use in the home, language use at work, and language of exposure to the mass media.

The ethnic identity attributed to the respondent by others when he spoke the second language was measured by means of the following question: "Do you speak (the other official language) so well that people think you are (other official language speaker) when you speak that language?" Thus we are able to implement similar controls as those used in the Montreal study.

There are a number of reasons for the differences in which the independent, dependent, and intervening variables are measured in the Recurrent Education as compared to the Montreal Study. First of all, the number of questions on language which could be included in the study was limited by two factors: the language questions had to be at least indirectly related to the needs of the sponsor, and secondly, in terms of objectives of the study and the length of the interview, the questions included had to be short, clear, and direct to cut down on interview time. Thirdly, the sponsor requested that the principal investigator eliminate certain questions and change the wording of others. However, despite these differences, one would have more confidence in the findings of the Montreal Study if it emerged that a different study, in a different bilingual community, in which different measures were used produced results which were in the same direction. Therefore, both studies will be used in Chapters VI and VII.

Finally, the categories of French and English in the reporting of the results of the Recurrent Education Study were established by means of the census mother tongue question. All those who had a language other than

French or English as their mother tongue were dropped from the analysis, leaving 354 weighted cases. In terms of standard controls for age, sex, education, and occupation, which are implemented since bilingualism varies across these categories, the distinction was made between those under 25, those 25-34, those 35-44, those 45-59, and those 60 and over. The education categories group together those with grade school or less, those with high school or less, and those with more than high school education. To control for occupation, the Blishen scale was divided into quartiles based on the sample distribution on the scale.

Summary

The hypotheses to be tested in this dissertation are the following:

1 Dominant language is the best predictor of ethnic identity in Canada.

2.1 Bilinguals identify with both groups whose languages they speak.

2.2 Bilinguals take a neutral stance on ethnic issues.

2.3 Bilinguals manifest lower social distance and less prejudice towards the other language group.

2.4 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 vary positively with degree of bilingualism.

3 As bilingualism declines the effects of bilingualism recede.

However, it is important to control for demographic context, intergroup contact, breadth of exposure to the other culture, and intensity of use of the other language in addition to relevant background characteristics (age, sex, education, occupation). This is necessary to test the adequacy of the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation (cf. Chapter 1).

The Montreal Study permits a test of hypotheses 2.1, 2.2, and 2.4. While the Montreal Study includes a measure of the independent variable (bilingualism) and of two of the dependent variables (subjective ethnic identity and stance taken on ethnic issues), it does not include measures of social distance or ethnic prejudice, and therefore hypothesis 2.3 is not testable by means of this study. Nor does it permit a test of the first and third hypotheses since the N is far too small. The Montreal Study permits controls for breadth of exposure to the other culture and for intensity of use of the other language in addition to controls for the usual background variables (age, sex, education, and occupation). However, a measure of intergroup contact was not included and demographic context cannot be varied.

The Recurrent Education Study (Ottawa) permits a test of hypotheses 2.1 and 2.4 since a measure of the independent variable (bilingualism) and the dependent variable (subjective ethnic identity) are included. The N is too small to permit a test of the first and third hypotheses. Since measures of stance taken on ethnic issues, social distance, and ethnic prejudice were not included, hypotheses 2.2 and 2.3 cannot be tested with this study. While breadth of exposure to the other culture and standard background variables are available as controls, intergroup contact was not measured and demographic context cannot be varied.

Another data set, the Ethnic Relations Study, which permits a test of all the hypotheses other than 2.2 became available from the York Survey Research Center after work on the dissertation had begun. This study, which is introduced in Chapter lll, includes a measure of the independent variable (bilingualism) and of a number of dependent variables (subjective ethnic identity, social distance, and ethnic prejudice). It permits controls for demographic context, intergroup contact, and for standard background variables

FIGURE II.1

MEASURES OF VARIABLES BY DATA SET*

VARIABLES	MONTREAL STUDY	RECURRENT EDUCATION STUDY	ETHNIC RELATIONS STUDY
Independent			
Bilingualism	X	X	X
Dominant Language	X	-	X
Dependent			
Subjective Ethnic Identity	X	X	X
Stance in Ethnic Disputes	X	-	-
Social Distance	-	-	-
Ethnic Prejudice	-	-	-
Intervening			
Intergroup Contact	-	-	X
Demographic Context	-	-	X
Breadth of Exposure to Other Culture	X	X	-
Intensity of Use of Other Language	X	-	-
Age	X	X	X
Sex	X	X	X
Education	X	X	X
Occupation	X	X	X

*An 'X' indicates that a measure of the variable is available in the study; an '-' indicates that a measure is not available.

(age, sex, education, occupation). Unfortunately, the Ethnic Relations Study does not permit controls for breadth of exposure to the other culture and intensity of use of the other language which might be masked in controlling for intergroup contact. In Figure 11.1, the measures of the independent, dependent, and control variables which each of the three studies includes are indicated.[12]

The value of using all three data sets will become apparent through the use to which they are put in the data chapters.

NOTES

1. Robert Dubin has long been a strong advocate of the importance of good descriptive sociology and has deplored the neglect of such research in modern North American sociology. The problem with research on bilingualism is that there has been an acute shortage of empirical work directed at testing the explicit or implicit theories pertaining to bilingualism--yet there are literally thousands of descriptive studies; Mackey's (1972) international bibliography of research on bilingualism has over eleven thousand entries, very few of which are of major theoretical import. In this area of research, as in many others, descriptive studies all too often incorporate latent theoretical premises in terms of which 'description' is made meaningful. It is usually only when one attempts to make explicit the implicit theoretical content of descriptive studies that one becomes aware of major theoretical problems, tautological reasoning, and so forth.

2. These data became available only after work on the dissertation had commenced. An earlier version obtained from one of the original investigators proved very difficult to work with given the resources available and the level of expertise of the researcher at the time.

3. Without any way of validating the independent variable, the analysis presented in the data chapters would have been open to major criticism. This is why considerable attention is devoted to the measurement of the independent variable, bilingualism.

4. For a male interviewer in an urban area doing cross-cultural interviewing, the refusal rate of 27% might be considered low. The interviewing was done in the dead of winter when respondents are likely to be less active. In periods of particularly bad weather--three-day snowstorms and fourteen below weather, for instance--refusals were rare and in such periods it was possible to complete up to six interviews a day.

5. When the interviewer sneaked into apartment buildings and knocked on the door, sometimes all that happened in response to the knock and any continued knocking was the audible shuffling of feet or the appearance of an eye at the peep-hole without the door ever being opened or without even an 'Hello?"

6. The questionnaire used in the Carlos study was made available by Jacques Brazeau who also provided some useful hints and ideas concerning the research problem and the methods planned to cope with it.

7. Table 11.2 reveals a rather puzzling discrepancy. Among those 65 and over in the sample, 61% claimed to be bilingual as compared to only 36% of this age category in the general population. This is probably due to the vagaries of chance. However, the older age group was particularly inclined to be ingratiating. It was very noticeable to the interviewer that the older respondents often served the interviewer coffee and wanted to continue interaction after the interview was completed. Perhaps this had something to do with the season--older people probably do not get out and about as much in the dead of winter. The interviewer suspects that since he had indicated that his purpose was to

conduct a study of bilingualism that there might have been some induced over-reporting in this age group. But this is slippery ground, and the best that can be said is that it constitutes an informed judgement.

8. Among these are the study of language use conducted for the Gendron Commission by Serge Carlos, the study of the attitudes of young Canadians by J.W.C. Johnstone for the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, the Pineo-Porter study of occupational prestige, and the Ethnic Relations Study conducted by the Social Research Group.

9. The instructions for the Census official languages question requested that respondents not claim to be able to conduct a conversation in the other official language unless they were able to converse in that language for a reasonable length of time and on diverse topics ("de pouvoir soutenir une conversation assez longue sur divers sujets").

10. Lambert's measures of "integrative" and "instrumental" orientation (cf. Gardner and Lambert, 1972: 148) were not suitable for use in the Montreal Study. The questions used as measures of these concepts (such as "It will help me to understand the French people and their way of life") are geared to people who are in or about to commence a course of second language instruction. Secondly, the semantic differential scale is used, (which is self-administered) which is not appropriate for use in interviews.

11. This information was obtained from the 1971 Census of Canada, Volume 1, Part 4 (Bulletin 1.4-5).

12. The three studies were carried out at different points in time--the Ethnic Relations Study in 1965, the Montreal Study in 1973, and the Recurrent Education Study in late 1974 and early 1975. It could be argued that developments in French-English relations in Canada over the past decade might have had considerable impact on the kinds of results obtained. This would appear not to be the case, at least as regards the phenomena which constitute the major focus of this dissertation. It will be shown in the data chapters that despite different measures of the major independent and dependent variables (bilingualism and subjective ethnic identity), the correlations between these two variables are remarkably similar across all three studies. Indeed, this is an example of the utility of employing all three data sets in the analysis!

CHAPTER III

THE ETHNIC RELATIONS STUDY

Introduction

In response to growing nationalism and political unrest in Quebec, the Liberal government of Lester B. Pearson established the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in 1963. The Commission was instructed to "inquire into and report upon the existing state of bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada" (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, 1965: 151). Extensive research on ethnic relations in Canada was conducted for the Commission which involved a considerable number of the country's foremost social scientists in various capacities--as research staff, as consultants, or as researchers under contract. Several attitude surveys were sponsored by the Commission, the largest of these being the Ethnic Relations Study carried out by the Social Research Group. This constitutes the major data source for this dissertation; the data set was acquired from the York University Institute for Behavioural Research Survey Data Bank. The Ethnic Relations Study is used to test all of the hypotheses with the exception of 2.2 (for which the Montreal Study is used).

There is much that might be said about this particular study since, despite the fact that it constitutes one of the largest and most

expensive social surveys ever conducted in Canada, little has been said about it or done with it. Few articles based on this data set have been published, though a number of papers based on it, which were presented at various academic meetings, appear never to have found their way into print. The data are widely available, yet there appear to be at least a dozen Canadian sociologists who have come away empty-handed from their encounters with it.

What, then, are some of the problems with the Ethnic Relations Study? There are some problems with the sampling techniques used; these are discussed later in this chapter. But the more visible problems pertain to the research instrument and to the data themselves.[1] Attention will be confined to the problems pertaining to the secondary analysis conducted for this study, since it is neither necessary nor within the frame of reference of this dissertation to provide a critique of the Ethnic Relations Study in its entirety, or to make an apology for it.

The researcher who is unfamiliar with the Ethnic Relations Study is likely to be bewildered by his first encounters with the data set. The basic problem lies with the research instrument and with the way in which it was administered; respondents were asked versions of two series of questions according to different ethnolinguistic selection criteria. First of all, different versions of a series of second language use and second language proficiency questions were asked according to the language the respondent spoke most of the time at home; this was defined as his "principal language." Unfortunately, almost a hundred respondents indicated that they spoke both English and French at home. The interviewers, in these instances, appear to have asked both sets of questions, or only one set, according to whatever criteria seemed appropriate to them. There

are also several cases of respondents not being asked a set of questions which corresponded with their "principal language." Secondly, different versions of a series of questions concerning contact, frequency of contact, and place of contact with the "other" group were asked according to whether the respondent identified himself as "English Canadian," "French Canadian," or "Other." Since five hundred and eighteen respondents identified themselves as "Canadian," this probably created some difficulties for the interviewers with regard to the particular version the respondent was to be asked. Questions on whether or not the respondent was willing to have members of the "other" group as close friends or relatives, and as to whether or not the "other" group treated everyone else as equals or whether they acted superior were also included in this latter series.

A major source of confusion would appear to arise from respondents having been asked either more than one set of questions in each of these series, or both series corresponding to different ethnolinguistic groups. This may account for some of the discrepancies in the Ethnic Relations Study data set.[2] One wonders about the reactions of French respondents who were asked whether they would be willing to have French Canadians as close friends or relatives, and so forth. This can sour an entire interview. So can interviewing a respondent in a language in which he is not very proficient, apart from whatever other biases may be introduced when this occurs. In the Ethnic Relations Study, the codebook indicates that 295 respondents of French "principal language" were interviewed in English as compared to 42 respondents of English "principal language" who were interviewed in French. What this means in concrete terms is that a substantial proportion of the weighted francophone cases outside of Quebec were interviewed in English. The effect of this remains unresearched in Canada. Since a report of the fieldwork is not available for this study, these interpretations are strictly intuitive. Suffice it to

say, there are processing errors in the Ethnic Relations data. By processing error is meant the inclusion of responses to questions which one would think respondents ought not to have been asked, the presence of responses which appear highly implausible, and responses on one question which contradict those on another.

The processing errors in the Ethnic Relations Study appear to be of a greater magnitude than that which is normally encountered in social surveys. Examples of the first two types of processing error have already been given. As an example of the third kind of error, let us take the category "speaks both languages equally well," a response elicited to the question asking the respondent which language he speaks best. This is then cross-tabulated with a question asking the respondent how well he speaks the other language. One is surprised to find that a proportion of the French and English (as measured by "principal language") who speak both languages equally well are coded as not speaking the other language fluently. To wit, 1.4%, 0.6%, and .01% of those of French home language, and 2.6%, 1.0%, and 1.6% of those of English home language who claimed to speak both languages equally well, were coded on the other language proficiency measure as speaking the other language with some difficulty, with great difficulty, or not at all. In comparison, on the Recurrent Education Study, the researcher found only one respondent (N: 401) who was coded as not being fluent in the other language, yet who was coded as using the other language in several domains of language use (this respondent was eliminated). The processing errors in the Ethnic Relations data appear, then, to be of considerable magnitude, at least in comparison with the some half dozen other surveys with which the researcher is familiar.

Since there are systematic errors in the Ethnic Relations Study and these are of greater magnitude than usual, it is of importance to point out

what was done about these errors, and what impact they have on the results presented here. The first step was to calculate mother tongue according to the language the respondent's parents spoke at home. If both parents spoke the same language at home, the respondent was assigned that language as his mother tongue. Everything was then keyed to mother tongue and worked out by means of IF and SELECT IF statements using the SPSS package. For example, only respondents whose mother tongue was French were allowed to respond to the questions concerning willingness to have English Canadians as close friends or close relatives. These procedures were followed with regard to *all* of the dependent and intervening variables. As for the independent variable, this combined the category "speaks both languages equally well" taken from the question asking the respondent which language he spoke best, with responses to a question asking the respondent how well he spoke the other language. Since the category "speaks both languages equally well" was not pre-coded but came directly from the respondent, it was given priority over responses to the second question. The second question was then split into two categories--those who spoke the other language with no difficulty, and all the others. Only a person of French mother tongue could respond to the French version of the question, and only a person of English mother tongue could respond to the English version of this question. Thus, by confining our attention to the universe of those of French and English mother tongue and proceeding from this point of departure, the problems associated with the Ethnic Relations Study were greatly attenuated.

As far as the experiences of other researchers are concerned, the Ethnic Relations Study poses a further problem--the lack of variance in

response to most of the attitudinal questions. On a large number of questions the bulk of the respondents fell into the same categories regardless of origin, language, or background variables. For instance, almost everyone is willing to have everyone else as close friends or relatives. Such measures of social distance may well "work" in the United States in a study of white attitudes to American blacks, but they are not subtle enough for the Canadian context. The attitudinal measures, if used as dependent variables against which are run all the standard independent variables used in sociological research, produce uniformly weak correlations. Given the above, it can be intuited that many who tried their hand at the ERS data lost enthusiasm in the face of both lack of correlations and the "clean-up" operation that is involved in putting the data to a specific use. However, after the procedures previously described were followed, the Ethnic Relations Study turned out to be a most useful and interesting data set in terms of the focus of this dissertation.

The Ethnic Relations Study Sampling

The Ethnic Relations Study sample was selected by means of a weighted, multi-stage, stratified area random procedure (Social Research Group, 1965). The electoral lists for the 1963 federal elections constitute the universe from which the sample was drawn. The procedure followed was to divide this universe into five regional strata from which the Yukon and Northwest Territories were excluded. These regions were: the Atlantic Provinces (Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island); Quebec; Ontario; the Prairies (Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta); and British Columbia. The electoral districts in these five regional strata were then divided into rural and urban districts. The rural and urban

districts of each regional stratum were then divided into three further strata according to the proportion of French in the electoral district, with these proportions varying from one regional stratum to the other; in Quebec, the proportion of English in the federal electoral district was used. Then federal election districts were chosen randomly from within each of these strata (for example, Quebec rural 1). The number of districts chosen from each of these strata was "determined arbitrarily while keeping in mind the relative size of each stratum" (Social Research Group, 1965: Appendix 1). The number of districts chosen per stratum varies from one to sixteen. One hundred and forty-two of 263 electoral districts were thus chosen with the probability of inclusion of each district being proportional to its number of registered voters. The number of interviews to be conducted was fixed at four thousand, and the number of interviews to be carried out within each regional stratum was determined according to the total electoral population of each stratum. The number of interviews to be carried out within each stratum of electoral districts within a region was determined by the proportion of the electoral population in the stratum relative to that of the others in the region, while the number of interviews conducted within each federal electoral district was determined by the proportion of electors in the district relative to the total electoral population of each stratum of electoral districts.

To over-represent the French outside of Quebec and the English in Quebec, the electoral lists of each federal electoral district selected were divided into two strata. A 'minority' stratum was created of those polling areas with federal electoral districts in the Atlantic Provinces, Ontario, the Prairies, and British Columbia, in which the proportion of French names on the polling lists reached 25% of the poll population; the residue constituted the 'majority' stratum. In Quebec, the inverse procedure was followed, and English names were substituted for French names. The choice of polling districts was

random with each poll in each stratum having an equal chance of being selected. Where a 'minority' polling district was chosen, two other 'minority' polling areas were selected. Then a sample of addresses was drawn from each polling district with the first one chosen at random and the others at fixed intervals. At each address thus selected where an interview "could not be conducted," a neighbouring address was substituted. If the address selected was a French name outside of Quebec, or an English name in Quebec, a 'French' or 'English' address was substituted accordingly whether it was a neighbouring address or not. This procedure led to the completion of 4,071 interviews and a weighted sample of 23,459 cases. The sample was brought down to approximate the original number of cases by dividing the original number of cases by the number of weighted cases, and by multiplying the weight of each case by the product. Thus the number of weighted cases is 4,070.

There are two major problems with the sampling procedure followed. Firstly, it is assumed that there is a close correspondence between having a French name outside of Quebec or having an English name in Quebec, with language and ethnicity. The existence of Daniel Johnsons and Claude Ryans makes this assumption of more than passing interest. Richard Joy (forthcoming) has pointed out that even a cursory check of the phone books in the Quebec Eastern Townships and a comparison of this with the census data on ethnic origin for this area, reveals a poor correspondence between the proportion of English names in the phone books and the proportion giving English as their ethnic origin on the census question (which asks the ethnic origin of one's male ancestors). There is no reason to assume that the correspondence between name, language,

and ethnicity is any closer in similar areas outside of Quebec where the French have been linguistically assimilated over several generations. To check on this, since names were already coded as French or non-French, respondent names were cross-tabulated by ethnic origin coded as French or non-French. While these data will be presented in Chapter IV with regard to the validity of the ethnic origin measure, suffice it to say that in Canada 18.5% of those with French names do not claim French paternal ancestry and 10.3% of those with non-French names do. A second problem pertains to the substitution procedure: the way in which substitutions were made appears to constitute a deviation from random sampling and to constitute a form of quota sampling. A detailed account of how substitutions were made is not given; of 4044 respondents for whom there is such information, 1975 (or 46.4%) were substitutes; some of these were "second" or "third" substitutions.[3]

Sorting Out The French From The English

The Ethnic Relations Study does not include a measure of mother tongue. It does include, however, a measure of the language parents of the respondent speak most of the time at home, the respondent's present language of the home, and the language which the respondent speaks best. Since it is standard practice among Canadian social scientists to report their research by mother tongue group, and since this practice is adopted in the Montreal and Recurrent Education studies, it was decided to seek an equivalent measure in the Ethnic Relations Study. There were other reasons as well. Since it is desired to exclude multilinguals, the best way of doing this with regard to the Ethnic Relations Study, was to in-

clude only those of English or French mother tongue, to exclude all those who spoke a non-official language at home, or who spoke a non-official language better than an official language.[4]

Mother tongue was determined in the following manner: if both parents spoke either of English or French most of the time at home, the respondent was considered to be of that mother tongue. All other cases were dropped from the analysis, and hence there is no need for a control for bi-ethnicity. Seven hundred and twenty-eight weighted cases were thus dropped leaving a total of 3,342 weighted cases.[5]

The Independent Variable in the Ethnic Relations Study

As a measure of bilingualism, the question used asked whether the respondent spoke the other official language without any difficulty, with some difficulty, with a great deal of difficulty, or whether he did not speak the other official language at all.[6] Only 17% of the Canadian population twenty years of age or over are bilingual in terms of the census official languages question (those who spoke neither English nor French were dropped in making this calculation). From Table III.1 it can be seen that 13% of the sub-sample of the Ethnic Relations Study claim to speak the other language with no difficulty whereas 18% claim to speak the other language with some difficulty. Since to consider only those who spoke the other language with no difficulty as bilingual would present a problem of under-representation of bilinguals and the inclusion of those who spoke with some difficulty would create a problem of over-reporting, there is no satisfactory solution.

As we have seen from Chapter II, the use of the Census question results in over-reporting, if used as a measure of bilingualism. Since it is bilingualism we wish to measure, it was decided to consider as bilingual

TABLE III.1

SPEAKING PROFICIENCY IN THE OTHER LANGUAGE
IN THE ETHNIC RELATIONS STUDY (in %)

Sample Characteristic	Speaking Proficiency in the Other Language					
	No Knowledge	Great Difficulty	Some Difficulty	No Difficulty	%	N
English Mother Tongue	67	16	14	3	100	2121
French Mother Tongue	28	16	27	29	100	1220
Total Sample	54	15	18	13	100	4069

only those who reported that they spoke the other language with no difficulty. However, it is not sufficient to distinguish between those who speak the other language with no difficulty (bilinguals) and those who do not. The measure of bilingualism in the Montreal Study makes a distinction between bilinguals who are more fluent in their mother tongue and bilinguals who speak both languages equally well. Fortunately, there is a question in the Ethnic Relations Study which asks the respondent which language he speaks best; the respondent could reply that he spoke both languages equally well. By means of combining this latter question with the other language proficiency measure, it was possible to sort out respondents into three categories: unilingual, bilingual, equilingual. This, it was maintained in Chapter 11, is the theoretically meaningful distinction.

Measuring the Dependent Variables in the Ethnic Relations Study

There are two measures of ethnic identification in the Ethnic Relations Study. The one which seems the most useful in terms of the theoretical orientation and hypotheses of this study is that which requires the respondent to locate himself in ethnic space vis-à-vis both official language groups. Subjective ethnic identity has been conceived of throughout as subject to change, and as something which can have considerable nuance, rather than as something fixed and concrete. Consequently, the following question is used as the primary measure of ethnolinguistic identity: "Do you feel closer to English Canadians or closer to French Canadians?" However, another measure of subjective ethnic identity is also used in the analysis based on the following question: "To what ethnic group do you consider you belong?" In the Montreal Study two measures of ethnic identity were used. Both asked the respondent what he considered himself to be and presented him with a number

of options including the option of claiming an identity not among those presented to him by the interviewer. However, the two questions differed with regard to the options presented the respondent by the interviewer. The first one listed a variety of ethnic, geographical, and national identitites whereas the second one presented only the identities "French Canadian," "English Canadian," and "belong to both groups." In the Ethnic Relations Study, the coding of the question which locates the respondent in ethnic space vis-à-vis both language groups distinguishes between those who felt closer to the English or French, and those who felt as close to neither, or somewhere in between. This question, therefore, seems to correspond quite closely in substance to the second identity question of the Montreal Study. However, those who indicated that they felt close to neither group, which involved a small number of cases, were dropped from the analysis since this does not locate the respondent in ethnolinguistic space. The categories 'as close to each' and 'somewhere in between' were combined since these seem to locate the respondent in the same ethnic space. Finally, the remaining categories can be combined for both studies in this manner: for the Ethnic Relations Study, responses can be coded as "locates in space of mother tongue group" and "locates as close to each or between both groups."

Since 2% of these of English mother tongue and 4.2% of those of French mother tongue in the Ethnic Relations Study placed themselves closer to the other group in ethnic space, and since a good proportion of such cases are accounted for by changes in dominant language, these cases were dropped from the analysis. In the case of the Montreal Study, those who identified themselves as "Canadians" or as anything other than that which was specified in the available options were dropped from the analysis

(22 cases), with the exception of those of French mother tongue who identified themselves as "Québécois"; in this latter instance, these responses were treated as "French Canadian". In this way, comparable dependent variables were created for both studies. The dependent variable in the Recurrent Education Study is unproblematic since it permits the following coding scheme: "more in common with mother tongue group", and "as much in common with both groups."

Finally, as a test of the hypothesis that bilinguals manifest lower social distance and less negative stereotyping with regard to the other group, a number of dependent variables were used. As measures of social distance, questions were used on which the respondents indicated their willingness to have members of the other groups as best friends or as close relatives, as were their preferences as to the ethnic composition of voluntary associations. These questions are straightforward and simple (Appendix C) and appear to capture the essence of what is generally meant by social distance (cf. Levine and Campbell, 1972). As measures of negative stereotypes of the other group questions used were those put to the respondents concerning the perceived quality of the other group's language, and concerning whether the other group was trying to gain too much influence in politics. These questions were chosen because they called upon the respondent to make an evaluation based upon a vague stimulus to which there is no "correct" answer -- one wonders what it means to "act as if they were above other people", to try to gain "too much" influence in politics, and on what grounds one would assess the "quality" of another group's language. Certainly, an image of the other group as acting superior, as trying to get too much influence in politics, or as

speaking a low grade language is certainly not a favourable one. As such, the questions appeared useful as a rudimentary measure of negative stereotypes of the other language group.

Controls Used in the Ethnic Relations Study

The controls implemented in the analysis of the Ethnic Relations Study are for interpersonal contact, frequency of interpersonal contact, frequency of speaking the other language, and demographic context (ethnic composition of the electoral district and linguistic composition of the region). There are also some problems with these measures. First of all, the measure of interpersonal contact is very rudimentary; respondents replied "yes" or "no" to a question which asks "Do you know or do you have contacts with French Canadians (or English Canadians, as the case may be)?" The frequency of interpersonal contact is measured by a question which confuses past with present contact; this question asks "Do you have (or did you have) contacts with French Canadians frequently, occasionally, or rarely?" With this there is the problem that it is not possible to distinguish between the respondent who had frequent contact with French Canadians in his army days and who hasn't seen one since, and the respondent who presently has frequent contact with French Canadians. It was decided to use the second question despite these problems, since the first question is simply too rudimentary to be considered an adequate control for interpersonal contact. The control for frequency of speaking the other language distinguishes between those who speak the other language every day or quite often, and those who speak the other language rarely or never. Electoral districts were coded as a control

for demographic contact according to their ethnic composition. As will be seen from Chapter IV, and as can be seen from Ryder's (1955) discussion of the ethnic origin question in the Canadian census, there is only a moderately high correspondence between ethnicity and language in Canadian society, and this correspondence is particularly poor in areas where one language group or the other is being assimilated, such as the Eastern Townships in Quebec, or in southern Ontario. Therefore it was decided to distinguish only between those electoral districts where the French or the English were in a majority; the "mixed" electoral districts of all kinds were dropped.[7] The linguistic composition of the region was coded as 'mother tongue group in majority' or as 'mother tongue group in minority.'

Also implemented are the familiar controls for gender , age, education, and occupation. While gender, age, education and occupation are not expected to be significant intervening variables, Lieberson (1970) has shown that bilingualism varies not only with mother tongue (and, of course, region) but with gender, age, education and occupation. Lieberson (1970) concludes that for francophones in particular, there is a signigicant economic incentive towards becoming bilingual. Since the data are reported according to mother tongue, controls for gender, education and occupation will be implemented. To control for age, the respondents were grouped into the following age categories: 29 and under, 30 - 39, 40 - 49, 50 - 59, 60 - 69, 70 and over. In controlling for education, a distinction was made between respondents having seven years or less of formal schooling, those having between 8 and 13 years, and those having fourteen years or more of formal schooling. The control for occupation

consisted of the following categories: operatives, service workers, labourers, and farmers (who will be referred to as "blue collar workers"); clerical, sales and kindred (who will be referred to as "white collar workers"); professionals, technicians, managers, officials, proprietors, and kindred (who will be referred to as "managerial and professional workers"). These constitute the controls which will be implemented wherever the Ethnic Relations Study is used. Lastly, a word is in order concerning measures of association and methods of implementing controls.

A Methodological Digression on Measures of Association

Pearson's r will be used as a measure of association, and partial correlation will be used for the purpose of implementing controls.[8] The independent variable, bilingualism, is a three category ordinal scale along which the respondents are classified as unilingual, bilingual, and equilingual. The dependent variables are dichotomous nominal variables. While a variety of measures of association applicable to interval scales can be used in conjunction with dichotomous nominal variables and interval variables, some controversy surrounds the use of measures of association applicable to interval scales in conjunction with nominal variables and ordinal scales. Labovitz (1970) argues that on empirical grounds, there is little reason not to treat ordinal data as if they were interval if one has a valid reason for doing so. While he acknowledges that in so doing "some small error" is involved, this is more than counter-balanced by the gains accruing from the subsequent availability of "more powerful, more sensitive, better developed, and more clearly interpretable statistics

with known sampling error" (Labovitz, 1970: 515). Less data is "wasted" than where complex controls in cross-classification analysis become impossible due to the rapidly diminishing number of cases in the cells of a given table with each additional control. These problems do not occur when partial correlation, multivariate correlation, and regression are used. Variance can also be computed, for which there is no equivalent in ordinal measurement, and the variance computed for ordinal scales treated as interval scales can be interpreted in the same way as for interval data (Labovitz, 1970: 523).

Labovitz's position is based upon empirical demonstration. Henkel (1975a) takes issue with Labovitz upon both logical and empirical grounds. However, Henkel's logical critique is not without its own problems; Henkel (1975a: 6) can be characterized as a'perfectionist' in that he takes the position that the "correlation coefficient . . . has minimal utility in either the construction or validation of theory" and that "theoretical statements must be in a functional (in the mathematical sense) form." According to Henkel (1975a: 6-7) the task of "objective scientific research should be the establishment of functional relationships by which the values of a dependent variable may be predicted given knowledge of the independent variable(s)...only then it becomes of some value to look at correlation coefficients."

If Henkel were to be taken seriously, much of what passes for sociology would be thrown out the window and much of that which would meet Henkel's standards would be regarded as devastatingly trivial by all but its practitioners. For instance, in the case of our particular research, a valid interval measure of bilingualism has yet to be constructed

and there is not even a consensus at the level of conceptual definition. With regard to the dependent variables, there is the same lack of consensus as to conceptual definition and the phenomena under study are not easily amenable to interval measurement. Also, in a world of limited resources, the researcher must often make do with what is at hand, and this is the fundamental issue with which "pragmatists" come to grasp and which 'perfectionists' tend to ignore. However, Henkel's critique is not only logical but empirical; in a lengthy technical argument Henkel (1975a) demonstrates that the high correlations between the rank correlation and the Pearsonian correlation reported by Labovitz (1970) were due to the rectilinear distributions of the data. Labovitz (1975: 33) himself admits that caution is called for in nonrectilinear cases, that is, whenever there are exponential distributions or skewed dichotomies. In a rejoinder to Labovitz, Henkel (1975b: 38-39) shies away from meeting Labovitz on empirical ground and retreats further into a strict philosophy of science position from which he concludes that "the paucity of information relevant to the argument for treating ordinal and quasi-interval data as interval . . . do not adequately justify such treatment." Not only is Henkel's "philosophy of science" a rather shrill theology of science, he seems also to have overlooked the fact that the "paucity of information" to which he refers, pertains to empirical information which demonstrates that the treatment of ordinal data as interval is not, in fact, justified. The empirical information thus far available favor treating ordinal data as interval except where exponential or skewed dichotomous distributions are involved.

The same conflict between the "perfectionist" and the "pragmatist" positions is in evidence in the recent exchange between Hornung (1975) and Hunter (1975). Hunter (1973; 1975) would have us look pragmatically at the "validity" of measures association in terms of the criterion of the correspondence of such measures with intuitive judgement; Hornung (1975: 979) chides Hunter for the inappropriate use of an interval measure of association in the process of validation: "the criterion variable, being an ordered metric-scale at best, does not meet the required assumption of interval measurement." Hunter (1975: 996) replies that Hornung "is expressing only one (and an increasingly rejected) point of view on the matter." It is unfortunate that there is a tendency on the part of those who invoke "*the* philosophy of science" to attribute to it the status of a sociology of science. The weight of the empirical evidence is in favor of the treatment of ordinal data as interval data under specified conditions. The postulates of a philosophy of science are themselves proper subjects of empirical investigation and when certain strictures are found wanting empirically, they too must be modified or rejected.[9]

It seems justifiable, then, in terms of this study, to pose and to answer Labovitz's question (1975: 29): "what would happen or how useful is the statistic for my problem if I violate assumptions(?)" Before proceeding to answer this question, it should be pointed out that one cannot violate a *false* assumption, a point which the "pragmatists" overlook. Both Labovitz and Hunter are, in effect, saying that the assumption is erroneous as it now stands. The question to be posed in terms of this study is that of whether the ordinal independent variable should be treated as if it were interval. Firstly, the hypotheses point to a linear relationship

between the independent and dependent variables. Secondly, without the use of partial correlation, it would not be possible to conduct a quantitive analysis of any of the data sets used in this dissertation at least not if complex controls are to be implemented, and these are necessary for a careful test of the hypotheses (in the Ethnic Relations Study, there are a relatively small number of anglophone bilinguals and in the other data sets a relatively small number of cases). It is for these reasons that Pearson's r, as a measure of association, and partial correlation as a method for implementing controls, seem to offer advantages over currently available statistical procedures for handling ordinal data.

In this instance there appears more to be gained by "violating" assumptions than by abiding by them. It can be contended that in social science research, the consequences of not violating assumptions are as important as the consequences of violating them. It is not a methodological *faux pas* to violate an assumption unless it can be shown that such a violation leads to the production of false or misleading results, and that other procedures available lead to "truer" or less misleading results.[10] The lag in the development of sophisticated statistical techniques applicable to ordinal data ought not to result in the abnegation of research on significant theoretical or substantive issues unless the violating of levels of measurement assumptions results in distortions so gross as to make the enterprise worthless.

Summary

Three data sets will be drawn upon to test the hypotheses put forward in Chapter I -- the Montreal Study, the Recurrent Education Study, and the Ethnic Relations Study. The ways in which these data sets will be used to test the specific hypotheses has been indicated in the text of Chapter II and III and needs no repetition here; the same applies to the ways in which the independent, dependent, and intervening variables were measured in each study. In the next Chapter, the first hypothesis, that dominant language is the best predictor of ethnic identity in Canada, is considered.

NOTES

1. Jonathan Pool, who provided the data set to the York Institute of Behavioural Research, served as a sounding board for several of the problems I encountered in the course of secondary analysis. Some of the points set forth in this Chapter were clarified in the course of discussion with him though the viewpoints expressed are my own. Pool also provided useful comments on earlier drafts of the analysis appearing in the dissertation.

2. For instance, two hundred and six respondents of English mother tongue, English home language, and English dominant language were asked whether they would like English Canadians as close relatives (seven of these were coded as not being willing to do so).

3. The proportion of substitutions and the sampling procedures based on the ethnolinguistic characteristics of the respondents' names appears to be a serious weakness in design.

4. Had the categories of 'French' and 'English' been established on the basis of language spoken at home, it would not have been possible to screen out the same proportion of multilinguals (or bilinguals in an official language and a non-official language).

5. Social science survey research in Canada might benefit considerably from the development of a set of basic, standardized ethnolinguistic variables which would be included in all major surveys. To date, there has been little coordination of effort along these lines--most of the major surveys conducted over the past decade and a half have used their own measures of subjective ethnicity and of second language proficiency, for instance. There has been a neglect of the problems surrounding the validation of various language background variables, and even the Canadian Census is amiss in this instance.

6. The questions constituting measures of the variables used in the secondary analysis of the Ethnic Relations Study are to be found in Appendix C.

7. These cases are dropped only where controls for this variable are implemented.

8. The only exception is in Chapter IV where Cramer's V is used since the dependent variable is a three-category nominal variable while the independent variables are dichotomous nominal variables.

9. We sometimes lose sight of the fact that philosophies of science are not theologies, and that their tenets are open to the same methods of investigation which they prescribe. Labovitz (1970) succeeded in arousing considerable controversy in adopting the latter course. His article appears to have been widely read by sociologists with an interest in methodological matters not only because it makes life a little easier for those of them engaged in empirical research but also because the contents seem to correspond with the experience and intuitive judgement of a good many of them.

10. "Pragmatists" might be less concerned with whether one should use procedure A or procedure B according to the canons of a philosophy of science than they are with whether following either procedure yields different results, and if so, under what circumstances. For instance, If one argues that one measure of association rather than another should have been used based on a priori reasoning, the pragmatist might point out that both yield similar results under certain kinds of circumstances, and one is therefore, in these circumstances, entitled to use either.

CHAPTER IV

LANGUAGE AND ETHNIC IDENTITY IN CANADIAN SOCIETY

Introduction

The "language as a vehicle of culture" theory attributes causality of observed associations between bilingualism and subjective ethnic identity to bilingualism itself--in internalizing another linguistic system, according to this theory, one also internalizes the cultural scheme of interpretation and expression of which it is the vehicle (cf. Chapter 1). As was pointed out in Chapter 1, it would be difficult to maintain that bilingualism has an effect upon ethnic identity such that a bilingual identifies with both language groups without conceding that the loss of the first language learned, and its replacement by another, involves identification with the group whose language is now spoken. The "language as a vehicle of culture" theory would seem to imply that the language one speaks best, best predicts one's ethnic identity. In this Chapter, the hypothesis that dominant language is the best predictor of ethnic identity in Canadian society will be tested.

Since there is an appreciable rate of language transfer from one official language group to another in Canada (Arès, 1975; Castonguay, 1974a, 1974b; Castonguay and Marion, forthcoming; Joy, 1972; Lieberson, 1970) this hypothesis is amenable to empirical verification by means of the Ethnic Relations Study since a measure of the language spoken best is included. All tables in this Chapter, therefore, are from the Ethnic Relations Study. To test the hypothesis that the language one speaks best is a better pre-

dictor of subjective ethnic identity than other predictor variables, mother tongue, language of the home, language spoken best, and ethnic origin will be used as independent variables with subjective ethnic identification as the dependent variable. The measure of subjective ethnic identification is that which locates the respondent vis-à-vis the two official language groups (cf. Chapter III). Attention will be confined to the universe of those having an official language as their mother tongue.[1]

That dominant language ought to best predict subjective ethnic identity is not at all obvious. Berger and Luckmann (1967: 143-144) claim that languages learned later in life rarely attain "the inevitable, self-evident reality of the first language learned in childhood." Weinreich (1968) reflects a rather popular view in asserting that an affective attachment is formed to the mother tongue that is rarely transferred to other languages learned afterwards. This is the usual objection to dominant language, the language spoken best, as an objective measure of ethnicity.[2] Canadian social scientists in reporting the results of their research have traditionally established their ethnolinguistic categories by means of a measure of mother tongue, language of the home, and less frequently, ethnic origin; the latter is almost never used where the other two are available (except when a specific purpose requires that this procedure be used). Ethnolinguistic categories have never been based, at least to my knowledge, on the language spoken best, which suggests that, at least in the minds of social scientists, mother tongue and language of the home are considered the best objective measures of ethnicity in Canadian society.

Canada is not a linguistically stable society, and therefore all the language predictor variables have their problems as measures of objective ethnicity. The problem with mother tongue as an objective measure of

ethnicity is that there is intra-generational shift in the language spoken best--that is, people do transfer to other main languages in the course of a lifetime. This means that those who use mother tongue as a measure of objective ethnicity must cope with the critiques of proponents of the "language as a vehicle of culture" theory. While in earlier times, the Catholic clergy in Quebec used to bandy about the cliché that to lose one's language was to lose one's religion, contemporary French-Canadian nationalists seem to equate loss of language with loss of ethnic identity (cf. Arès, 1975; Castonguay, 1974a, 1974b). With regard to language of the home, it is well-known that the language spoken at home does not always correspond either with dominant language or mother tongue, especially in contexts where there is a degree of exogamy; hence its use as an objective indicator of ethnicity is not usually warranted where mother tongue is available. The poorer the degree of correspondence between mother tongue, language of the home, and dominant language in a given society, the greater the degree of linguistic instability (in terms of linguistic and, presumably, ethnic shift) and the more problematic choice of measures of objective ethnicity becomes. In these terms, what picture emerges of Canada's official language groups?

The Degree of Correspondence Between the Language Predictor Variables

There is a very high correspondence between mother tongue, home language, and dominant language among anglophones in Canada and in all of its regions (Tables IV.1, IV.2, and IV.3). Mother tongue and home language correspond 98.9% of the time for this group. There is not much regional variation since in all regions except Quebec (where the rate is 91.2%), mother tongue and home language correspond over 99% of the time. There is an equally high correspondence between mother tongue and dominant language

among anglophones. In Canada, and in all regions except Quebec, English mother tongue and English dominant language correspond over 99% of the time; in Quebec the rate of correspondence is 93.4%. Therefore, it would appear that it matters very little if one uses mother tongue, language of the home, or dominant language as a measure of objective ethnic identity for this group (except with regard to those of English mother tongue in Quebec), since the degree of inter-correlation is very high indeed. The situation for those of French mother tongue is markedly different--French mother tongue and French home language correspond only 90.2% of the time in Canada as a whole, and this ranges from a high of 97.9% in Quebec, to 76.9% in the Maritimes, to 66.8% in the Prairie provinces, and to 56.6% in Ontario. The correspondence between French mother tongue and French dominant language is even poorer--the rate of correspondence is 85.8% in Canada as a whole, and from a high of 94.9% in Quebec it plunges downward to 70.7% in the Maritimes, to 57.4% in the Prairie provinces, and to 45.1% in Ontario. What this means is that in Ontario only 45.1% of those who have French as their mother tongue, and hence the language thatthey spoke best at one point in their lives, still speak French better than the other official language! There is a much lower correspondence between the language spoken at home and the language spoken best by those of French mother tongue. For those of French mother tongue in Canada as a whole, the rate of correspondence is 93.4%, but in Quebec it is 96.5%; this drops to 85.4% in the Maritimes, to 78.3% in the Prairie provinces, and to 70.9% in Ontario. In other words, other than for those of French mother tongue in Quebec, it cannot be assumed that mother tongue, language of the home, and the language spoken best are equally good predictors of ethnolinguistic identity for those of French mother tongue.

TABLE IV.1

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MOTHER TONGUE AND LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME FOR THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE GROUPS IN CANADA AND REGIONS (in %)

MOTHER TONGUE	CANADA	MARITIMES	QUEBEC	ONTARIO	PRAIRIES	B.C.
			ENGLISH HOME LANGUAGE			
ENGLISH	98.9	99.4	91.2	99.2	99.8	100.0
N	(2,116)	(296)	(153)	(954)	(434)	(279)
			FRENCH HOME LANGUAGE			
FRENCH	90.2	76.9	97.9	56.6	66.8	-----
N	(1,216)	(77)	(946)	(141)	(41)	(11)

TABLE IV.2

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MOTHER TONGUE AND LANGUAGE SPOKEN BEST FOR THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE GROUPS IN CANADA AND REGIONS (in %)

MOTHER TONGUE	CANADA	MARITIMES	QUEBEC	ONTARIO	PRAIRIES	B.C.
			ENGLISH BEST LANGUAGE			
ENGLISH	98.9	99.2	93.4	99.0	99.5	100.0
N	(2,113)	(297)	(153)	(952)	(434)	(277)
			FRENCH BEST LANGUAGE			
FRENCH	85.8	70.7	94.9	45.1	57.4	-----
N	(1,220)	(78)	(947)	(142)	(41)	(12)

TABLE IV.3

CORRESPONDENCE OF LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME AND LANGUAGE SPOKEN BEST BY MOTHER TONGUE FOR CANADA AND REGIONS (in %)

LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME	CANADA	MARITIMES	QUEBEC	ONTARIO	PRAIRIES	B.C.
		ENGLISH BEST LANGUAGE AND ENGLISH MOTHER TONGUE*				
ENGLISH	99.6	99.9	99.5	99.5	99.6	100.0
N	(2,084)	(294)	(139)	(943)	(431)	(277)
		FRENCH BEST LANGUAGE AND FRENCH MOTHER TONGUE**				
FRENCH	93.4	85.4	96.5	70.9	78.3	-----
N	(1,095)	(59)	(925)	(80)	(27)	(4)

*"English Best Language and English Mother Tongue" means that these respondents, all of whom spoke English at home, also spoke English best and had English as their mother tongue as well.

**"French Best Language and French Mother Tongue" means that these respondents, all of whom spoke French at home, also spoke French best and had French as their mother tongue as well.

In making this point, a bleaker picture has been painted of the state of the French language in Canada than that portrayed in analyses of the Canadian Census (Castonguay, 1974a, 1974b; Joy, 1972; Lieberson, 1970). First of all, a number of deficiencies in the sampling procedure of the Ethnic Relations Study were called to the reader's attention in Chapter lll. These alone make comparison with the Census somewhat tenuous. Secondly, "mother tongue" was calculated in this analysis of the Ethnic Relations Study by means of the language spoken by the respondent's parents at home. Thirdly, with regard to dominant language--the language spoken best, if a respondent spoke both French and English equally well, he was coded as no longer speaking his mother tongue best.[3] However, a stand must be taken with regard to the results reported here concerning the proportion of those with a French mother tongue having an English home language. The proportion of respondents of French mother tongue having an English home language is considerably higher in the results presented here than the proportion worked out based on the Canadian Census (Castonguay, 1974a, 1974b; Castonguay and Marion, forthcoming).[4] It is readily conceded that the analysis of the Ethnic Relations Study might be reporting *over-estimations*; the Census, however, yields under-estimations of such transfers. This requires elaboration.

Since the Census defines mother tongue as the first language learned and still understood, it is obvious that a proportion of those who learned French first but who no longer understand it report another mother tongue (i.e. English). We simply do not know what proportion of people who learned French first no longer understand it. However, in such instances, a language transfer has taken place. Secondly, the Census does not accept responses to the effect that a respondent has two mother tongues; in such cases the "darkest pencil mark is accepted" (Kralt, 1974). Nor does the Census

allow respondents to report more than one language spoken at home--if more than one is reported, the "darkest pencil mark" is accepted.[5] It would be somewhat naive to entertain the notion that a committee of judges gravely pondered the darkness of pencil marks on tens of thousands of census returns. The more skeptical might be inclined to believe that the "darkest pencil mark" with regard to language of the home was "French" when the respondent indicated that his mother tongue was French, and "English" when the respondent indicated that his mother tongue was English. One thing seems reasonably certain--considerably more of those who learned French first would be subject to "darkest pencil mark" decisions both with regard to mother tongue and language of the home. Very few scholars are aware of the processing decisions taken by Statistics Canada, but this is one area, and a politically sensitive one, that deserves particular scrutiny.

In examining the validity of census-type ethnic origin measures, which will now be taken up, it will be argued that such measures lack validity and this has the effect of *under-estimating* inter-generational language transfer for the French in Canada (and for the English in Quebec).

The Validity of "Census-Type" Ethnic Origin Measures

While there is a relatively close correspondence between ethnic origin and mother tongue among those of British origin in Canada and among those of French origin in Quebec, there is a much poorer correspondence between ethnic origin and mother tongue for those of French origin outside

of Quebec (Lieberson, 1970: 240-245); likewise, while there is a close correspondence between ethnic origin and language of the home among those of French origin in Quebec, this correspondence is much poorer for those of French origin outside of Quebec (Arès, 1975). This situation reflects the linguistic assimilation which has taken place in the course of Canadian history. Consequently, Canadian social scientists prefer not to use ethnic origin to establish ethnolinguistic categories in reporting their research. This not only reflects a conviction that language variables are better predictors of ethnicity, in the subjective sense, but this also reflects suspicions as to the validity of census-type measures of ethnic origin. Joy (forthcoming) has pointed to the lack of correspondence between the proportion of those with English names in the Eastern townships and the proportion reporting themselves to be of Anglo-Celt origin on the Census ethnic origin question. Henripin (1974: 41-44) devotes a special appendix to a critique of some "surprising results" obtained in an analysis of the 1971 Census. By means of an estimating procedure he concludes that not less than 300,000 individuals who declared themselves to be of British origin were of other origin. Henripin's estimations were based on a comparison of the 1961 and 1971 Censuses. The test of the validity of the ethnic origin question by means of the Ethnic Relations Study yields an even more pessimistic picture.

With regard to the Ethnic Relations Study, the procedure followed was to code respondents into two categories based on their responses to the question "To which ethnic or cultural group did your paternal ancestors belong?" The two categories established were "French" and "non-French" origin. Origin was then cross-tabulated by the respondent's name which had been coded as "French" or "non-French." This would seem to be a rather simple and effective check on the validity of this and similar measures of ethnic

origin. While 81.5% of those with French names in Canada claim French paternal ancestry, this proportion rises to 86% in the Maritimes and to 87% in Quebec, then declines precipitously to 54.9% in Ontario, to 46.1% in the Prairie provinces, and to 26.9% in B.C. Equally intriguing is that while less than ten percent of those with non-French names in every other region of Canada claim French paternal ancestry, this rises to 39.3% in Quebec (Table IV.4).[6] While one would not expect a perfect correspondence between name and ancestry, the discrepancies by region indicate that such "census-type" origin questions are not valid measures of objective ethnic origin.[7] Since there is no plausible alternative explanation of the magnitude of the discrepancies between the ratio of French names and French paternal ancestry in the other regions of Canada as compared to that for Quebec or for the magnitude of the discrepancies between the ratio of non-French names and non-French ancestry in Quebec as compared to those in other regions of Canda, it would seem that "census-type" measures of ethnic origin are of questionable validity.

The consequences of these findings are quite important. This means that the Canadian Census seriously under-estimates the number of those of French ancestry in Canada, and the number of those of non-French ancestry in Quebec. This implies that the only measure of language transfer available up until the 1971 Census--that based on ratios of mother tongue to ethnic origin,--seriously under-estimates the actual rate of inter-generational language transfer that has occurred among those of French paternal ancestry outside of Quebec and among those of non-French paternal ancestry in Quebec throughout the course of Canadian history. Arès (1975) reports that 54.9% of those of French ethnic origin outside of Quebec speak English at home. If a correction factor were built in for the discrepancy between French name and

TABLE IV.4: ETHNIC ORIGIN BY ETHNIC NAME IN CANADA AND REGIONS (in %)

Region and Ethnic Origin	ETHNIC NAME	
	French	Non-French
Canada		
French	81.5	10.3
Non-French	18.5	89.7
Total	100.0	100.0
N	(1011)	(2702)
	Chi-square: 178.7, 1 df, $p < .001$	
Maritimes		
French	86.0	9.1
Non-French	14.0	90.9
Total	100.0	100.0
N	(51)	(322)
	Chi-square: 159.8, 1 df, $p < .001$	
Quebec		
French	87.7	39.3
Non-French	12.3	60.7
Total	100.0	100.0
N	(808)	(254)
	Chi-square: 245.7, 1 df, $p < .001$	
Ontario		
French	54.9	9.5
Non-French	45.1	90.5
Total	100.0	100.0
N	(83)	(1137)
	Chi-square: 146.2, 1 df, $p < .001$	
Prairies		
French	46.1	4.3
Non-French	53.9	95.7
Total	100.0	100.0
N	(42)	(660)
	Chi-square: 102.2, 1 df, $p < .001$	
British Columbia		
French	26.9	3.7
Non-French	73.1	96.3
Total	100.0	100.0
N	(27)	(329)
	Chi-square: 21.9, 1 df, $p < .001$	

French origin among francophones outside of Quebec, the rate of assimilation thus emerging would horrify the most cynical Quebec nationalist. It would seem that measures of language transfer based on any of the measures provided by the Canadian Census will result in under-estimations of French linguistic assimilation both historically and intra-generationally. It would, however, appear from Chapter 11 that the Canadian Census official languages question results in *over-estimations* of the incidence of bilingualism in Canada.[8] The total impact, then, is one of producing an overly sanguine picture of linguistic situation in Canada, as far as the official language groups are concerned.[9]

Having terminated the "tour d'horizon" of the problems associated with each of the predictor variables, it is time to put them to work.

Language Variables Versus Reported Origin as Predictors of Ethnic Identity

From Table IV.5 it can be seen that language variables best predict location in ethnic space for the universe of those of French and English mother tongue in Canada. While the language spoken best is, as hypothesized, the best of the predictor variables, there is not a great degree of difference between the various language variables as predictors of location in ethnic space. The correlation of dominant language with location in ethnic space is .873 in Canada compared to a correlation of .861 between home language and location in ethnic space; the correlation between mother tongue and the dependent variable for Canada is .846. However, dominant language is the best predictor of location in ethnic space only in Quebec and Ontario. In Quebec the correlation between language spoken best and the dependent variable is .751 though the correlation between home language and the dependent variable (.745) is almost as high;

TABLE IV.5

ASSOCIATIONS (V) OF THE PREDICTOR VARIABLES WITH THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE, SUBJECTIVE ETHNIC IDENTITY FOR CANADA AND REGIONS*

PREDICTOR VARIABLES	SUBJECTIVE ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION					
	CANADA	MARITIMES	QUEBEC	ONTARIO	PRAIRIES	B.C.**
Mother Tongue	.846	.744	.708	.647	.726	
Home Language	.861	.766	.745	.645	.680	
Dominant Language	.873	.736	.751	.713	.705	
Ethnic Origin	.805	.679	.642	.621	.708	

*These cross-classification tables were all significant at better than the .01 level. V is used as a measure of association because the dependent variable is a three-category nominal variable.

**B.C. has been dropped from the analysis due to the very small number of cases of French mother tongue, French home language, and French dominant language.

mother tongue emerges as a much weaker predictor of location in ethnic space in Quebec with the correlation between this variable and the dependent variable being .708. In Ontario, the language spoken best is a slightly better predictor of location in ethnic space with a correlation of .713 between this predictor and the dependent variable as compared to correlations of .647 and .645 between the dependent variable and mother tongue and home language, respectively. In the Maritimes, home language is a better predictor of location in ethnic space (.766) whereas in the Prairie provinces, mother tongue (.726) emerges as a better predictor than either dominant language (.705) or home language (.680).

Language variables, then, are better predictors of subjective ethnic identity than ethnic origin, and of the language variables, dominant language is a slightly better predictor overall than either mother tongue or home language.

Summary

The findings presented in this Chapter do not clearly support either Weinreich's (1968) views, which have wide popular currency, that an affective attachment is formed to the mother tongue that is rarely transferred to another language learned later in life, or that dominant language is the best predictor of ethnic identity, which is implied by the "language as a vehicle of culture" theory.

Generally speaking, at least in Canada, intra-generational transfer in dominant language tends to be accompanied by identification with the group corresponding to that language. While there are regional variations, only in the Prairie provinces where mother tongue is the best predictor of ethnic identity, are these supportive of Weinreich's position; in the Maritimes, language of the home is the best predictor. However, it is clear from the

data presented in this chapter that language variables are excellent predictors of subjective ethnic identification for the official language groups in Canada.

NOTES

1. The reader should keep in mind wherever the Ethnic Relations Study is being used that "mother tongue" has been calculated according to the language the respondent's parents spoke at home.

2. By "objective measure of ethnicity" is meant any measure of ethnicity which is not based on respondent self-identification.

3. The respondent indicated whether he spoke French or English best, or both languages equally well. Conceptually speaking, those who spoke their mother tongue best belonged in one category, and all those who didn't, in another. This procedure also facilitated quantitative analysis.

4. Some of the problems with such uses of the census data are aired in my article "La mesure du transfert linguistique au Canada," La Monda Lingvo-Problemo, forthcoming.

5. Those who spoke both French and English at home were dropped from the Ethnic Relations Study in calculating the correlation between home language and subjective ethnic identification.

6. To check on the results reported in Table IV.4, a secondary analysis of the Opinion Survey of Canadian Youth (N: 1365) carried out by J.W.C. Johnstone for the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, was conducted. In this study also, the respondents' names were coded as "French" or "non-French." This variable was cross-tabulated with responses to a question which asked "From which country outside Canada did your father's ancestors originally come from?" The countries named were coded as French (France and Belgium) or non-French (all others). In Canada as a whole, 84.7% of those with French names indicated that their father's ancestors country of origin was French. However, 94.3% of those with French names in Quebec indicated that their father's ancestors country of origin was French as compared to only 70.4% of those with French names outside of Quebec. This compares to 87.5% of those with non-French names in Canada who indicated that their fathers' ancestors came from a non-French country. As for those with non-French names in Quebec, only 64.4% indicated that their fathers' ancestors came from a non-French country!

7. One cannot expect a perfect correspondence between name and ancestry for a number of reasons. Firstly, some owners of "French" names may have Anglo-Celt genealogies dating right back to the Norman conquest. For instance, while Lamy is a French name, I recall reading an account in an eighteenth century newspaper of goings on in Scotland involving a person by the name, who was obviously considered to be Scottish. In such instances, one might well expect a discrepancy between name and ancestry. More obviously, one does not know how good a job the coders did--there might be a low rate of error, or a rather high one; but assuming that the coding was all done by the same group of people, the coding error ought not to vary from one region to another. Lastly,

a proportion of respondent names can be assumed to have been anglicized or francicized, and this can be assumed to vary by region. However, if one assumes that anglicization of French names is more frequent outside of Quebec and francicization of English names is more frequent in Quebec, this means that the discrepancies between name and origin are actually under-estimations for the French outside of Quebec and the English in Quebec.

8. In Chapter 11 it was shown that there is a tendency for respondents in Montreal to over-report on the census official languages question in terms of the interviewer's rating of respondents on the same variable. With this is mind, recent trends in rates of bilingualism in Canada might make sense. In comparing the number of bilinguals by province, as reported in the 1961 and 1971 Censuses, one is surprised to find that "bilingualism" is up from 5,300 to 9,300 in Newfoundland, and from 57,500 to 101,400 in British Columbia! It is remarkable, indeed, to encounter such an irruption of bilingualism in areas of Canada so far removed from French-speaking areas, from the French media, and from the federal government's bilingualization program.

9. This point has been made to Census Field officials of Statistics Canada who were encouraged by the researcher to undertake some validation studies. Naturally, response was unenthusiastic--as one wit put it "It is not the kind of money the government can afford to spend."

CHAPTER V

BILINGUALISM AND IDENTITY IN CANADA

Introduction

It was seen in Chapter 1 that both theory and empirical research in a variety of disciplines point to an association between bilingualism and identity. The impression is conveyed in this body of research that the association between bilingualism and identity is a strong one. Mead (1964: 258) mentions that a "person learns a new language . . . and gets a new soul." Pieris (1951: 336) maintains that "many bilinguals are acutely conscious of their cultural marginality." Christophersen (1948: 8) claimed that "nobody can know a language perfectly without associating himself to a large extent with the people who speak it." Gardner and Lambert (1972: 3) theorize that "the more proficient one becomes in a second language, the more he (sic) may find his place in his own membership group modified . . ." Van Overbeke (1972: 158) points out that the bulk of negative findings with regard to the effects of bilingualism have come from psychologists or from "des personnes qui ont recours à des arguments psychologiques." The principal argument has been that bilingualism leads to a "dualité interne" (Van Overbeke, 1972: 158).[1] Generally, bilingualism is viewed as the "cause" of the phenomena which have been found to be associated with it and a common explicit or implicit theoretical explanation of these findings is some variation of the "language as a vehicle of culture" theory. Basically, this theory is that the interna-

lization of another liguistic system involves the internalization of the cultural scheme of interpretation and expression of which it is the vehicle.

The purpose in this Chapter is two-fold--to determine whether there is an association between bilingualism and identity, and, if so, whether the unicausal social psychological theory mentioned above provides an adequate explanation. It was reasoned that if the "language as a vehicle of culture" theory is adequate, the strength of the relationship between bilingualism and identity ought not to vary from one region of Canada (demographic context) to another, or from one mother tongue group to the other (group status); moreover, contact with the other group, frequency of using the other language, age, sex, education, and occupation ought not to be intervening variables of any magnitude. Should any of these variables prove to be significant intervening variables, the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation would have to be rejected and the search for a more adequate theory commenced.

The Ethnic Relations Study is used throughout this Chapter to test the hypothesis (2.1, cf. Chapter 1) that bilinguals identify with both groups whose languages they speak, and that this varies positively with degree of bilingualism. The measure of bilingualism distinguishes between unilinguals, bilinguals, and equilinguals (cf. Chapter 111); responses to the following question constitute the measure of ethnic identity: "Do you feel closer to English Canadians or closer to French Canadians?" Responses to this question were coded as follows: "closer to mother tongue group," "as close to each or between both groups" (cf. Chapter 111).

Bilingualism and Subjective Ethnic Identity in National and Regional Perspectives

There is indeed a statistically significant relationship between bilingualism and Subjective Ethnic Identity in Canada and its regions (Table V.1), and this varies positively with degree of bilingualism. In Canada, 14.6% of unilinguals locate themselves as close to each or between both language groups as compared to 25.1% of bilinguals, and to 57.3% of equilinguals (those who speak both languages equally well). The sharp contrast is between equilinguals and the other two categories; nearly three out of five equilinguals in Canada locate themselves as close to each or between both groups in comparison to only one out of four bilinguals and only three out of twenty unilinguals. However, the correlation between bilingualism and Subjective Ethnic Identity is a rather modest .20.

In terms of regional variations, the correlation between degree of bilingualism and Subjective Ethnic Identity is consistent and ranges between .23 and .27 in all five regions of the country. In terms of proportions, in all regions with the exception of the Maritimes, over half of those who are equilingual locate as close to each or between both groups--these percentages range from a low of 34.9% in the Maritimes to a high of 73.9% in B.C.; in Quebec, 54.3% of equilinguals choose this option, as compared to 63.8% in Ontario, and 58.7% in the Prairie provinces. As for bilinguals, the proportion locating as close to each or between both groups varies from a low of 21.6% in Quebec to a high of 56.7% in B.C.; 37% of bilinguals in the Maritimes, 33.1% in Ontario, and 24.1% in the Prairie provinces situate themselves in this manner. Among unilinguals, the proportion locating as close to each or between both groups ranges from a high of 16.6% in the Maritimes to a low of 12.2% in Quebec; 15.5% of unilinguals in Ontario, 16.1% in the Prairie provinces, and 13.9% in B.C. choose this option. It is apparent that the

TABLE V.1

SUBJECTIVE ETHNIC IDENTITY IN CANADA AND AND REGIONS BY DEGREE OF BILINGUALISM (in %)

Do you feel closer to English Canadians or closer to French Canadians?	Degree of Bilingualism		
	Unilingual	Bilingual	Equilingual
Canada			
Locates closer to mother tongue group	85.4	74.9	42.7
Locates as close to each or between both groups	14.6	25.1	57.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(2781)	(290)	(98)
	Chi-square: 138.2, 2 df, $p < .001$ ($r = .20$)*		
Maritimes			
Locates closer to mother tongue group	83.4	63.0	65.1
Locates as close to each or between both groups	16.6	37.0	34.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(323)	(17)	(11)
	Chi-square: 6.8, 2 df, $p = .03$, ($r = .26$)*		
Quebec			
Locates closer to mother tongue group	87.8	78.4	45.7
Locates as close to each or between both groups	12.2	21.6	54.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(812)	(200)	(32)
	Chi-square: 49.4, 2 df, $p < .001$ ($r = .27$)*		
Ontario			
Locates closer to mother tongue group	84.5	66.9	36.2
Locates as close to each or between both groups	15.5	33.1	63.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(956)	(45)	(40)
	Chi-square: 67.5, 2 df, $p < .001$ ($r = .23$)*		
Prairies			
Locates closer to mother tongue group	83.9	75.9	41.3
Locates as close to each or between both groups	16.1	24.1	58.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(421)	(23)	(11)
	Chi-square: 14.1, 2 df, $p < .001$ ($r = .26$)*		
British Columbia			
Locates closer to mother tongue group	86.1	43.3	26.1
Locates as close to each or between both groups	13.9	56.7	73.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(270)	(5)	(4)
			($r = .27$)*

* r is statistically significant at < .01 level

proportion of unilinguals locating as close to each or between both groups does not vary considerably from one region to another (whereas there are considerable variations in the proportions of bilinguals and equilinguals locating as close to each or between both groups from one region to another). While no consistent pattern emerges, generally speaking the proportion of bilinguals and equilinguals locating as close to each or between both groups is higher west of Quebec, which suggests variations by mother tongue or demographic context.

The results for each mother tongue group reveal differences of some magnitude (Table V.2). More English mother tongue unilinguals, bilinguals, and equilinguals locate as close to each or between both groups than their counterparts of French mother tongue; 15.5% of English unilinguals, 44.7% of English bilinguals, and 59.2% of English equilinguals choose this option; for the French, the proportions are 12.4%, 22.4%, and 57.2% respectively. A possible explanation for the tendency of more anglophones of all levels of fluency to choose this option than their francophone counterparts will be considered in Chapter VI. More important, in terms of our immediate purpose, the strength of the relationship varies considerably from one mother tongue group to the other. The r is .29 for those of French mother tongue as compared to .13 for those of English mother tongue. Whether stronger relationships between bilingualism and subjective ethnic identity among the French is due to demographic effects, or due to the effects of subordinate group status, might have been illuminated by examining the strength of the relationship for each mother tongue group in each of the five regions. These results are not given in Table V.2 since the very small number of equilinguals in the sample precludes such a procedure.

TABLE V.2

SUBJECTIVE ETHNIC IDENTITY IN CANADA BY MOTHER TONGUE AND BY DEGREE OF BILINGUALISM (in %)

Location in Ethnic Space	Degree of Bilingualism		
	Unilingual	Bilingual	Equilingual
English			
Locates closer to mother tongue group	84.5	55.3	40.8
Locates as close to each or between both groups	15.5	44.7	59.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(1978)	(36)	(9)
	Chi-square: 33.5, 2 df, $p < .001$ ($r = .13$)*		
French			
Locates closer to mother tongue group	87.6	77.6	42.8
Locates as close to each or between both groups	12.4	22.4	57.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(803)	(255)	(90)
	Chi-square: 112.9, 2 df, $p < .001$ ($r = .29$)*		

* r is statistically significant at < .01 level

To summarize, it is apparent from the results presented thus far that the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation of the association between bilingualism and identity is manifestly inadequate. The correlation between degree of bilingualism and identity is a modest .20 which is, however, consistent from one region of Canada to another; the strength of the relationship varies from .23 to .27 across the country's five regions. Differences between mother tongue groups are of much more importance than regional differences; the correlation between bilingualism and identity is a respectable .29 for those of French mother tongue but a low .13 for those of English mother tongue. That the strength of the relationship between bilingualism and identity is rather low, and that it differs substantially from one mother tongue group to the other, indicates that there is much more to the relationship between bilingualism and identity than can be accounted for by the "language as a vehicle of culture" theory. These results also seem to rule out a simplistic "personality" explanation.

That language in itself may have some effect on identity cannot be ruled out; nor can the role of personality variables since, generally speaking, more bilinguals do not identify with both groups than those that do, and a healthy minority of equilinguals do not identify with either. Rather, unicausal explanations of either type are inadequate. Therefore we are now in an active search for the effects of other sociological variables. The first question raised by the results reported thus far is whether the variation in the strength of the relationship by mother tongue group is due to the effects of demographic context or subordinate group status.

Differences by Mother Tongue Group -- Subordinate Group Status or Demographic Context Effects?

If the discrepancies by mother tongue group were due to subordinate group status rather than demographic context, it could be expected that the strength of the relationship between bilingualism and identity would be weaker among anglophones in Quebec than among francophones in the rest of Canada, since anglophones in Quebec do not constitute a subordinate group in terms of the meaning this concept is usually given. It could also be expected that if demographic context rather than subordinate group status was the more important of the two variables that the strength of the relationship between bilingualism and identity would be higher among anglophones in Quebec than among francophones in Quebec (since francophones are in a demographic majority in Quebec). It would be difficult to conceive of Quebec anglophones as constituting a subordinate group since English Canadians receive the same prestige rating as French Canadians on the part of the francophones everywhere in Canada, and anglophones in Quebec hold, on the average, better paid and more prestigious occupations. On the other hand, French Canadians are assigned less prestige than English Canadians by anglophones everywhere in Canada, and francophones, on the average, occupy less prestigious and less well remunerated positions.[2]

The data indicate that demographic context rather than subordinate group status is the most important factor. The correlation between degree of bilingualism and location in ethnic space is .20 among francophones outside of Quebec as compared to a correlation of .28 for anglophones in Quebec (Table V.3), whereas the strength of the relationship between bilingualism and location in ethnic space is .21 for those of French mother tongue in Quebec. The strength of the relationship between bilingualism and identity

TABLE V.3

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN BILINGUALISM AND SUBJECTIVE ETHNIC IDENTITY BY MOTHER TONGUE AND REGION

Region and Mother Tongue	Correlation
Quebec, English Mother Tongue	.28*
Quebec, French Mother Tongue	.21*
Canada, Other Than Quebec, French Mother Tongue	.20*

*r is statistically significant at < .01 level

is therefore higher among anglophones in Quebec than among francophones in the rest of Canada and in Quebec itself. This suggests that the variation in the strength of the relationship is due to the effects of demographic context. The data presented in Chapter VI for Montreal and Ottawa would appear to support this interpretation. In Montreal, the strength of the relationship is stronger among the English (.55) than among the French (.29); in Ottawa, the relationship is stronger among the French (.26) than among the English (.16).

If demographic context accounts for a good part of the variation in the strength of the relationship by mother tongue group, controls for ethnic composition of the electoral district and linguistic composition ought to result in partial coefficients which would be lower than the zero-order correlations for both mother tongue groups; one would also expect that contact variables would have an impact on the relationship. The effects of these variables will now be assessed.

The Effects of Contact and Context

To assess the effects of contact and context on the relationship between bilingualism and identity it was decided to control for interpersonal contact, frequency of interpersonal contact, frequency of speaking the other language, ethnic composition of the electoral district, and linguistic composition of the region. Since there is little variation in the strength of the relationship between bilingualism and identity from one region to another, and since due to the small number of equilinguals, an analysis by region and mother tongue could not be pursued, region is replaced by linguistic composition of the region. If a respondent was of French mother tongue and lived in Quebec, he was coded as living in a region in which he was part of a linguistic majority; francophones living everywhere else in Canada were coded as being part of a linguistic minority; anglophones in Quebec were coded as being part of a linguistic minority, whereas anglophones everywhere else in Canada were coded as being part of a linguistic majority. Ethnic composition of the electoral district is coded into two categories according to whether or not the ethnic majority in the electoral district corresponds with the respondent's mother tongue. Both the context and the contact controls have been discussed previously in Chapter III.

A matrix of correlations of the independent, dependent, and intervening variables is presented in Table V.4. Since frequency of speaking the other language correlates highly (.60) with degree of bilingualism, it was decided that it would not be appropriate to compute a partial coefficient controlling for this variable. As for the other intervening variables,

TABLE V-4

CORRELATION MATRICES OF INDEPENDENT, DEPENDENT, AND INTERVENING VARIABLES

Canada

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Degree of Bilingualism	...	.20	.23	.24	.60	.24	.36
2. Subjective Ethnic Identity		...	.23	.21	.17	.22	.22
3. Contact			...	.34	.26	.21	.23
4. Frequency of Contact				...	.39	.18	.20
5. Frequency of Speaking Other Language					...	.24	.32
6. Ethnic Composition of Electoral District						...	.84
7. Linguistic Composition of Region							...

English

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Degree of Bilingualism	...	.13	.10	.10	.54	.31	.25
2. Subjective Ethnic Identity		...	.21	.15	.24	.19	.15
3. Contact			...	.39	.15	.23	.18
4. Frequency of Contact				...	.26	.14	.15
5. Frequency of Speaking Other Language					...	.44	.24
6. Ethnic Composition of Electoral District						...	.90
7. Linguistic Composition of Region							...

French

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Degree of Bilingualism	...	.29	.36	.42	.56	.28	.34
2. Subjective Ethnic Identity		...	.26	.30	.17	.27	.30
3. Contact			...	.24	.34	.30	.26
4. Frequency of Contact				...	.52	.28	.30
5. Frequency of Speaking Other Language					...	.23	.17
6. Ethnic Composition of Electoral District						...	.79
7. Linguistic Composition of Region							...

two of them, ethnic composition of the electoral district and linguistic composition of the region, intercorrelate highly (.79 for the French mother tongue group, and .90 for the English mother tongue group). Since they represent, nonetheless, different levels of demographic context, it was felt that these variables might differ in their impact on the relationship ; hence both were included (i.e., it might be that the immediate social environment is more important than the larger social context). As for the contact variables, the correlation between interpersonal contact and frequency of interpersonal contact is low -- only .24 for those of French mother tongue and .39 for those of English mother tongue; this seems attributable to the failure of the frequency of contact measure to distinguish between present and past behaviour (cf. Chapter III).

The partial coefficients computed with each of the contact and context variables controlled are all slightly lower than the zero-order correlations and this for both mother tongue groups (Table V.5). No clear picture emerges from these partials; for the English mother tongue group, the context variables appear to have a greater impact than the contact variables, though the difference is very slight whereas, for those of French mother tongue, there is no trend. The first order partials for sex, age, education, and occupation (Table V.5) reveal that these variables have no impact at all. This is also found to be the case in the analysis of the Montreal and Ottawa studies (Chapter VII).

Since no clear picture emerges from the first order partials controlling for the contact and context variables individually, second order partials were computed controlling simultaneously for both contact variables and for both context variables (Table V.6). From the second order

TABLE V.5

FIRST-ORDER PARTIAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN BILINGUALISM AND SUBJECTIVE ETHNIC IDENTITY CONTROLLING FOR EACH INTERVENING VARIABLE INDIVIDUALLY

Controlling for	Sample Characteristic		
	Canada	English	French
Zero-order	.20	.13	.29
Contact	.15*	.11*	.22*
Frequency of Contact	.16*	.11*	.19*
Ethnic Composition of the Electoral District	.15*	.08	.24*
Linguistic Composition of the Region	.13*	.09**	.21*
Sex	.20*	.13*	.29*
Age	.20*	.13*	.29*
Occupation	.20*	.13*	.29*
Education	.20*	.13*	.29*

* r is statistically significant at .001 level

** r is statistically significant at the .05 level

TABLE V.6

SECOND ORDER PARTIAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN BILINGUALISM AND SUBJECTIVE ETHNIC IDENTITY CONTROLLING FOR CONTACT AND FREQUENCY OF CONTACT SIMULTANEOUSLY AND FOR ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF THE ELECTORAL DISTRICT AND LINGUISTIC COMPOSITION OF THE REGION SIMULTANEOUSLY

Controlling for	Sample Characteristic		
	Canada	English	French
Zero-order	.20	.13	.29
Contact and Frequency of Contact	.13*	.10**	.14*
Ethnic Composition of the Electoral District and Linguistic Composition of the Region	.14*	.07	.21*

*r is statistically significant at the .001 level

**r is statistically significant at the .016 level

partials, the effects of contact as opposed to context emerge much more clearly. While both contact and context have an effect upon the relationship between bilingualism and identity, as is indicated by the discrepancies between the zero-order correlations and the second order partial coefficients, these variables have a slightly different effect from one mother tongue group to the other. For those of English mother tongue, controls for contact result in a partial of .10 as compared to a zero-order of .13, which indicates that the effects of contact are very minor. The partial coefficient controlling for context is .07 and the relationship is no longer statistically significant. Demographic context is therefore a significant intervening variable for the English mother tongue group. Among those of French mother tongue, the effects of interpersonal contact are somewhat stronger than the effects of social context since the second order partial for the former is .14 as compared to a second order partial of .21 for the latter; these compare to a zero-order of .29. Among those of French mother tongue, then, interpersonal contact is a more important intervening variable.

To determine whether there was very much of a relationship between bilingualism and identity left when both contact and context were controlled for, fourth order partial coefficients were computed controlling simultaneously for all of the contact and context variables (Table V.7). For those of English mother tongue, the fourth order partial of .07 is the same as the second order partial controlling for the context variables alone. Among those of French mother tongue, the fourth order partial is .10. In the case of the English, demographic context is more important than interpersonal contact; with context controlled the partial coeffi-

TABLE V.7

FOURTH ORDER PARTIAL CORRELATION BETWEEN BILINGUALISM AND SUBJECTIVE ETHNIC IDENTITY CONTROLLING SIMULTANEOUSLY FOR CONTACT, FREQUENCY OF CONTACT, ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF THE ELECTORAL DISTRICT AND LINGUISTIC COMPOSITION OF THE REGION

Controlling for	Sample Characteristic		
	Canada	English	French
Zero-order	.20	.13	.29
Contact, Frequency of Contact, Ethnic Composition of the Electoral District, and Linguistic Composition of the Region	.10*	.07	.10**

* r is statistically significant at the .001 level

** r is statistically significant at the .003 level

cient of .07 is no longer statistically significant and compares with a zero-order of .13. For those of French mother tongue, interpersonal contact is an important intervening variable and the partial of .14 in controlling for this factor compares to a zero-order of .29. However, controls for both contact and context result in a partial of .10. In short, for both groups, when the effects of either context or context and contact are controlled for, there is not much of a relationship left between bilingualism and identity. The "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation has therefore fared rather poorly.

Summary and Discussion

While bilinguals tend to locate themselves between both groups whose languages they speak, and while this varies positively with degree of bilingualism in Canada, in all of its regions, and among both mother tongue groups, the strength of the relationship is surprisingly low given the impression conveyed in previous research that this relationship is very strong. The correlation between degree of bilingualism and location in ethnic space is a very modest .20 for the universe of those of French and English mother tongue in Canada, but this relationship is consistent across all five regions of the country, ranging between .23 and .27. This appears not to be due to the way in which the independent and dependent variables were measured, since it will be seen in Chapter VI that the relationship between bilingualism and identity in Montreal and in Ottawa is .34 and .26 respectively. Three different measures of the independent, and three different measures of the dependent variable produce very similar results.

As the relationship between degree of bilingualism and identity is stronger among those of French mother tongue than among those of English mother tongue (.29 versus .13), it was thought that this might be due to either subordinate group status or demographic context. Since the relationship between degree of bilingualism and location in ethnic space is higher among anglophones in Quebec than among francophones in Quebec, or among francophones in the rest of Canada, this suggests that these differences cannot be attributed to subordinate group status but appear to be due to demographic context. The relationship between bilingualism and identity weakens considerably among both mother tongue groups when the effects of contact and context are controlled for. In controlling for context, in the case of those of English mother tongue, and in controlling for both context and contact, in the case of those of French mother tongue, partials of .07 and .10 are yielded; these contrast with zero-orders of .13 and .29 respectively. The "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation of the association between bilingualism and identity must therefore be discarded.

The data presented in this chapter leave two interesting findings unexplained. These are, firstly, that proportionally more anglophones than francophones at all levels of proficiency in the second language locate as close to each or between both groups; secondly, the strength of the relationship between degree of bilingualism and identity is higher among anglophones where they are in a linguistic minority than among francophones everywhere in Canada. The first finding suggests, at least at first glance, that anglophones are less anchored in an ethnic universe

than francophones; the second suggests, in conjunction with the first, that there may be something to Gardner and Lambert's (1972) hypothesis that those who are less anchored in an ethnic universe are more likely to be able to identity with both language groups and to learn second languages more easily, all other things being equal. Therefore, in Chapter VI saliency of ethnicity will be controlled for. This will enable us to determine whether the greater strength of the relationship between bilingualism and identity among anglophones (where they are in a linguistic minority) can be attributed to this factor.

NOTES

1. This research is reviewed in English by Diebold (1968) and Weinreich (1968: 116-122). Van Overbeke (1972: 158-163) provides an overview of some research covered neither by Diebold nor by Weinreich.

2. Lieberson (1970: 167-175) deals with differences in income; the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (1969: 16-95) deals with differences in income and socio-economic status; in terms of differences in ethnic group prestige, these data were made available in unpublished form by Professor P.C. Pineo.

CHAPTER VI

ETHNIC UNIVERSES AND LANGUAGE GROUPS: SALIENCY OF ETHNICITY AS AN INTERVENING VARIABLE

Introduction

It was found in Chapter V (Table V.2) that proportionately more anglophones at all levels of proficiency in the second language locate as close to each or between both groups than francophones. In this chapter, it will be shown by means of the Montreal and Recurrent Education studies that despite different measures of the independent and dependent variables, proportionately more anglophones at all levels of proficiency in the second language in both Montreal and Ottawa identify with both groups or see themselves as having as much in common with both groups; further, the strength of the relationship between bilingualism and identity is higher among anglophones in Montreal than among francophones in Montreal, whereas in Ottawa the reverse is found. These findings are very compatible with those in the Ethnic Relations Study. It will then be shown using other identity measures in all three studies that anglophones appear to be less anchored in an ethnic universe than francophones.

If anglophones are less rooted in an ethnic universe, as the data presented in this Chapter suggest, this might account for the greater strength of the relationship between bilingualism and identity among anglophones where they constitute the linguistic minority--Gardner and Lambert (1972) hypothesize that those who are less ethnocentric are more able to identify with another language group and to learn its language more easily. Therefore, the relationship between bilingualism and identity

is examined with salience of ethnicity held constant by means of the Montreal Study. Salience of ethnicity, however, is found to be an intervening variable of *minimal* importance for both mother tongue groups.

A Comparison of the Findings for Montreal and Ottawa with those for the Ethnic Relations Study

Despite different measures of the independent and dependent variables, the data from Montreal and Ottawa are very comparable to those of the Ethnic Relations Study (Tables VI.1 and VI.2). In Montreal, no francophone who is not bilingual identifies with both groups whereas 8.3% of anglophone unilinguals identify with both groups; only 41.4% of French mother tongue bilinguals as compared to 64.3% of English mother tongue bilinguals identify with both groups. In Ottawa, 21% of francophone unilinguals felt they had as much in common with both groups as compared to 30.2% of their anglophone counterparts; of those who spoke the other language well, these percentages are 51.1% and 53.8% respectively; among those who spoke both languages equally well, however, 64.2% of francophones as compared to 55% of anglophones felt they had as much in common with both groups. The trends for proportionately more anglophones to identify with both language groups is present in both studies, but it must be cautioned that the results for anglophones in Montreal and francophones in Ottawa are not statistically significant.

The strength of the relationship between bilingualism and identity in both Montreal and Ottawa are quite similar to the strength of the relationship between bilingualism and identity in the Ethnic Relations Study

TABLE VI.1

ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION BY DEGREE OF BILINGUALISM AND MOTHER TONGUE IN MONTREAL (in %)

Ethnic Identification	Degree of Bilingualism		
	Unilingual	Bilingual	Equilingual
Montreal			
Identifies with mother tongue group	97.9	88.9	63.2
Identifies with both groups	2.1	11.1	36.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(48)	(54)	(19)
	Chi-square: 16.1, 2 df, $p < .001$ ($r=.34$)*		
Montreal French		Bilingual and Equilingual**	
Identifies with mother tongue group	100.0	58.6	
Identifies with both groups	0.0	41.4	
Total	100.0	100.0	
N	(36)	(59)	
	Corrected chi-square: 5.6, 1 df, $p<.02$ ($r=.30$)*		
Montreal English			
Identifies with mother tongue group	91.7	35.7	
Identitifes with both groups	8.3	64.3	
Total	100.0	100.0	
N	(12)	(14)	
	N.S.		($r=.55$)*

* The r is based on the two by three tables since all zero-order and partial coefficients presented in this and the next chapter are thus calculated, and to depart from this practice in this particular instance would only confuse the reader.

** The categories of 'bilingual' and 'equilingual' have been combined since three of the six cells in the one table, and four of the six cells in the other had expected frequencies of less than five. The Yates' correction (cf. Maxwell, 1961: 21-23) has been applied to the 2 X 2 tables.

Source: Montreal Study

TABLE VI.2

SUBJECTIVE ETHNIC IDENTITY IN OTTAWA BY DEGREE OF FLUENCY IN THE SECOND LANGUAGE AND BY MOTHER TONGUE

(in %)

Do you feel you have more in common with English speaking Canadians or with French speaking Canadians?	Degree of Fluency in Second Language		
	Unilingual	Speaks other language well	Speaks other language very wel
Ottawa			
More in common with mother tongue group	70.1	47.7	38.2
As much in common with both groups	29.9	52.3	61.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(232)	(37)	(56)
	Chi-square: 23.1, 2 df, p < .001		(r=.26)*
Ottawa French			
More in common with mother tongue group	79.0	48.9	35.8
As much in common with both groups	21.0	51.1	64.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(7)	(21)	(42)
	N.S.		(r=.26)*
Ottawa English			
More in common with mother tongue group	69.8	46.2	45.0
As much in common with both groups	30.2	53.8	55.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(225)	(17)	(14)
	Chi-square: 7.2, 2 df, p=.03		(r=.16)*

*r is statistically significant at < .01 level

Source: Recurrent Education Study

(Tables VI.1 and VI.2). The strength of the relationship is .34 for Montreal and .26 for Ottawa; in Montreal, it is higher among anglophones (.55) than among francophones (.30), whereas in Ottawa, it is higher among francophones (.26) than among anglophones (.16). In the Ethnic Relations Study it was found that the strength of the relationship between bilingualism and identity varies from between .23 to .27 in all regions of the country, and that it was higher among the linguistic minority.

Since the Montreal Study will be used extensively in both this chapter and in the subsequent one, a comparison of the findings of the Montreal Study with those of the Quebec sample of the Ethnic Relations Study seems in order at this point. As has been pointed out, in Montreal, the correlation between bilingualism and identity is .34 for the total sample as compared to .27 for the Quebec province sub-sample of the Ethnic Relations Study. While for the Province of Quebec, the correlation between degree of bilingualism and location in ethnic space is .21 for those of French mother tongue, it is .30 for the French in Montreal (Tables VI.1 and VI.3).

In Chapter V it was shown that demographic context does have an effect, and in this light, the differences in the strength of the relationship for those of French mother tongue in Quebec Province, as compared to that for those of French mother tongue in Montreal appear to be in the expected direction. However, for those of English mother tongue, the strength of the relationship between degree of bilingualism and identity is .55 in Montreal as compared to .28 for those of English mother tongue in the entire province. Of course, in both instances, the *N*'s are very small -- there are only 21 Quebec anglophone bilinguals in the

TABLE VI.3

SUBJECTIVE ETHNIC IDENTITY IN QUEBEC BY DEGREE OF BILINGUALISM AND MOTHER TONGUE

(in %)

Do you feel closer to English Canadians or to French Canadians?	Degree of Bilingualism		
	Unilingual	Bilingual	Equilingual
Province of Quebec			
Locate closer to mother tongue group	87.8	78.4	45.7
Locate as close to each or between both groups	12.2	21.6	54.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(812)	(200)	(32)
	Chi-square: 49.4, 2 df, p < .001		(r=.26)*
Quebec French			
Locate closer to mother tongue group	90.8	82.8	48.8
Locate as close to each or between both groups	9.2	17.2	51.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(697)	(181)	(29)
	Chi-square: 51.9, 2 df, p < .001		(r=.21)*
Quebec English			
Locate closer to mother tongue group	69.0	34.6	12.5
Locate as close to each or between both groups	31.0	65.4	87.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(115)	(18)	(3)
	Corrected chi-square:		(r=.28)*

*r is statistically significant at < .01 level

Source: Ethnic Relations Study

Ethnic Relations Study and only 14 in the Montreal Study. The dependent variable in the Montreal Study appears to be "stricter" than the dependent variable used in the Ethnic Relations Study; proportionately fewer unilinguals, bilinguals, and equilinguals claim to "belong to both groups" in Montreal as unilinguals, bilinguals, and equilinguals who locate themselves as close to each or between both groups in Quebec province. In Montreal, only 2.1% of unilinguals, 11.1% of bilinguals, and 36.8% of equilinguals see themselves as "belonging to both groups" (Table VI.2); this is in contrast to the 12.2% of unilinguals, 21.6% of bilinguals, and 54.3% of equilinguals in Quebec who locate themselves between or as close to each group (Table VI.3). The overall patterns by mother tongue group are similar: more anglophones at all levels of proficiency, in Montreal, in Quebec, and in Canada tend to have some identification with the other group than francophones.

The results of the Montreal and Ottawa studies, then, demonstrate a high degree of compatibility with the findings of the Ethnic Relations Study. Since different measures of the independent and dependent variables are used in all studies, this increases our confidence with regard to the strength of the relationship between bilingualism and identity in Canada, with regard to the finding that the relationship is stronger among the linguistic minority, and with regard to the tendency of proportionately more anglophones at each level of fluency in the second language to identify with both groups. The possibility that anglophones are less anchored

in an ethnic universe and that this might explain the stronger relationship between bilingualism and identity among anglophones when they are in a linguistic minority, must now be given serious attention.

Ethnic Universes and Language Groups

One problem with the inference immediately above is that the questions used in all three studies for which results have been reported, only permitted anglophones the choice between English Canadians, French Canadians, or a middle position between the two. It could be objected that if anglophones were presented the option of both "English Canadian" and "Other", there would be little difference in what might be called "ethnic consciousness" between anglophones and francophones. To check on this possibility, identity questions included in all three studies which permitted such a choice were cross-classified by mother tongue. In the Ethnic Relations Study, when such options were presented to the respondents, anglophones opted more frequently for a national rather than an ethnic identity (Table VI.4); 82.8% of anglophones as compared to 96.1% of francophones chose an ethnic identity. The choice of a national identity as opposed to an ethnic one varies positively with degree of bilingualism among both mother tongue groups (Table VI.5); more English mother tongue unilinguals, bilinguals, and equilinguals opted for a national identity than their French mother tongue counterparts. Again, the strength of the relationship between bilingualism and the choice of a non-ethnic identity is higher among francophones (.18). the linguistic minority.

TABLE VI.4

ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION BY MOTHER TONGUE IN CANADA (in %)

"To what ethnic group do you consider that you belong?"	Mother Tongue	
	English	French
"English Canadian," "other" (or "French Canadian")	82.8	96.1
"Canadian"	17.2	3.9
Total	100.0	100.0
N	(2091)	(1184)
	Corrected Chi-square = 121.8, 1 df, $p < .001$	

Source: Ethnic Relations Study

TABLE VI.5

ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION IN CANADA BY MOTHER TONGUE AND BY DEGREE OF BILINGUALISM (in %)

"To what ethnic group do you consider that you belong?"	Degree of Bilingualism		
	Unilingual	Bilingual	Equilingual
English			
"English Canadian" or "Other"	82.9	85.6	32.7
"Canadian"	17.1	14.4	67.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(2036)	(46)	(9)
	Chi-square: 16.2, 2 df, $p < .001$		($r=.05$)
French			
"French Canadian"	98.1	93.6	84.7
"Canadian"	1.9	6.4	15.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(828)	(271)	(85)
	Chi-square: 42.5, 2 df, $p < .001$		($r=.18$)

Source: Ethnic Relations Study

Similar results emerge in Montreal and Ottawa. In the Montreal Study, a measure of identity which presented the respondent with a variety of geographic, national, and ethnic identities was included. The responses to this question were coded according to whether the respondent chose a geographic or national identity, or an ethnic one. Nearly four times the number of anglophones in Montreal (90% versus 23.8%) chose a geographic or national identity over an ethnic one (Table VI.6). The Recurrent Education Study provided the respondent a choice between English Canadian, French Canadian, Franco-Ontarian, Canadian or something else. The responses were coded according to whether the respondent chose a national or an ethnic identity. Nearly double the number of anglophones in Ottawa chose a national identity--77.1% of anglophones as compared to 40.7% of francophones (Table VI.7). However, a more potent indicator that anglophones are less anchored in an ethnic universe is available in the Montreal Study. Saliency of ethnicity was measured by means of a question which asked "Does it matter very much to you which ethnic or cultural group you belong to?" Responses were coded as 'yes' or 'no'; these results are presented in Table VI.8. Nearly double the number of anglophones (56.4%) than francophones (28.7%) responded that it was not important to them which ethnic or cultural group they belonged to. On the basis of the evidence presented thus far, it would appear that anglophones are less anchored in an ethnic universe.[1]

If, as Gardner and Lambert (1972) suggest, those who are less anchored in an ethnic universe are more likely to identify with both language groups and to learn second languages more easily, the strong correlation (.55) between bilingualism and identity among anglophone Montrealers might be considerably weaker with saliency of ethnicity held constant. It turns out that salience of ethnicity is an intervening variable of minimal

TABLE VI.6

ETHNIC IDENTITY BY MOTHER TONGUE IN MONTREAL (in %)

"Which of the following statements describes *you* best?"	Mother Tongue	
	French	English
Ethnic Identity chosen	76.2	10.0
Geographic or national identity chosen	23.8	90.0
Total	100.0	100.0
N	(101)	(40)
	Corrected chi-square = 48.8, 1 df, $p < .001$	

Source: Montreal Study

TABLE VI.7

ETHNIC IDENTITY BY MOTHER TONGUE IN OTTAWA (in %)

"Do you consider yourself to be an English Canadian, a French Canadian, a Franco-Ontarian, or something else?"	Mother Tongue	
	French	English
"French Canadian" (or "English Canadian, or "Other")	59.3	22.9
"Canadian"	40.7	77.1
Total	100.0	100.0
N	(81)	(256)
	Corrected chi-square = 36.0, 1 df, $p < .001$	

Source: Recurrent Education Study

TABLE VI.8

SALIENCE OF ETHNICITY BY MOTHER TONGUE IN MONTREAL (in %)

"Does it matter very much to you which ethnic or cultural group you belong to?"	Mother Tongue	
	French	English
Yes	71.3	43.6
No	28.7	56.4
Total	100.0	100.0
N	(101)	(39)
	Chi-square = 8.2, 1 df, $p < .01$	

Source: Montreal Study

TABLE VI.9.1

CORRELATION MATRICES OF THE INDEPENDENT, DEPENDENT, AND INTERVENING VARIABLE BY MOTHER TONGUE (MONTREAL)

	French			English		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
Degree of Bilingualism	...	.30*	.21*	...	.55*	.00
Ethnic Identity		...	.16		...	.14
Salience of Ethnicity			...			...

*r is statistically significant at < .05 level

TABLE VI.9.2

FIRST-ORDER PARTIAL CORRELATIONS CONTROLLING FOR SALIENCE OF ETHNICITY

Controlling for	Mother Tongue	
	French	English
Zero-order	.30*	.55*
Salience of Ethnicity	.28*	.56*

*r is statistically significant at < .01 level

Source: Montreal Study

importance for both mother tongue groups. For those of French mother tongue, the partial of .28 compares with a zero-order of .30, whereas for anglophones, the partial of .56 compares to a zero-order of .55 (Table VI.9.2). Hence, the empirical data cannot support the argument that the stronger relationship between bilingualism and identity among anglophones where they are in a linguistic minority is due to their being less anchored in an ethnic universe. Salience of ethnicity is not a significant intervening variable.

Summary

The possibility that the greater strength of the relationship between bilingualism and identity among anglophones in a linguistic minority than among francophones in similar situations might be due to the lower salience of ethnicity among anglophones, an explanation which is highly compatible with Gardner and Lambert's (1972) hypothesis, has been examined. However, when salience of ethnicity was statistically controlled, it was found to have no impact on the relationship between bilingualism and identity among anglophones and only a very minimal impact among francophones.[2]

In the next chapter, the effects of other intervening variables, intensity of language use, breadth of exposure to the other culture, and "passing" for a member of the other group when the second language is spoken will be examined with the Montreal and Recurrent Education studies.

NOTES

1. There appears to be a considerable amount of distortion in the responses to the ethnic identity questions among Montreal anglophones and this may be why the relationship between bilingualism and identity is higher among anglophones in Quebec.

What is meant by distortion? The meaning will be conveyed through examples. For instance, a 59-year-old foreman when presented with the set of geographic, national, and ethnic identity options replied: "There is no such thing as an English Canadian;" yet in reply to the question which asked what he thought of the statement that bilinguals sometimes feel that they belong to neither of the groups whose languages they speak, and whether this applied to him, he stated: "I don't agree, I am completely English." A fifty-year-old housewife replied in answer to the same question: "You're just Canadian--there is too much of that here;" yet when she was asked which side she takes in ethnic disputes between the French and English in Quebec, she replied "the English side." A forty-five-year-old banker told me in response to the identity question: "I don't want to commit myself--I don't want to knock the French people;" yet he too stated "naturally, you are going to side with your own mother tongue." A sixty-five-year-old engineer said in response to the identity question: "I don't think we should distinguish;" on the question concerning the group membership of bilinguals, he replied: "No, I feel completely English and proud of it." A twenty-eight-year-old elementary school teacher said: "I don't like saying I am English Canadian;" yet she told of how annoyed she would be if she had to bring up her children in French and that she was "quite prepared to leave if I need to." A twenty-seven year-old sales manager who claimed that "the mentality I use when I speak French is different" said in reply to the question concerning the group membership of bilinguals:

> Garbage--I feel completely English. It holds total priority because I figure if I move somewhere else, that's what would count.

This could be interpreted as indicating that while strong affirmations of ethnic belonging lack legitimacy among anglophones in Montreal, there is a good degree of latent ethnic awareness despite an apparent adherence to an ideology of "unhyphenated Canadianism."

2. These findings will be discussed further in the concluding chapter where "reference group theory" is examined as a possible theoretical framework within which the findings of this dissertation can be integrated.

CHAPTER VII

LANGUAGE USE AND "PASSING" AS INTERVENING VARIABLES

Introduction

It was found in Chapter V that intergroup contact and demographic context are intervening variables of considerable importance. With demographic context held constant, the role of different variables will be examined, since it is possible that the impact of intergroup contact may not be as strong, and indeed mask the effects of other related variables such as intensity of use of the other language and breadth of exposure to the other culture. The concern in this chapter is with the impact of intensity of language use, of breadth of exposure to the other culture, on the relationship between bilingualism and identity. The effect of being perceived as a member of the other group when the second language is used will also be assessed, and the reason for considering this variable is elaborated below. The Montreal and Recurrent Education studies constitute the data sources.

While the reasons for implementing controls for intensity of use of the other language and for breadth of exposure to the other culture are evident from the content of Chapter V, why one would wish to control for whether or not one passes for a member of the other group requires some elaboration. Many fluent bilinguals are perceived differently as they use one language and then the other; this seems adequately demonstrated by two imaginative experiments by Lambert (1960) and Preston (1963) involving

the playing of tape-recorded voices of fluently bilingual speakers to samples of French and English Canadian university students. In these experiments the fluent bilinguals were assigned different attributes by the "judges" according to the language they used; this indicates that fluent bilinguals face stereotyped reactions which differ significantly in nature according to which of their languages they speak. That bilinguals occupy a social space somewhere between both ethnolinguistic groups in the eyes of others is indicated by Ross (1954: 274) in a study of a small French-Canadian town:

> The anglicized French are marginal people who are looked upon with suspicion. . . . No Frenchman who . . . talks English too well or too much in public, or in other ways identifies himself too closely with the English is completely accepted by the French. On the other hand, the marginal Frenchman is often eagerly sought after by the English. For they feel closer to a Frenchman who is bilingual. . . .

That this would have an effect upon the bilingual's ethnic identity would seem to follow from Mead's (1964: 218) theory of the self according to which it is the "organized community or social group which gives to the individual his unity of self;" this Mead called the "generalized other." Mead (1964: 220) also maintained that in "abstract thought the individual takes the attitude of the generalized other toward himself." If the bilingual is perceived as a member of one group and then of the other as he uses each of his languages, one would expect that the tendency to identify with both groups would vary positively with this factor. This is also suggested by Stonequist's (1937) classic study of marginality.

Intensity of Use of the Other Language, Breadth of Exposure and "Passing"

The first problem encountered in controlling for these intervening variables through partial correlation techniques is that the zero-order correlation matrices reveal that for both mother tongue groups in Montreal, the independent variable correlates too strongly for comfort with the intervening variables (Table VII.1). The best that can be made of this is that all of the intervening variables correlate to approximately the same extent with the independent variable, which at least permits an assessment of the relative importance of each of the intervening variables. It was felt that the computation of first-order partial coefficients would be worthwhile since the purpose at this juncture is to delineate some of the central variables which might be useful in the construction of a multi-causal theory which would take into account interaction effects. An hypothesis is not being tested and the case base does not permit much flexibility in research procedures. Finally, it must be cautioned that there is a further problem -- the small *N*'s of both the Montreal and Ottawa studies (bilinguals are a scarce commodity) made pairwise rather than listwise deletion of cases necessary in the computation of the partial coefficients. Therefore the results of these procedures for the English in Montreal and in Ottawa must be taken as approximations.

The first-order partial coefficients (Table VII.2) reveal that none of the intervening variables, with the exception of "passing" has the kind of impact on the relationship between bilingualism and identity in Montreal that one might have expected. For those of French mother tongue the partials when controls resulting from the implementation of controls for intensity

CORRELATION MATRICES OF THE INDEPENDENT, DEPENDENT, AND INTERVENING VARIABLES (Montreal)

Montreal French

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Degree of Bilingualism	...	.30*	.48*	.45*	.46*
2. Ethnic Identity		...	.22*	.16	.17
3. Intensity of Use of the Other Language			...	.34*	.36*
4. Breadth of Exposure to Other Culture				...	.19*
5. Identity in Eyes of Others when Second Language is Spoken					...

*r significant at < .05 level or less

Montreal English

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Degree of Bilingualism	...	.55*	.47*	.44*	.57*
2. Ethnic Identity		...	.37*	.36*	.76*
3. Intensity of Use of the Other Language			...	.21	.56*
4. Breadth of Exposure to Other Culture				...	.21*
5. Identity in Eyes of Others when Second Language is Spoken					...

*r is significant at < .05 level

Source: Montreal Study

TABLE VII.2

FIRST-ORDER PARTIAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN BILINGUALISM AND IDENTITY CONTROLLING FOR INTENSITY OF LANGUAGE USE, BREADTH OF EXPOSURE TO THE OTHER CULTURE, AND IDENTITY IN THE EYES OF OTHERS WHEN THE SECOND LANGUAGE IS SPOKEN

Controlling for	Mother Tongue	
	French	English
Zero-order	.30*	.55*
Intensity of Language Use	.23*	.46
Breadth of Exposure to the Other Culture	.26*	.47*
Identity in Eyes of Others when Second Language is Spoken	.26*	.21
Linguistic Composition of the Neighbourhood	.31*	.57*
Age	.30*	.55*
Sex	.30*	.56*
Education	.31*	.58*
Occupation	.31*	.56*

*r is statistically significant at < .05 level

Source: Montreal Study

of language use, breadth of exposure to the other culture, and for "passing" are .23, .26, and .26 respectively, as compared to a zero-order of .30. For those of English mother tongue, the partials are .46, .47, .21, respectively, as compared to the zero-order of .55. For both mother tongue groups, whether or not one passes for a member of the other group appears to be an intervening variable of some importance -- more important than intensity of language use or breadth of exposure to the other culture. When "passing" is controlled, the relationship is no longer statistically significant for both groups. The correlation between degree of bilingualism and "passing" is quite strong but not sufficiently strong to consider it a mere supplement to a more complex measure of the independent variable. Buxbaum (1949), in a clinical study, has argued that "a faulty accent" is often a way of indicating an unwillingness to identify with a particular group. Among those of English mother tongue, "passing" correlates more highly with identity than with bilingualism while the inverse is true for those of French mother tongue. The relationship between "passing," bilingualism, and identity appears, therefore, to be interactive.

Controls for language of the neighbourhood were implemented, but as can be expected in Greater Montreal, this variable is of minimal importance. As was found in the Ethnic Relations Study, age, sex, education, and occupation do not have to be reckoned with since controls for these variables reveal that they have no impact whatsoever on the relationship.

In analyzing the Recurrent Education Study, it was possible to control only for breadth of exposure to the other culture and "passing." The zero-order correlations between the independent, dependent, and intervening variables are not uncomfortably strong (Table VII.3) and one would

TABLE VII.3

CORRELATION MATRICES OF INDEPENDENT, DEPENDENT, AND INTERVENING VARIABLES

Ottawa French

	1	2	3	4
1. Fluency in Second Language	...	.26*	.30*	.34*
2. Location in Ethnic Space		...	.28*	.40*
3. Breadth of Exposure to Other Culture			...	.30*
4. Identity in the Eyes of Others when Second Language is Spoken				...

*r is significant at < .05 level

Ottawa English

	1	2	3	4
1. Fluency in Second Language	...	.16*	.09	.32
2. Location in Ethnic Space		...	.11*	.45*
3. Breadth of Exposure to Other Culture			...	.10
4. Identity in Eyes of Others when Second Language is Spoken				...

*r is significant at < .05 level

Source: Recurrent Education Study

TABLE VII.4

FIRST-ORDER PARTIAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN BILINGUALISM AND IDENTITY CONTROLLING FOR BREADTH OF EXPOSURE TO THE OTHER CULTURE AND IDENTITY IN THE EYES OF OTHERS WHEN SECOND LANGUAGE IS SPOKEN

Controlling for	Mother Tongue	
	French	English
Zero-order	.26*	.16*
Breadth of Exposure to the Other Culture	.19**	.15**
Identity in the Eyes of Others when Second Language is Spoken	.14**	.02**
Age	.26*	.16*
Sex	.25*	.15*
Education	.26*	.16*
Occupation	.28*	.16*

*r is statistically significant at < .05 level

**r is not statistically significant

Source: Recurrent Education Study

therefore have more confidence in the results of the first-order partials for each of the intervening variables; in addition, the larger case base attentuates the impact of pair-wise deletion. The first-order partials (Table VII.4) corroborate the Montreal findings with regard to breadth of exposure to the other culture and "passing;" breadth of exposure to the other culture has little impact on the relationship for both mother tongue groups with partials of .19 for those of French mother tongue, and .15 for those of English mother tongue as compared to the zero-order of .26 and .16, respectively; whether or not one passes for a member of the other group is of much more importance since the partials are .14 for those of French mother tongue and .02 for those of English mother tongue. In both the Montreal Study and the Recurrent Education Study, whether or not one "passes" turns out to be an intervening variable of some significance.

The partials for age, sex, education, and occupation in the Recurrent Education Study reveal that these variables have no effect on the relationship (Table VII.4). In all three studies, then, age, sex, education, and occupation appear to be variables which are irrelevant to the relationship between bilingualism and identity.

Summary

It was found in this Chapter that intensity of use of the other language is not an intervening variable of major significance in Montreal. In both Montreal and Ottawa, breadth of exposure to the other culture, as measured by exposure to the other language across several major domains of language use, is not of much significance either. However, whether or not

one passes for a member of the other group in speaking the second language is of importance as is suggested by the work of both Mead (1964) and Stonequist (1937). Thus far, demographic context, intergroup contact, identity in the eyes of others, and by inference, "significant others" would appear to emerge as basic building blocks of a multi-causal theory. That age, sex, education, and social class have no effect on the relationship, and this in all the studies used, suggests that social psychological variables are of some importance in this area of research.

In the following Chapter, attention is turned to the relationship between bilingualism and ethnic allegiance and ethnic attitudes. The interesting empirical and theoretical issues at stake will be taken up in the introduction.

CHAPTER VIII

BILINGUALISM, ETHNIC ALLEGIANCE, SOCIAL DISTANCE, AND PREJUDICE

Introduction

The theoretical literature on bilingualism suggests that bilingualism, identity, allegiance and attitudes are inter-related. Mead and Schutz (1964) both argue that the internalization of two cultural schemes of interpretation and expression has an effect on identity and attitudes. While Mead (1964) is vague as to the nature of the identity and attitudinal changes which accompany the internalization of another "universe of discourse," Schutz (1964: 104) is more specific: he refers to the person who has internalized two cultural schemes of interpretation and expression as tending to be a "cultural hybrid" of "doubtful loyalty," from the perspective of the host society. Both Mead and Schutz seem to imply that attitudinal changes and the restructuring of identity occur simultaneously, and that both take place within the same individual. Christophersen (1948), too, sees allegiance conflicts as accompanying identity problems.

One would, therefore, expect that there would be a strong positive correlation of bilingualism with conflicts of allegiance, with low social distance, and with lack of prejudice. One would also expect a strong correlation of identity with these variables. Although previous research (Guboglo, 1974; Lambert et al. 1972) points to a negative association between degree of bilingualism and ethnocentrism, little is known concerning the relation of conflicts of allegiance to ethnocentrism,

and to identity. Lambert, Giles, and Picard (1972), nonetheless, present some interesting findings. In a study of young Franco-Americans, four identity categories were discerned (cf. Chapter 1); the fourth comprised those who had achieved a "comfortable bicultural identity." These individuals were said to be "non-ethnocentric" and were said not to suffer from allegiance conflicts. It seems from these findings that identification with two groups is not necessarily accompanied by allegiance conflicts.

In general, then, the focus has been on the relationships between bilingualism and identity, allegiance, and ethnocentrism; and it has been assumed rather than demonstrated that all of these variables are inter-related. By means of the Montreal and Ethnic Relations studies, the relationship between bilingualism, allegiance, social distance, and prejudice will be examined, and the extent to which these latter variables correlate with identity will be determined.

Bilingualism and Ethnic Allegiance

There is a relationship between bilingualism and group allegiance in Montreal, as measured by the reluctance of bilinguals to take sides in ethnic disputes between the French and the English (Table VIII.1). In Montreal, 25% of unilinguals side with neither group, as compared to 42% of bilinguals and 66.7% of equilinguals. The correlation is a modest .28. While the chi-squares are not significant for each mother tongue group, this reflects the diminishing number of cases rather than a substantive change in the distributions. The correlation between degree of

ETHNIC ALLEGIANCE BY DEGREE OF BILINGUALISM

AND MOTHER TONGUE IN MONTREAL (in %)

"When important issues arise between the English and French . . . do you find that you are more on the French side, more on the English side, or what?"	Degree of Bilingualism		
	Unilingual	Bilingual	Equilingual
Montreal			
Sides with mother tongue group	75.0	58.0	33.3
Sides with neither group	25.0	42.0	66.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(32)	(50)	(15)
	Chi-square = 7.5, 2 df, p = .02		(r=.28)*
French			
Sides with mother tongue group	71.4	61.8	41.7
Sides with neither group	28.6	38.2	58.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(21)	(34)	(12)
	N.S.		(r=.20)*
English			
Sides with mother tongue group	81.8	50.0	----
Sides with neither group	18.2	50.0	100.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(11)	(16)	(3)
	N.S.		(r=.48)*

*r is statistically significant at < .01 level

Source: Montreal Study

bilingualism and allegiance is higher among anglophones (.48) than among francophones (.20). The relationship between bilingualism and allegiance is, therefore, quite similar to that between bilingualism and identity (cf. Chapter VI), though the correlations are slightly lower. However, the correlation between identity and allegiance is only .19 for the Montreal sample (.13 for those of French mother tongue, and .34 for those of English mother tongue). Conflicts of allegiance, therefore, are not strongly related to identification with both groups.

The partial correlations (Table VIII.2) reveal some interesting fluctuations. In all three studies, age, sex, education, and occupation were not important as intervening variables on the relationship between bilingualism and identity. Yet when the effects of these variables are controlled for, the partial correlations between bilingualism and allegiance begin to fluctuate slightly in several directions, in the case of both mother tongue groups. Among those of French mother tongue, the variations are of minor importance when education and occupation are controlled; among those of English mother tongue, sex (in particular) and occupation have an impact upon the relationship. Linguistic composition of the neighbourhood has some importance as an intervening variable for both mother tongue groups. Controls for this variable yield partials of .14 for those of French mother tongue, and .39 for those of English mother tongue; these compare to zero-orders of .20 and .48 respectively. The impact of language of the neighbourhood and occupation upon the relationship between bilingualism and allegiance (for both mother tongue groups) suggests that allegiance is more strongly influenced by one's larger social environment than is identity -- that is, identity may have

TABLE VIII.2

FIRST-ORDER PARTIAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN BILINGUALISM AND ETHNIC ALLEGIANCE CONTROLLING FOR INTENSITY OF LANGUAGE USE, BREADTH OF EXPOSURE TO THE OTHER CULTURE, AND IDENTITY IN THE EYES OF OTHERS WHEN THE SECOND LANGUAGE IS SPOKEN

Controlling for	Mother Tongue	
	French	English
Zero-order	.20*	.48*
Intensity of Language Use	.18	.42*
Breadth of Exposure to the Other Culture	.21*	.53*
Identity in Eyes of Others when Second Language is Spoken	.13	.44*
Linguistic Composition of the Neighbourhood	.14*	.39*
Age	.20*	.48*
Sex	.20*	.37*
Education	.25*	.49*
Occupation	.23*	.55*

* r is statistically significant at < .05 level
Source: Montreal Study

a more social psychological basis. This interpretation is further reinforced by the effects of gender on this relationship among those of English mother tongue: males are less likely to take sides. In other words, living in a mixed neighbourhood or in one where the other language predominates, holding a higher status occupation, and being male are all positively associated with taking a neutral position in ethnic disputes. Individuals of this description are more likely to serve as linguistic mediators between the two language groups, and such a stance would be socially appropriate. More bluntly, one can circulate among the French more easily if one identifies with the English and takes a neutral stance in ethnic disputes, than if one identifies with the French but sides with the English. The side one takes in ethnic disputes appears more relevant to social interaction than the way in which one identifies oneself. As a 24-year-old musician put it: "Sometimes I feel caught in the middle -- especially if I happen to be hanging around French people at the time." The results appear not to support the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation.

Bilingualism and Social Distance

The relationship between bilingualism and social distance is very weak in Canada for both mother tongue groups (Table VIII.3). The measures used are far from ideal, since the vast majority of respondents of all backgrounds and both mother tongues manifest an unusual enthusiasm for each other as best friends and close relatives. Further, all those who had already acted upon this enthusiasm had to be dropped from the analysis since they "already had some." Proportionately more bilin-

TABLE VIII.3

SOCIAL DISTANCE IN CANADA BY DEGREE OF BILINGUALISM AND MOTHER TONGUE (in %)

Social Distance Measures	Mother Tongue: English			Mother Tongue: French		
	Uni-lingual	Bi-lingual	Equi-lingual	Uni-lingual	Bi-lingual	Equi-lingual
"From what you have heard about (English or French Canadians), or judging from your contactswith them, would you like to have some among your best friends?"						
No	16.5	6.5	---	13.2	5.7	8.1
Yes	83.5	93.5	100.0	86.8	94.3	91.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(1151)	(29)	(5)	(544)	(171)	(43)
	N.S.	(r=.05)*		Chi-square = 7.8 2 df, p = .02, (r=.09)*		
"From what you have heard about (English or French Canadians), or judging from your contacts with them, would you like to have some among your close relatives?"						
No	31.2	7.4	32.1	18.8	7.4	9.4
Yes	68.8	92.6	67.9	81.2	92.6	90.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(1052)	(35)	(5)	(490)	(164)	(41)
	N.S.	(r=.07)*		Chi-square = 13.4 2 df, p = .001, (r=.12)*		
"Which do you prefer: to belong to associations or clubs in which all members are people of your own ethnic group, or to belong to associations or clubs in which members are people of different ethnic groups?"						
Own ethnic group	12.6	10.8	10.7	39.9	21.3	18.1
Different groups/ or indifferent	87.4	89.2	89.3	60.1	78.7	81.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(1785)	(45)	(10)	(472)	(193)	(69)
	N.S.	(r=.01)*		Chi-square = 29.0 2 df, p < .001, (r=.19)*		

*r is significant at < .05 level
Source: Ethnic Relations Study

guals and equilinguals were thus excluded. Among those of English mother tongue, the relationship between bilingualism and the social distance measures is in the direction reported in previous research, but the chi-squares are not significant and the correlations extremely low: .05 on willingness to have the French as best friends, .07 on willingness to have the French as close relatives, and .01 on preferences regarding ethnic composition of voluntary associations. Among those of French mother tongue, the chi-squares are all significant and the correlations are somewhat higher: .09 on willingness to have the English as best friends, .12 on willingness to have the English as close relatives, and .19 as regards the preferred ethnic composition of voluntary associations.

Once intergroup contact and demographic context are controlled, the relationship between bilingualism and the social distance measures all but disappears among both mother tongue groups (Table VIII.4). While the effects of contact and demographic context are the same for those of English mother tongue, controls for both sets of variables yield a partial of .02 on willingness to have the French as best friends and a partial of .03 on willingness to have them as close relatives. (No partial is reported for preference of ethnic composition of voluntary associations since the zero-order is only .01.) These second-order partials compare to zero-orders of .05 and .07 respectively. Among those of French mother tongue, intergroup contact is a more important intervening variable than demographic context. There is no relationship between bilingualism and willingness to have the English as best friends when intergroup contact is controlled -- the zero-order is .09. The

TABLE VIII.4

PARTIAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN BILINGUALISM AND SOCIAL DISTANCE MEASURES CONTROLLING FOR CONTACT, CONTEXT, AND BACKGROUND VARIABLES

Controlling for	English			French		
	Social Distance Measures			Social Distance Measures		
	Friends	Relatives	Associations	Friends	Relatives	Associations
Zero-order	.05*	.07*	.01**	.09*	.12*	.19*
Interpersonal Contact and Frequency of Interpersonal Contact	.02	.03	---	.00	.05	.10*
Ethnic Composition of Electoral District and Linguistic Composition of Region	.02	.03	---	.07*	.11*	.16*
Interpersonal Contact, Frequency of Interpersonal Contact, Ethnic Composition of Electoral District, and Linguistic Composition of Region	.01	.02	---	---	.05	.09*
Sex	.05*	.07*	---	.08*	.12*	.19*
Age	.05*	.07*	---	.09*	.13*	.19*
Education	.05*	.07*	---	.07*	.13*	.16*
Occupation	.05*	.07*	---	.09*	.13*	.19*

*r is statistically significant at < .05 level

Source: Ethnic Relations Study

second-order partial of .05 on willingness to have the English as close relatives, with intergroup contact controlled, compares to a zero-order of .12. The relationship between bilingualism and preferences concerning the ethnic composition of voluntary associations is .10, with intergroup contact controlled. This contrasts with a zero-order of .19. The fourth-order partials for both contact and context do not differ to any extent from the second-order partials for contact alone.

The relationship between bilingualism and social distance is, therefore, rather weak, and since intergroup contact and demographic context have a relatively significant impact, causality cannot be attributed to bilingualism. Age, sex, education, and occupation are not important as intervening variables.

Bilingualism and Prejudice

Perceptions of the other group as acting superior, as speaking a language of poorer quality than that spoken by their co-linguists in the country of language origin, and as trying to get too much influence in politics were considered to be measures of prejudice (cf. Chapter III). While the relationships between bilingualism and the prejudice measures are statistically significant -- and this for both mother tongue groups -- the correlations are very low (Table VIII.5). Among those of English mother tongue, the zero-order correlation between bilingualism and the way the other group is perceived as treating others is .08; for those of French mother tongue it is .09. The zero-order

TABLE VIII.5

ETHNIC PREJUDICE IN CANADA BY DEGREE OF BILINGUALISM AND MOTHER TONGUE (in %)

Prejudice Measures	Mother Tongue: English			Mother Tongue: French		
	Uni-lingual	Bi-lingual	Equi-lingual	Uni-lingual	Bi-lingual	Equi-lingual
"From what you have heard about (members of the other group), or judging from your contacts with them, would you say that they treat other people as equals or that they act as if they were above other people?"						
Act 'above'	22.7	5.1	----	36.0	25.2	23.2
Treat as equals	77.3	94.9	100.0	64.0	74.8	76.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(1286)	(37)	(6)	(538)	(219)	(73)
	Corrected chi-square = 2 df, $p < .05$ ($r=.08$)*			Chi-square = 11.2, 2 df, $p = .004$ ($r=.09$)*		
"In your opinion, is the (language) spoken by (other group) better, as good as, or poorer than the (language) spoken by (other group members) of (country of origin)?						
Poorer	74.5	52.9	50.0	27.0	22.9	15.7
Better, as good as	25.5	47.1	50.0	73.0	77.1	84.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(1240)	(42)	(8)	(591)	(239)	(80)
	Chi-square = 11.8, 2 df, $p < .01$ ($r=.09$)*			N.S.		($r=.08$)*
"(Other group members) are trying to gain too much influence in the political affairs of Canada."						
Agree	68.4	43.0	34.4	67.1	54.8	46.6
Disagree	31.6	57.0	65.6	32.9	45.2	53.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(1695)	(47)	(11)	(625)	(217)	(59)
	Chi-square = 19.0, 2 df, $p < .001$ ($r=.10$)*			Chi-square = 17.7, 2 df, $p < .01$ ($r=.14$)*		

*r is statistically significant at < .05 level /Source: Ethnic Relations Study

correlation between bilingualism and the perceived quality of the other group's language is .09 for those of English mother tongue and .08 for those of French mother tongue. Perceptions of the other group as being politically threatening do not correlate strongly with bilingualism: the zero-orders are .10 for those of English mother tongue and .14 for those of French mother tongue.

Again, when controls for intergroup contact and demographic context are implemented, the relationship between bilingualism and the prejudice measures is very weak among both mother tongue groups (Table VIII.6). For those of English mother tongue, demographic context is slightly more important than intergroup contact; and for those of French mother tongue, the inverse is true. For both mother tongue groups, with intergroup contact and demographic context controlled, the fourth-order partial correlations between bilingualism and the prejudice measures range between .02 and .07; these compare to zero-orders ranging between .08 and .14. Age, sex, education, and occupation are not important as intervening variables.

While the relationships between bilingualism and both the social distance and prejudice measures are in the direction suggested by other research, these relationships are extremely weak: on both sets of measures (Table VIII.7) the correlations range between .01 and .10 for those of English mother tongue, and between .08 and .19 for those of French mother tongue. Controls for intergroup contact and demographic context result in partial coefficients which are considerably lower, relatively speaking, than these zero-orders. The correlations of ethnic

TABLE VIII.6

PARTIAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN BILINGUALISM AND PREJUDICE MEASURES CONTROLLING FOR CONTACT, CONTEXT, AND BACKGROUND VARIABLES

Controlling for	English			French		
	Prejudice Measures			Prejudice Measures		
	Treatment of Others	Quality of Language	Political Threat	Treatment of Others	Quality of Language	Political Threat
Zero-order	.08*	.09*	.10*	.11*	.08*	.14*
Interpersonal Contact and Frequency of Interpersonal Contact	.05	.09*	.09*	.03**	.05	.07*
Ethnic Composition of Electoral District and Linguistic Composition of Region	.04	.06	.07	.07*	.05	.08*
Interpersonal Contact, Frequency of Interpersonal Contact, Ethnic Composition of Electoral District, and Linguistic Composition of Region	.03	.06	.07	.02	.04	.04
Sex	.08*	.09*	.10*	.11*	.08*	.14*
Age	.08*	.09*	.10*	.11*	.07*	.14*
Education	.07*	.09*	.10*	.10*	.08*	.12*
Occupation	.07*	.09*	.10*	.11*	.08*	.14*

*r is statistically significant at < .05 level

Source: Ethnic Relations Study

TABLE VIII.7

CORRELATIONS OF SOCIAL DISTANCE AND PREJUDICE MEASURES WITH DEGREE OF BILINGUALISM AND LOCATION IN ETHNIC SPACE

Measures	Mother Tongue			
	English		French	
	Bilingualism	Ethnic Identity	Bilingualism	Ethnic Identity
Friends	.05*	.16*	.09*	.15*
Relatives	.07*	.25*	.12*	.14*
Associations	.01	.12*	.19*	.23*
Treatment of Others	.08*	.15*	.11*	.22*
Quality of Language	.09*	.10*	.08*	.07*
Political Threat	.10*	.17*	.14*	.19*

* r is statistically significant at < .05 level

Source: Ethnic Relations Study

identity to social distance, and to prejudice are also very weak (Table VIII.7): these range between .10 and .25 for those of English mother tongue, and between .07 and .23 for those of French mother tongue. Previous theoretical and empirical research implies a stronger relationship.

Summary

It was pointed out that both Mead (1964) and Schutz (1964) seem to tie together (in their discussions of the effects of the internalization of another cultural scheme of interpretation and expression) both identity and attitudes. Christophersen (1948) linked identification with both groups, and conflicts of allegiance. While bilingualism correlates with allegiance, social distance, and prejudice, the relationships are far weaker than other research on bilingualism would lead one to expect. Although it has been assumed that ethnic allegiance and ethnocentrism correlates highly with identity, this appears not to be the case.

It could be argued that the extremely low correlations which were obtained were due to inadequate measures of the dependent variables. This point is readily conceded since the field experience in Montreal convinced the researcher that there may be a great deal of respondent distortion in responses to these questions. Perhaps there is considerable ideological pressure in Canada, an *officially* bilingual and multicultural society, to report more liberal ethnic attitudes than the respondent really holds.

It would appear that Canadians tend to over-report their degree of proficiency in the other official language and to under-report their degree of social distance and prejudice. This would, of course, account for the very low correlations cited in this chapter. On the other hand, many of the measures of ethnicity, language proficiency, ethnic prejudice, and so forth, current in Canadian survey research, appear too "loose" and invite respondent distortion, given the prevailing ideological climate. Researchers who, themselves, are steeped in this ideological climate, need greater ingenuity in devising more appropriate and valid measures.

Survey research has come of age; and just as people in urban areas have learned how to act when the local TV or radio station thrusts a microphone under their noses, so have they come to know the role of "survey respondent." People are continually filling in questionnaires of all sorts and are accustomed to "being interviewed." Several respondents in the Montreal sample refused to be interviewed since similar requests had been made of them in the recent past, and one respondent explicitly stated that she was refusing because she had just been interviewed the night before (over the phone) by investigators from the Université de Québec at Montreal who wished to know how she felt about their ongoing strike. One cannot board an airplane or dine at a restaurant, it would seem, without encountering questionnaires. Some respondents in Montreal volunteered their names and addresses, and asked that they be sent published reports of the research. It is time that the assumption of the "naive" respondent -- an assumption which thrives

in the minds of researchers--were abandoned. A good proportion of respondents in urban areas have been interviewed by telephone or in person before, and they know that they might be reading about the study in the local newspapers several weeks later.

Respondent distortion on questions which have ideological connotations appears to be a strong possibility. It would appear that this has occurred on these particular questions in the Ethnic Relations Study and that, consequently, they do not constitute valid measures of the attitudes people really hold in these matters. This having been said, it must be pointed out that, since intergroup contact and demographic context are significant intervening variables, bilingualism cannot be said to cause lower social distance and lower prejudice. The significance of these findings in terms of the theoretical and empirical research literature will be dealt with in the concluding chapter.

CHAPTER IX

A LIFE CYCLE PERSPECTIVE ON BILINGUALISM, IDENTITY, AND ETHNIC ATTITUDES

Introduction

It was hypothesized in the first chapter that if the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation of the association between bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes were an adequate one, the "effects" of bilingualism ought to recede as bilingualism declines. However, the evidence presented in previous chapters has revealed that the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation is inadequate. But there is another reason of theoretical significance for wishing to explore the question of whether, as bilingualism declines, its "effects" recede. Gardner and Lambert (1972) theorize that those who learn a second language better are those who are less ethnocentric and who identify less strongly with their own ethnic group. If one states that those who are both less ethnocentric and less likely to identify with their own language group learn second languages with more ease and with greater fluency, one is claiming that basic personality variables (which are, presumably, stable over the course of the life cycle) are involved. It would not be expected from such a perspective that loss of fluency in the second language would be accompanied by an increase in ethnocentrism or by a greater tendency to identify with the mother tongue group. Operationally speaking, if relationships of age to identity, of age to social distance, and of age to prejudice should

cease to exist if bilingualism is controlled, this would indicate two things: firstly, it is loss of fluency in the second language which accounts for the association between age and the dependent variables; secondly, it is unlikely that bilinguals in Canada are any less ethnocentric and any less likely to identify with their own group prior to becoming bilingual.

Longitudinal Inferences from Cross-Sectional Data

In this chapter, we are attempting to determine: (1) whether as bilingualism decreases, identification with the mother tongue group, social distance and prejudice toward the non-mother tongue group increase; or (2) whether as bilingualism decreases there is no change in group identity, identification, social distance, and prejudice. As longitudinal data are not available, a cross-sectional analysis of the Ethnic Relations Study will be pursued. Longitudinal inferences from cross-sectional data are methodologically risky for the familiar reason that the results obtained might be due to a cohort effect. However, if bilingualism declines cross-sectionally with age in the Ethnic Relations Study, comparisons will be made with Census data which show that, in fact, bilingualism does decline longitudinally with age in Canada. There would still be the problem of demonstrating that the age categories at which bilingualism declines longitudinally is stable from one cohort to another. If it could be shown that bilingualism in the Ethnic Relations Study declines cross-sectionally in the same age category as that in which bilingualism declines in the Census, and that the age at which bilingualism declines in the Census is stable from one cohort to another, there would still remain the problem of determining whether variation in the dependent variables is due to a cohort effect and, if not, whether the variation in the dependent variables might

be due to factors other than declining bilingualism. Each of these issues will be taken up in turn.

It is fortunate that the question of whether or not bilingualism declines with age longitudinally can be resolved. Table IX.1 presents Lieberson's (1970: 101) estimates of the rate of bilingualism by age cohorts in 1941, 1951, and 1961; these are rates estimated from the census data by means of a rather complex procedure. Also included in this table (Table IX.1) are the actual rates, as opposed to estimated rates, for the same age categories in the 1971 census; these data were tabulated for the researcher by Statistics Canada. It is quite evident that the actual rates of bilingualism in each age category for 1971 are highly similar to Lieberson's estimations for 1961 and prior censuses. It therefore seems legitimate to compare the 1971 results with Lieberson's estimates for previous censuses.

It is apparent from Table IX.1 that bilingualism declines cross-sectionally with age among both sexes of both mother tongue groups, and this across all four Censuses between 1941 and 1971. However, the central issue pertains to the age at which bilingualism declines and whether this is stable across different cohorts for both sexes of both mother tongue groups. To determine this, three age cohorts--the 0 - 4, the 10 - 14, and 20 - 24 age categories in 1941--are followed across the various Censuses through 1971. These results are presented in Table IX.2. Unfortunately, while bilingualism declines with age longitudinally, the age at which bilingualism declines varies by cohort and by sex. Among anglophone males and females, and among francophone males, the age at which bilingualism declines drops from the 50-54 age category among those in the 20 - 24 cohort in 1941, to the 40 - 44 age category among those aged 10 - 14 in 1941; among anglophones of both sexes, the age at which bilingualism declines drops to the 30 - 34 age group

TABLE IX.1

BILINGUALISM BY AGE, SEX, AND MOTHER TONGUE, CANADA: 1941, 1951, 1961, and 1971

Age	English Mother Tongue: Percent Learning French								French Mother Tongue: Percent Learning English							
	Male				Female				Male				Female			
	1941	1951	1961	1971	1941	1951	1961	1971	1941	1951	1961	1971	1941	1951	1961	1971
0-4	1.0	1.0	0.8	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.1	8.6	5.0	4.1	7.9	8.5	4.9	3.8	7.9
5-9	2.3	2.1	1.9	2.0	2.4	2.1	2.1	2.2	13.0	9.8	10.7	12.6	13.1	10.4	10.7	12.8
10-14	3.7	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.9	3.5	3.8	4.5	19.8	17.5	17.8	17.8	19.5	17.4	17.3	17.9
15-19	5.2	5.8	6.6	7.4	5.9	6.0	7.5	10.9	37.0	35.4	35.0	32.7	33.2	33.1	34.2	33.5
20-24	6.1	7.0	9.0	9.4	5.7	6.1	7.7	9.3	50.7	49.2	48.9	50.5	41.4	39.1	40.3	41.1
25-29	6.4	7.6	10.2	8.6	5.4	5.7	7.9	7.1	55.2	55.4	53.7	53.0	43.1	40.6	38.6	39.2
30-34	6.9	8.0	10.4	7.7	5.3	5.7	7.8	6.0	57.7	57.1	55.6	52.9	42.3	41.0	38.8	38.6
35-39	7.0	7.9	11.2	7.3	5.2	5.6	7.7	5.7	59.8	57.3	57.0	54.0	40.9	40.7	40.2	38.5
40-44	7.4	8.0	9.5	7.1	4.6	5.3	7.4	5.7	61.9	57.6	57.5	54.5	41.4	39.2	40.1	38.6
45-49	7.3	8.1	9.4	7.1	4.5	5.2	6.8	5.4	61.1	58.2	55.7	55.0	39.7	37.8	39.7	39.3
50-54	6.2	7.9	9.1	6.9	3.9	4.9	6.5	5.2	59.7	58.9	54.6	53.9	37.9	36.4	37.9	38.9
55-59	5.3	7.9	8.4	6.4	3.5	4.4	5.9	4.8	57.4	56.7	53.7	51.2	36.5	34.6	29.9	36.7
60-64	4.7	6.4	8.1	5.7	3.2	3.8	5.0	4.5	54.9	53.6	52.6	48.5	34.0	32.6	33.2	33.7
65-69	4.2	4.9	6.8	4.7	3.0	3.2	4.3	3.4	52.3	51.0	49.1	45.2	32.0	30.9	31.1	31.4
70-74	4.0	4.3	5.6	4.3	2.9	3.1	3.9	3.2	48.1	46.5	45.0	43.7	28.9	28.8	29.4	29.9

* The data for 1941, 1951, and 1961 were taken from Lieberson (1970: 101) who derived them by means of an estimating procedure. The lay-out of the table was also taken from Lieberson (1970: 101). The 1941 figures do not include Newfoundland.

** The data for 1971 were obtained by means of a special tabulation from Statistics Canada (no. 8884 A, 1975).

TABLE IX.2

AGE CATEGORY IN WHICH BILINGUALISM DECLINES FOR SPECIFIC CENSUS COHORTS ACROSS THE 1941, 1951, 1961, AND 1971 CENSUSES

Age Cohort (1941 Census)	Age Category in Which Bilingualism Declines			
	English Mother Tongue		French Mother Tongue	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
0 - 4	30 - 34	30 - 34	_____*	30-34
10-14	40 - 44	40 - 44	40 - 44	30 - 34
20-24	50 - 54	50 - 54	50 - 54	30 - 34

*There is no decline in bilingualism for the 0-4 (1941) French male cohort as of the 1971 Census.

Source: Table IX.1

for the 0 - 4 cohort of 1941 (though, paradoxically, the proportion of anglophones who are bilingual appears to be rising the younger the cohort!). Among francophone females, bilingualism starts to decline in the 30 - 34 age category in all three cohorts. From Table IX.3 it can be seen that bilingualism declines cross-sectionally in the Ethnic Relations Study only in the 60 - 69 age category and this compares poorly with the trends in the Census data. This is a rather thorny, unanticipated difficulty.

Overlooking the complication mentioned above, for the moment, if identification with the mother tongue group, social distance and prejudice all increase with age (as bilingualism declines) and this when bilingualism is controlled, then, several interpretations are possible. It could be argued that this is due to a cohort effect--that older Canadians were brought up in a period when social distance and prejudice were higher. Alternatively, and of more theoretical import, it could be argued that this reflects a developmental process associated with aging. The reasoning behind this latter argument is worth exploring.

Baum and Baum (1973) view ethnicity as providing a basic framework within which life events can be integrated and made meaningful. As they point out with regard to ethnicity: "Being an ascriptive status, ethnicity is inescapable, hence reductive of a generalized sense of choice as to who one is, was, and could have been" (Baum and Baum, 1973: 55). Another aspect of ethnicity pointed out by Baum and Baum (1973: 55) is this: "Being past oriented in the focal time dimension . . . ethnicity also provides a relatively more acceptant normative climate for

TABLE IX. 3

BILINGUALISM BY AGE IN THE ETHNIC RELATIONS STUDY (in %)

Bilingualism	Age					
	Under 29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70 -
Not Bilingual	87.6	88.1	85.4	84.3	87.8	91.2
Bilingual	12.4	11.9	14.6	15.7	12.2	8.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	(642)	(726)	(727)	(494)	(360)	(285)
	N.S.					

Source: Ethnic Relations Study

engagement with the past." The Baums reason that in societies where ethnic identities have high legitimacy (as in Canada, for instance), an identification with an ethnic group enhances the probability of "integrity" outcomes of the life review process, a process which Butler (1968) claims to be universal. Baum and Baum argue that a life review organized from an ethnic frame of reference (where such identities are legitimate) has higher chances of being successful -- that is, what Erikson (1959; 1963) calls an "integrity" outcome. In viewing one's biography from the perspective of a participant in a collectivity with a past, present and future larger than one's own, one's life experience can more readily be made sense of, and one's "ego identity" maintained. Blau (1973: 108) reports data indicating that "participation in a social group forestalls the psychological changes that mark old age more effectively than participation in a number of dyadic relationships" and that having "even one stable group in which *others share with the older person the knowledge of who and what he was before he grew old* acts to preserve sameness of identity" (1973: 113).

The capacity of ethnicity to serve this function can be illustrated through biographical material. Speaking of the life of the eminent linguist, Edward Sapir, Mandelbaum (Sapir, 1968: x) recounts:

> he would occasionally tell how profoundly Judaism had affected his life. During childhood he had rebelled against it. The interminable regulations, the blinding restrictions of orthodoxy seemed unnecessary, intolerable. But as he grew older he came more and more to appreciate the grand plan that lay beneath the irksome details. Toward the end of his life he turned to the ethnological and linguistic study of the Talmud. . . .

Henry (1968: 212) quotes Freud to illustrate how Jewry provided the latter with "a sense of history and purpose that locates the individual in a continuity:"

> . . . it was my Jewish nature alone that (sic) I owed two characteristics that had become indispensible to me in the difficult course of my life. Because I was a Jew I found myself free from many prejudices which restricted others in the use of their intellect; and as a Jew I was prepared to join the Opposition and to do without agreement with the "compact majority."

Occupational identities, which may have changed several times in the course of a lifetime, and which cover only a portion of the life cycle, cannot provide the comprehensive framework for reviewing a life lived or maintining "ego identity" comparable to that furnished by ethnic and kinship identities.

While the theoretical reasoning above night account for increases in ethnocentrism which occur very late in life (among those over the age of sixty, for instance), it would not adequately explain increases in ethnocentrism which emerged in middle-age, for example. It would seem unlikely that, prior to the years immediately preceding retirement, people are consciously or unconsciously preparing for death. The view that ethnocentrism is higher among older people is a popularly held view, but there is little evidence to show that this effect is longitudinal.

Ethnic Identity, Social Distance, Prejudice and the Life Cycle

Given the difficulties discussed in the previous section, the reader might rightly balk at any attempt to make longitudinal inferences from the projected cross-sectional analysis of the Ethnic Relations Study. The results presented in Table IX.4 render unnecessary any such epistemological leap. In terms of both ethnic identity, social distance, and prejudice as well, there appears to be a cohort effect at work. That is, overall, identification with the mother tongue group, social distance, and prejudice tend to increase slightly in each age category, rather than manifesting the curvilinear relationship with age which one would expect if bilingualism were an important intervening variable.

Regarding the 50 - 59 age group, the results for this age category appear to be inconsistent if all of the dependent variables are taken as a set. If it were not for the kinds of responses given by the 50 - 59 age group, there would be a weak, but definite, tendency for identification with the mother tongue group, for social distance, and for prejudice to increase in each age category. The response patterns of the 50 - 59 age group are puzzling. However, this is the only age category which was pre-coded into a ten-year interval in the original codebook. (All the other age categories in the Ethnic Relations Study were precoded into five-year intervals.) Why this was done, is not indicated in the York Survey Research Centre codebook which accompanies the data.

If one is prepared to question the results for the 50-59 age group, the overall trend of identification with the mother tongue group, social distance, and prejudice, is for these to increase in each age

TABLE IX. 4

ETHNIC IDENTITY, SOCIAL DISTANCE, AND PREJUDICE BY AGE IN CANADA (in %)

Dependent Variable	Age					
	Under 29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70 -
Identifies with mother tongue group	82.9	82.4	82.3	81.2	84.7	88.7
	N.S. (N = 3070)					
Not willing to have members of the other group as best friends	10.4	9.0	13.5	11.3	23.1	21.4
	Chi-square = 38.2, 5 df, p = .001 (N = 1974)					
Not willing to have members of the other group as close relatives	14.5	17.2	22.0	24.1	34.5	37.9
	Chi-square = 57.6, 5 df, p < .001 (N = 1831)					
Prefers voluntary associations composed of members of own ethnic group	15.6	17.2	18.3	18.2	21.6	23.2
	N.S. (N = 2515)					
Perceives other group as acting superior	22.5	24.1	29.9	24.0	27.8	30.0
	N.S. (N =2108)					
Perceives other group as speaking a language of poorer quality	53.8	50.4	55.6	51.6	53.8	59.9
	N.S. (N = 2122)					
Perceives other group as trying to gain too much influence in politics	57.4	61.0	65.3	72.6	75.8	75.5
	Chi-square =52.7 , 5 df, p < .001 (N=2575)					

Source: Ethnic Relations Study

category. This would seem to suggest a cohort effect rather than a developmental one, unless one is willing to countenance the idea that a hardening of the social arteries begins at thirty. Bilingualism appears to have little to do with this trend. Given the ambiguities surrounding the 50 - 59 age category, further analysis would be of dubious value.

Summary and Discussion

An analysis of the Ethnic Relations data proved unhelpful in the attempt (made in this chapter) to discover whether, as bilingualism declines, there are increases in the tendency to identify with the mother tongue group, in social distance, and in prejudice. Such a trend would have been interpreted as evidence against the hypothesis that bilinguals are less ethnocentric and less likely to identify with their mother tongue group prior to becoming bilingual. The analysis did indicate that identification with the mother tongue group, social distance, and prejudice increase in every age category (excepting the 50-59 age group); and this seems due to cohort effects rather than a developmental one.[1]

Data have been presented which demonstrate that bilingualism declines longitudinally with age in Canadian society between the ages of 30 - 55 depending upon the cohort, sex, and mother tongue group. It seems rather doubtful that bilingualism should decline in this stage of the life cycle because of a change in ethnic identity or in ethnic attitudes associated with aging. It might be more fruitful to focus on such factors as the levelling off of occupational careers and on changing patterns of social participation. As occupational careers level off, there may be little incentive to maintain a second language unless it is already in use.

At the same stage in life, social participation patterns may change or social participation may start to decline. Both these developments may involve decreased contact with the other language group and, subsequently, a gradual change in the level of fluency in the other language and perhaps in ethnic identity and ethnic attitudes, since social interaction patterns do have an impact on the latter (cf. Chapter V; Maxwell, 1971). In any event, empirical data capable of providing further insight into what might be called "language unlearning" among the official language groups in Canada is not presently available.

NOTES

1. I had argued in favour of the Baum and Baum (1973) viewpoint and presented a paper entitled "Aging and Ethnicity: a Provisional Hypothesis" at the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association meetings in 1974 in which a cross-sectional analysis of the Ethnic Relations Study was used to support it. In this particular paper, fewer age categories were used, different coding decisions were taken, and the data were broken down by principal language (language of the home) rather than mother tongue. As a result of the use of a larger number of age categories and a number of different coding decisions, the data seem to suggest that a cohort effect is more probable than a developmental one. If one argues in favour of a developmental interpretation, one would have to countenance the idea that a hardening of the social arteries begins around thirty. Whatever the merits of that view, neither Baum and Baum's (1973) theoretical reasoning nor my own could account for it. Moreover, if there is a tendency to orient oneself to things ethnic in later life, the tendency would not be a strong one, if the cross-sectional data were given a longitudinal interpretation.

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSIONS

This dissertation has focussed upon the relationship between bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes. At stake were several important empirical and theoretical issues. At the empirical level, the thrust of previous research in several disciplines is that there is an association between bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes. Bilinguals are said to identify with both groups whose languages they speak, to have divided loyalties, and to be less ethnocentric (Christophersen, 1948; Diebold, 1968; Gardner and Lambert, 1972; Guboglo, 1974; Mead, 1964; Pieris, 1951).

Mead (1964: 258), for instance, refers to the bilingual as acquiring "a new soul," as becoming "a different individual." According to Mead (1964: 258), one cannot converse with members of another community in their language "without taking on its peculiar attitudes." Pieris (1951: 321) contended that "a bare colloquial smattering of a foreign language gives the speaker a sense of identification with the culture that language symbolizes" and that "many bilinguals are acutely aware of their cultural marginality" (1951: 336). Christophersen (1948: 8) claimed that "nobody can know a language perfectly without associating himself to a large extent with the people who speak it." Schutz (1964: 104-105) theorized that those who internalized another cultural scheme of interpretation and expression to the point of being able to use it as the scheme of their own

expression would, if one or the other was not opted for, become "a cultural hybrid on the verge of two different patterns of group life, not knowing to which of them he belongs." Diebold (1968) is rather critical of the research methodologies on which many social psychological studies of bilingualism have been based. Much of this research has been based on participant observation, clinical, or experimental studies. Diebold (1968: 236) pointed out that "there are no surveys to aid in formulating the generalizations." To date, there have not been studies of bilingualism from a social psychological orientation whose results are generalizable to specific communities, regions, or societies. For this reason, three sample surveys, a national sample survey of Canada, and sample surveys of greater Montreal, and the Census Metropolitan Area of Ottawa constituted the data sources for this study.

Compatibility of the General Results with Previous Research

In the analysis of the Ethnic Relations Study, a national sample survey of Canada, it was found that there is indeed an association between bilingualism and ethnic identity in Canada (among those having an official language as their mother tongue). The correlation (r) is, however, a rather modest .20. Whereas 14.6% of unilinguals said that they felt they were as close to each or between both groups when they were asked whether they felt closer to English Canadians or closer to French Canadians, this proportion rises to 25.1% among bilinguals, and to 57.3% among equilinguals (i.e. those who say they speak both languages equally well). The strength of the relationship between bilingualism and ethnic identity is highly consistent from one region of the country to the other, ranging from a low of .23 in

Ontario to a high of .27 in Quebec and British Columbia. Moreover, in the Montreal Study, a sample survey of greater Montreal, and in the Recurrent Education Study, a sample survey of the Ottawa Census Metropolitan Area, the correlations between bilingualism and ethnic identity are .34 and .26, respectively. These consistencies emerge despite the use of different measures of the independent and dependent variables in each of the three studies, and despite the fact that these studies were conducted at different points in time. While there is, then, a consistent but modest correlation between bilingualism and ethnic identity among the official language groups in Canadian society, this relationship appears not to be as strong as Christophersen (1948), Mead (1964), and Pieris (1951) would seem to suggest.

As for the contention made by Christophersen (1948) that bilinguals tend to have divided loyalties, the strength of this relationship could only be determined by means of the Montreal Study since neither of the two remaining studies included a measure of ethnic allegiance. When asked whether they were more on the French side or more on the English side when disputes arose between the French and the English, 25% of unilinguals, 42% of bilinguals, and 66.7% of equilinguals responded that they sided with neither group. The correlation between degree of bilingualism and this measure of ethnic allegiance is .28. It would appear that at least in Montreal, there is a tendency for bilinguals to remain neutral in ethnic disputes.

Regarding the relationship reported in previous research between bilingualism and "ethnocentrism," rather weak correlations between bilingualism and social distance, and between bilingualism and ethnic prejudice were found. These results were obtained in the analysis of the Ethnic Relations Study though the measures used were not ideal (cf. Chapter VIII). As measures of social distance, willingness to have members of the other

official language group as best friends and as close relatives, and preferences regarding the ethnic composition of associations and clubs were used. The correlations between degree of bilingualism and each of these variables is .05, .07, and .01 for those of English mother tongue, and .09, .12, and .19 for those of French mother tongue. As measures of prejudice, responses to three questions were used: the first asked whether members of the other group treated other people as equals or whether they acted as if they were above other people; the second asked whether the language spoken by members of the other official language group was better, as good as, or poorer than the language spoken in their ancestors' country of origin; the third asked whether members of the other group were trying to get too much influence in politics. The association between degree of bilingualism and these variables were .08, .09, and .10 for those of English mother tongue, and .09, .08, and .14 for those of French mother tongue. While bilinguals do tend to manifest less social distance and less prejudice towards members of the other language group, these relationships do not appear to be of the magnitude suggested in previous research. More powerful measures might have resulted in higher correlations.

Christophersen (1948), Mead (1964), and Schutz (1964) seem to imply that attitudinal changes and the restructuring of identity occur simultaneously within the same individual in the process of internalizing another cultural scheme of interpretation and expression. These views receive very weak support in this study. The analysis of the Montreal Study revealed a correlation of .34 between degree of bilingualism and ethnic identity, but the correlation between ethnic identity and ethnic allegiance is only .19. As regards the correlations between ethnic identity and the measures of both social distance and prejudice in the Ethnic Relations Study,

these provide weak support for the views mentioned above--the correlations between ethnic identity and the social distance measures range between .12 and .25 for those of English mother tongue, and between .14 and .23 for those of French mother tongue; as regards the prejudice measures, the correlations between these and ethnic identity range between .10 and .17 for those of English mother tongue, and between .07 and .22 for those of French mother tongue.

In summary, in terms of the empirical findings, there are associations between bilingualism, ethnic identity, ethnic allegiance, social distance, and prejudice, though these relationships appear weaker than one would expect from previous research. In reports of clinical and experimental studies, only percentages or means and *t* values are reported in the overwhelming majority of cases. However, the verbal interpretations of the data in these reports, and the reports of participant observers or theoreticians have implied stronger relationships than those reported here. One reason for this might be that "bilingualism" has often remained undefined, either conceptually or operationally, and one gets the impression that very fluent bilinguals may often have been compared to unilinguals. Since it was found in this study that the relationship between bilingualism and the dependent variables varies (in most cases) with degree of bilingualism, it does matter what one means by "bilingual." A stronger relationship between bilingualism and the dependent variables would emerge in two by two designs used in clinical or experimental studies if, as might be suspected, very fluent bilinguals were compared with unilinguals.

Theoretical Implications of the Findings

The voluminous clinical and experimental research on bilingualism has often attributed causality of that which was found to be associated with bilingualism to bilingualism itself. In this regard, Diebold (1968: 219) voices the suspicion that "matched" samples of unilinguals and bilinguals which were compared as though bilingualism were the critical variable, were not otherwise equally matched. Most studies of bilingualism in which clinical or experimental methods are used do not attempt to take into account the effects of plausible intervening variables. Such research usually involves the intensive study of a small number of cases and the use of children or adolescents as subjects. To vary sociological variables in any meaningful way, a relatively large number of cases is required. Given the relative dearth of bilinguals in many societies, large samples are necessary if one wishes not only to vary sociological variables but to generalize one's results to a specific population. In short, methodological shortcomings have impeded progress at the theoretical level.

In social psychological research on bilingualism it has too often been assumed rather than demonstrated that that which has been observed to be associated with bilingualism is, in fact, caused by it. Research findings based on this assumption have been made sense of in terms of an implicit or explicit unicausal social psychological theory which has been called in this dissertation the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation; the essence of this explanation is that language cannot be learned in the abstract since it is a vehicle of the culture to which it corresponds; hence, the internalization of another linguistic system involves the internalization of another cultural scheme of interpretation and expression--and it is this which has an impact upon ethnic identity and ethnic attitudes.

As was pointed out in Chapter 1, theoretical support for this explanation can be derived by extrapolating from the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of linguistic relativity, from Mead's (1964) symbolic interactionist approach to the link between language and identity, and from Schutz's (1964) social phenomenology. The "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation of the relationship between bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes has been challenged by Soffietti (1955) and Diebold (1968). Both these authors suggest that these relationships might be due to exposure to the other culture and to the social context in which the bilingual operates.

It was argued in the opening Chapter that if the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation was an adequate one, one would expect that the relationships between bilingualism and ethnic identity, and between bilingualism and ethnic attitudes would be strong, that they would vary in a linear fashion with degree of bilingualism, and that they would not be affected by controls for such variables as intergroup contact and demographic context. It was suggested that the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation could be considered to be inadequate if controls for plausible intervening variables resulted in weaker relationships between the independent and dependent variables. It was further argued that, by extrapolation, the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation implies that the language one speaks best is the best predictor of one's ethnic identity where transfers in dominant language occur; it was reasoned that if learning a second language has an impact upon one's ethnic identity such that one identifies with both language groups, persons transferring to another language, could be expected to identify with the corresponding language group. Finally, if causality of that which has been observed to be associated with bilingualism can properly be attributed to bilingualism itself, one would expect that

as bilingualism declines (bilingualism declines longitudinally with age in Canada) that ethnic identities and ethnic attitudes of former bilinguals would resemble those of unilinguals. The findings pertaining to each of these points will be summarized in turn.

As has been pointed out earlier in this Chapter, the relationship between bilingualism and ethnic identity in Canada is not strong--rather, there is a modest but consistent correlation between these variables, and this across all three studies used in the dissertation, each of which included different measures of the independent and dependent variables. The correlation between bilingualism and identity is .20 in the Ethnic Relations Study, .34 in the Montreal Study, and .26 in the Recurrent Education Study (Ottawa). Not only do the correlations between bilingualism and ethnic identity appear to be too weak to be accounted for in terms of the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation, these correlations vary considerably by mother tongue group, a finding which cannot be reconciled with this unicausal social psychological theory. In the Ethnic Relations Study, the correlation between bilingualism and ethnic identity is .13 among those of English mother tongue, and .29 among those of French mother tongue; in the Montreal Study, these correlations are .55 and .30, respectively; in the Recurrent Education Study, the correlation between bilingualism and ethnic identity is .16 for those of English mother tongue and .26 among those of French mother tongue. The adequacy of the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation was further undermined when controls for intergroup contact and demographic context were implemented. Using the Ethnic Relations Study, controls for both intergroup contact and demographic context among both official language groups each resulted in lower correlations between bilingualism and ethnic identity. Among those of English mother tongue,

controls for intergroup contact resulted in a partial correlation coefficient of .10 compared to the initial zero-order correlation of .13; among those of French mother tongue, this control resulted in a partial of .14 as compared to a zero-order of .29; controls for demographic context resulted in a partial of .07 among those of English mother tongue, and of .21 among those of French mother tongue. Controlling simultaneously for both intergroup contact and demographic context, a partial correlation coefficient of .07 results among those of English mother tongue, and of .10 among those of French mother tongue as compared to zero-orders of .13 and .29, respectively. Since the relationship between bilingualism and ethnic identity is extremely weak when intergroup contact and demographic context are controlled, it is quite apparent that causality of the observed relationship cannot be attributed to bilingualism. Further, given the obvious importance of sociological variables, the association between bilingualism and ethnic identity cannot be explained in terms of purely psychological or linguistic theories.

Similar results were obtained in examining the relationship between bilingualism and social distance, and between bilingualism and prejudice by means of the Ethnic Relations Study. The measures used and the zero-order correlations have been reported elsewhere in this Chapter. When controls for both intergroup contact and demographic context were implemented, partial correlations of .01, .02, and .00 were obtained on each measure of social distance among those of English mother tongue; these contrast with zero-orders of .05, .07, and .01. Among those of French mother tongue, controls for intergroup contact and demographic context resulted in partials of .00, .05, and .09 on each of the social distance measures; these contrast with zero-orders of .09, .12, and .19. As for the relationship between bilingualism and the prejudice measures, when controls for intergroup contact and demographic context were implemented, the partial cor-

relations were considerably lower than the zero-orders among both mother tongue groups: among those of English mother tongue, partials of .03, .06, and .07 contrast with zero-orders of .08, .09, and .09; among those of French mother tongue, partials of .02, .04, and .04 contrast with zero-orders of .11, .08, and .14. While there are weak relationships between bilingualism and social distance, and between bilingualism and prejudice, these all but disappear when intergroup contact and demographic context are controlled. Causality cannot therefore be attributed to bilingualism and sociological factors are of obvious importance.

As regards the extrapolation from the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation that when a transfer to another dominant language (language spoken best) occurs, dominant language ought to best predict one's ethnic identity, the findings were ambiguous (cf. Chapter IV). While dominant language predicts ethnic identity better than either other language variables or ethnic origin among the official language groups in Canada, there are regional variations. While dominant language is a better predictor of ethnic identity in Quebec and Ontario, language of the home is a better predictor in the Maritimes, while mother tongue is a better predictor in the Prairie provinces. The attempt to determine whether, as bilingualism declines, the "effects" of bilingualism recede (which would seem to be a corollary of the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation) was not successful. The procedure followed involved an attempt to make longitudinal inferences from cross-sectional data by means of the Ethnic Relations Study; the attempt failed since there appeared to be cohort effects at work which rendered the analysis of dubious value (cf. Chapter IX).

The finding of major theoretical import is that causality of the association between bilingualism and ethnic identity, and between bilingualism and ethnic attitudes cannot be attributed to bilingualism. This would seem to resolve a theoretical squabble of long duration in social psychological research on bilingualism. Despite Diebold's (1968) grave misgivings concerning the attribution of causality of that which has been found to be associated with bilingualism to bilingualism itself, he states concerning the "alienation" and "anomie" which has been reported among bilinguals with bicultural backgrounds:

> It is not at all clear at the time of this writing whether the critical factors are exclusively sociolinguistic. Especially among my colleagues in anthropology whom I have consulted, there is a conviction that a linguistic cognitive etiology is basic. Their interpretation is not the simplistic appeal to the bilingual's "having too much in his head" but a much more sophisticated argument based on concepts of cognitive perceptual incongruence; these concepts would include what psychologists discuss in terms of "contamination of categories," expectancy disconfirmations involving "double-bind" and "cognitive dissonance," and "perceptual disparity."

This line of theoretical reasoning involves the grafting on of a consistency model of psychological functioning to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of linguistic relativity. The findings of this study would seem to strongly discourage linguistic, psychological, or psycho-linguistic explanations of such phenomena. Quite simply, the relationships between bilingualism and ethnic identity, and between bilingualism and ethnic attitudes are very weak with intergroup contact and demographic context controlled.

While the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation invoked by both anthropologists and psychologists is based on the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of linguistic relativity, to which is added the assumption of a consistency model of psychological functioning, sociologists have access to a different source of similar theoretical reasoning which can be traced,

to mention only the giants, from Cooley (1909), through Mead (1964), to the phenomenology of Schutz (1964). Cooley (1909: 69-70) was a rather poetic proponent of the "language as a vehicle of culture" theory, but he did not apply it to bilingualism:

> A word is a vehicle, a boat floating down from the past, laden with the thought of men we never saw; and in coming to understand it we enter not only into the minds of our contemporaries, but into the general mind of humanity continuous through time.
>
> It is almost the most wonderful thing about language that by something intangible in its order and movement and in the selection and collocation of words, it can transmit the very soul of man. . . .

Mead (1964), who was influenced by Cooley, his precursor, applied this line of reasoning to the bilingual. The almost magical qualities ascribed to language by Cooley colour Mead's (1964: 258) treatment of bilingualism; he refers to bilinguals as acquiring "a new soul," and as becoming "a different individual." Mead (1964: 258) also seems to subscribe to a consistency model of psychological functioning, in that he maintains that one cannot converse with members of another community in their language without taking on the attitudes of that community; this, in turn, lead to a "readjustment of views." Schutz (1964: 104-105), whose phenomenology was influenced by Cooley and Mead's symbolic interactionist views, maintained that if another cultural scheme of interpretation and expression was internalized, and if one or the other universe of discourse was not opted for, the individual would become "a cultural hybrid on the verge of two different patterns of group life, not knowing to which of them he belongs." Schutz (1964: 105) also subscribed to a consistency model of psychological functioning since he maintains that once the meaning of something experienced was seized "we then transform step by step our general scheme of interpretation of the world in such a way that the strange fact and its meaning

become compatible and consistent with all other facts and their meanings." It can be seen that despite the difference in theoretical pedigrees, the substance of the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation invoked by anthropologists, psychologists, and sociologists is essentially the same.

In rejecting the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation of the association between bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes, the problem arises as to what kind of explanation is to be offered in its place. Some progress might be made in this direction if the research problem is first re-phrased. Perhaps one of the major stumbling blocks has been the way in which researchers interested in the social psychological aspects of bilingualism have formulated their questions. One major question which has been posed is the following: Why is it that bilinguals tend to identify with both groups whose languages they speak, and why is it that they tend to hold more positive attitudes towards the other language group? Put this way, attempts to respond to the question are biased in favour of explanations which attribute causality to bilingualism. It has been shown that causality cannot be attributed to bilingualism with respect to these relationships. It may be more fruitful to change the question to: Under what conditions do people tend to identify with two language groups and to hold positive attitudes towards both of them?

Having thus re-formulated the research problem, sociological theory pertaining to group membership can be drawn upon to suggest a tentative answer.

The Relevance of Group Membership Theory to Research on Bilingualism, Ethnic Identity, and Ethnic Attitudes

In reformulating the research problem in terms of attempting to account for identification with two language groups, there is the built-in assumption that speakers of a given language always have a sense of identification with it. As Weber (1964: 138-139) indicates, this may not always be the case:

> Orientation to the rules of a common language is . . . primarily important as a means of communication, not as the content of a social relationship. It is only with the emergence of a consciousness of difference from third persons who speak a different language that the fact that two people speak the same language, and in that respect share a common situation, can lead them to a feeling of community and to modes of social organization consciously based on the sharing of a common language.

While there are two official languages in Canada, and while language variables are very good predictors of ethnic belonging, which suggests that ethnicity in Canada is largely grounded in the sharing of a common language with others, this appears not to be true in Ireland, which also has two official languages but only one over-arching ethnic identity. Pieris (1951: 330) gives an account of yet another situation in which two languages are spoken yet whose speakers do not have a shared identity based on speaking a common language:

> Now bilingualism does not necessarily entail cultural marginality or a "schism in the soul". Thus in Java, the noblemen speak Noko, the commoners Kromo. But the two orders understand each other's language in addressing him. In this case, bilingualism is part of the cultural set-up, social stratification being reflected in a linguistic bifurcation. The two languages are part of the same culture, and are far from symbolizing any cultural conflict.

Therefore, a "language group," for the purposes at hand, refers to a group of persons speaking a common language who share a feeling of belonging together based on this shared characteristic.

Not all language groups are "open" to new membership. Weber (1964: 139) conceptualizes "open" and "closed" relationships as follows:

> A social relationship . . . will be spoken of as 'open' to outsiders if and in so far as participation in the mutually oriented social action relevant to its subjective meaning is, according to its system of order, not denied to anyone who wishes to participate and who is actually in a position to do so. A relationship will, on the other hand, be called 'closed' against outsiders so far as, according to its subjective meaning and the binding rules of its order, participation of certain persons is excluded, limited, or subjected to conditions.

One would not expect non-members to identify with a "closed" language group--that is, one that is "closed" to them. An example of a "closed" language group would be one which, in addition to basing a sense of belonging on a common language, bases it on origin or religion as well.

In situations in which both language groups are "open" ones, under what conditions will a person identify with both? Merton (1957: 269) extols the virtues of reference group theory in terms of its applicability to such situations:

> The framework of reference group theory, detached from the language of sentiment, enables the sociologist to identify and to locate renegadism, treason, the assimilation of immigrants, class mobility, social climbing, etc. as so many special forms of identification with what is at the time a non-membership group.

Merton (1957: 285-286) proposes three basic criteria of group membership: frequency of patterned interaction; that the interacting persons define themselves as members; that the persons in interaction are defined by others as belonging to the group.

Merton (1957) makes several hypotheses concerning the conditions under which a person is likely to identify with another membership group. Firstly, "it is the isolate, nominally in a group but only slightly incorporated in its network of social relations, who is most likely to become

positively oriented toward non-membership groups" (Merton, 1957: 270). This, in turn, has an impact upon attitudes towards non-membership groups: "there is a continued and cumulative interplay between a deterioration of *social relations* within in the membership group and *positive attitudes* toward the norms of a non-membership group" (Merton, 1957: 270). Merton (1957: 270) sees the outcome of this cumulative and interactive process as being the affiliation of the individual with his reference group: "If the possibility is negligible or absent, then the alienated individual becomes socially rootless." Thwarted attempts to affiliate with the outgroup result in "social rootlessness" since: "To the degree that the individual identifies himself with another group, he alienates himself from his own group" (Merton, 1957: 269). The relationships between social interaction patterns, attitudes towards membership groups, and identification with membership groups are, in Merton's view, interactive and cumulative.

In terms of accounting for identification with two language groups, a number of elaborations are necessary. To be eligible for membership in two "open" language groups, a person must have a minimal knowledge of the languages of both groups. This introduces Merton's (1957: 289) hypothesis concerning the relationship between eligibility for membership in an outgroup and one's orientations towards it:

> The distinction between eligible and ineligible non-members can serve to clarify the conditions under which non-members are likely to become positively oriented towards the norms of a group. Other attributes of non-membership being equal . . . non-members eligible for membership will presumably be more likely to adopt the norms of the group as a positive frame of reference.

In other words, as regards two "open" language groups, bilinguals are more eligible than unilinguals for membership in either. What Merton's approach suggests is that those who are less integrated into a language group to

begin with are more likely to become positively oriented toward another one, more likely to become bilingual, and hence more eligible for membership in another language group, and more likely, ultimately, to identify with another language group. However, this would seem to explain what might be called an "identity transfer" rather than a continued identification with the original language group as well as an identification with another one. In this regard, Merton (1957: 294) states:

> It can be provisionally assumed that membership in a group which has involved deep-seated attachments and sentiments cannot be easily abandoned without psychological residue. This is to say that former members of a group previously significant to them are likely to remain ambivalent, rather than wholly indifferent, toward it.

"Ambivalence" is less likely where "complete spatial and social separation from the group may reduce the occasions on which it is salient to the former member" (Merton, 1957: 294).

It is evident that Merton's hypotheses, though much more precise and complete, convey a similar message to Gardner and Lambert's (1972) hypothesis concerning second-language learning. Gardner and Lambert (1972: 3) hypothesize that those who are less ethnocentric are more likely to learn second languages successfully (though cross-national, longitudinal studies have not supported this hypothesis, cf. Chapter 1). Merton's theoretical perspective points to an interactive and cumulative relationship between social interaction patterns, orientations to outgroups, and group identification. The major findings of this study are that the relationship between bilingualism and identity, and between bilingualism, social distance, and prejudice are very weak with intergroup contact and demographic context controlled. There are modest intercorrelations between intergroup contact, social distance, prejudice, bilingualism, demographic

context, and identity as Merton's hypotheses imply (cf. Tables V.4, VIII.7). It would seem more fruitful in future research into social psychological aspects of bilingualism to elaborate and refine this theoretical perspective than to work within the theoretical perspectives which have previously predominated in this area of inquiry.

The objection might be raised that while group membership theory might seem to provide a more fruitful theoretical perspective in terms of accounting for the social psychological aspects of the bilingual's relationships to the exterior world, it may not be able to deal adequately with aspects of the "inner life" of bilinguals. For instance, Diebold (1968: 236) reports:

> The literature abounds in evidence which purports to show that the early bilingual does not function well as an older child or adult, and that he is especially subject to failures in conflict resolution characterized by a symptomatology for what we loosely call "alienation" or "anomie".

Simmel (1955) is one of the few sociologists who have attempted to deal with the impact of multiple group-affiliations on personality. Simmel (1955: 141) after referring to "an old English proverb which says: he who speaks two languages is a knave," goes on to elaborate:

> It is true that external and internal conflicts arise through the multiplicity of group-affiliations, which threaten the individual with psychological tensions or even a schizophrenic break.

Unfortunately, Simmel (1955: 142) then veers off into a discussion of conditions under which multiple group-affiliations can "reenforce the integration of . . . personality." He confines his attention to multiple group-affiliations which are not mutually exclusive. One could expect "psychological tensions" mainly in situations where the membership groups involved are mutually exclusive. One cannot, for instance, claim to be a

French-English Canadian. The vocabulary of neither French nor English in Canada furnishes a label for such an identity. As Goodenough (1965: 7) observes, a person must select for any occasion several identities at once "andthey must be ones which can be brought together to make a grammatically possible composite identity." While the kinds of research findings referred to by Diebold (1968) can potentially be dealt with from a group membership theory perspective, further elaboration, refinement, and precision of this perspective is necessary.

In summary, the "language as a vehicle of culture" explanation of the relationship between bilingualism, ethnic identity, and ethnic attitudes has been tested and has been found wanting. Doubt has been cast upon the extensive research literature on bilingualism which, in reporting relationships between bilingualism and ethnic identity, and between bilingualism and ethnic attitudes, has conceived of bilingualism as the cause of these "effects." When relevant sociological variables such as intergroup contact and demographic context are controlled, the relationships between bilingualism and these variables are very weak. This would seem to call for a shift from a social psychological to a sociological perspective in this area of research. It has been suggested that group membership theory might provide a more suitable theoretical perspective for future research in this area of inquiry.

APPENDIX A

BILINGUALISM IN MONTREAL STUDY

2. What is your mother tongue, that is, the first language you learnt and still understand?
( ) English ( ) French ( ) Other (TERMINATE)

3. Do you speak or have you ever spoken a language other than English or French?
( ) No ( ) Yes (TERMINATE)

4. Are you ( ) single, ( ) married, ( ) separated, ( ) widowed, or ( ) divorced?

5. Can you speak English or French well enough to conduct a conversation?
( ) English only ( ) French only ( ) both English and French.

6. What is your wife's mother tongue (IF APPLICABLE), that is, the first language she learnt and still understands?
( ) English ( ) French ( ) Other.

7. Can your wife/husband (IF APPLICABLE) speak English or French well enough to conduct a conversation?
( ) English only ( ) French only ( ) both English and French.

8. Which one of the following statements describes *you* best?

( ) I am a Montrealer
( ) I am a Quebecker
( ) I am a Canadian
( ) I am an English Canadian
( ) I am a French Canadian
( ) I am an English person
( ) I am a French person ( ) or what?

9. Which of these statements best describes your spouse? (IF APPLICABLE)

10. Which of these statements regarding degree of bilingualism in English and French best describes *you?*

( ) I am not bilingual.
( ) I am bilingual, but I speak English much better than I speak French.
( ) I am bilingual, but I speak French much better than I speak English.
( ) I am bilingual, but I speak English a little better than I speak French.
( ) I am bilingual, but I speak French a little better than I speak English.
( ) I am perfectly bilingual, that is, I speak both French and English equally well.

IF "NOT BILINGUAL" SKIP THIS SECTION

11. At what age did you become bilingual?

12. At what age did you attain your present level of bilingualism?

13. How about when you speak or write French, do you find that your way of speaking or writing French is affected by your English? (How is it affected?) (Does this happen very often?) (Does this bother you?) (How much?)

14. When you speak or write English, do you find that your way of speaking or writing English is affected by your French? (How is it affected?) (Does this happen very often?) (Does this bother you?) (How much?)

15. When you are alone, and you sit back and think about things, do you think in French or in English, or both? (If both: how much of the time do you think in French and how much in English?)

16. Do you feel as much an English person as you used to since you learned French? (If no: in what ways don't you feel as much an English person?)

17. It is said about bilinguals that they sometimes feel caught in the middle when disputes arise between French and English. Does this happen to you or do you find no trouble siding with one group or the other? (If no trouble siding: Which side do you usually find yourself on? If you have trouble siding: Can you give me some examples of where you have had trouble siding with one group or the other?)

18. How did you learn what French you know? (Any other ways?)

19. Have you ever made a deliberate effort to improve or keep up your French? (How?) (Do you still do?)

20. Do you understand spoken French ( ) very well ( ) well ( ) with difficulty or ( ) not at all?

21. Do you hear French spoken other than in public places such as stores and restaurants ( ) every day ( ) every second day ( ) every week ( ) less than every week.

22. Do you speak French ( ) very well ( ) well ( ) with difficulty or ( ) not at all?

IF DOES NOT SPEAK FRENCH AT ALL SKIP FOLLOWING SECTION

23. When you speak French, do you have, in your opinion, ( ) a very good French accent, ( ) a good French accent, or ( ) an English accent?

24. Is your French so good that most people think it is your mother tongue?

25. When you speak French, are you able to put over your point of view with all the shades of meaning you think are necessary? (If no: Can you give me any examples of some problems that you have had?)

26. Has it ever happened that when you speak French people have thought that you were French Canadian? (If yes: were these people French-speaking or English-speaking?)

27. When you speak French, do you think in French?

28. Are there times when you feel at a disadvantage when you have to speak French? (Can you give me some examples?) (Does this happen often?)

29. Do you feel more at ease and self-confident in English, more at ease and self-confident in French, or do you feel equally at ease and self-confident in both French and English? (Can you give me examples of when you feel less at ease and less self-confident in _____?)

30. When you switch from one language to another, do you feel that you are exactly the same kind of person in both languages, or do you feel that there are things about you which change depending on the language you use? (What things?) (How often do you feel this?)

31. Do you speak French ( ) every day, ( ) every second day, ( ) every week, ( ) less than every week?

32. Do you read French ( ) very well, ( ) well, ( ) with difficulty, ( ) or not at all?

33. Do you read French ( ) every day, ( ) every second day, ( ) every week, ( ) less than every week?

34. Do you write French ( ) very well, ( ) well, ( ) with difficulty, ( ) or not at all?

35. Do you write French ( ) every day, ( ) every second day, ( ) every week, ( ) less than every week?

36. What language do you speak at home with your family? (If more than one: Which one do you use most or are both used about equally?)

37. What languages do you speak at work? (If more than one: Which one do you use more or are both used about equally?)

SKIP 38 AND 39 IF USES ONLY MOTHER TONGUE AT WORK

38. Do you think you could do your work better and get further ahead in your job if you could work in English only? (Why?)

39. Do you think you would be happier if you could work in English only? (Why?)

40. What languages do you speak with your friends? (If more than one: Which one do you use more or do you use both about equally?)

41. In recreational activities such as sports, clubs, and other associations, which languages do you speak? (If more than one: Which one do you use more or do you use both about equally?)

42. Do you listen to radio and T.V. ( ) only in French, ( ) only in English, ( ) mostly in French, ( ) mostly in English, ( ) in French and English about equally?

43. Do you read newspapers and magazines ( ) only in French, ( ) only in English, ( ) mostly in French, ( ) mostly in English, ( ) in French and English about equally?

44. Do you attend theatres and cinemas ( ) only in French, ( ) only in English, ( ) mostly in French, ( ) mostly in English, ( ) in both French and English about equally?

45. What language did you speak at home in your youth, that is, up to the age of 16? (If more than one: Which one did you use more or were both used about equally?)

46. Did you ever attend school in a language other than your mother tongue, or have you ever attended a bilingual school? (For how long?) (Between what ages?)

47. What languages did you speak with friends, neighbours, and playmates in your youth, that is, up to the age of 16? (If more than one used: Which one did you use more or did you use both about equally?)

48. Which of the following descriptions describes *you* best?

( ) I am a French Canadian
( ) I am an English Canadian
( ) I belong to both groups
( ) or what?

49. It has been said about bilinguals that they sometimes feel that they belong to neither of the groups whose language they speak, that is, they feel neither completely French nor completely English. What do you think of this?

50. Some people say that bilinguals seem to change their personalities as they switch from one language to another. Others say it is only style that changes; and still others think that nothing really changes at all about a person as he switches from one language to another. What do you think?

51. Do you find any difference at all between the French language and the English language other than the words you use? (What differences do you notice?)

52. What do you think are the advantages of knowing French? (Any other advantages?) (What about at work?) (How about in your social life?)

53. Has what French you know helped you in life? (How?) (Any other ways?) (How about in your work?)

54. Are there any bad sides to knowing French? (What are they?) (Are there any other bad sides?)

55. IF "BILINGUAL"
Do you think that if you didn't know French at all your ideas about what is going on in Quebec would be different? (In what ways would they be different?)

IF "NOT BILINGUAL"
Do you think that if you knew more French your ideas about what is going on in Quebec would be different? (In what ways would they be different?)

56. IF "BILINGUAL"
Do you think that your opinions of French people and your relations with them would be different if you didn't know French at all? (In what ways would they be different?)

IF "NOT BILINGUAL"
Do you think that your opinions of French people and your relations with them would be different if you knew more French? (In what ways would they be different?)

57. If you had a choice, would you prefer to live your life ( ) entirely in English, ( ) entirely in French, ( ) or in both French and English? (Why?)

58. Do you think that there are ways in which people who speak both French and English are different from people who are unilingual? (In what ways are they different?)

59. Does it matter very much to you which ethnic or cultural group you belong to?

60. Do you feel more at ease among French Canadians or English Canadians, or does it make any difference?

61. Do you feel more friendly toward English Canadians than toward French Canadians, or do you feel equally friendly toward both?

62. When important issues arise between the English and French in Montreal or in Quebec over such things as the role of the French language in business and in the school system, and the role of the provincial government in Quebec society, do you find that you are more on the French side, more on the English side, or what?

63. Some people say that the French and the English are different in their ways of living, and other people say they are similar. What do you think? (In what ways are they different?)

64. Do you think that the English Canadian mentality is similar to the French Canadian mentality or are they different? (In what ways are they different?)

65. What do you think are the biggest differences between English people and French people in Quebec?

66. What do you think are the main problems that exist between French-speaking and English-speaking Quebeckers?

67. Would you like to see Quebec become more bilingual or would you prefer Quebec to become entirely French-speaking and the rest of Canada to become entirely English-speaking?

68. It has been said that there are two principal cultures in Canada, the English culture and the French culture. What do you think are the main differences between these cultures or do you think there are any differences at all?

69. Where were you born?

70. In what year were you born?

71. How many years have you lived in Montreal?

72. How many years have you lived in Quebec outside of Montreal?

73. Where have you lived outside of Quebec?

74. For how long?

75. In the time you have lived in Montreal, or in Quebec, have you lived ( ) mainly in French-speaking neighbourhoods, ( ) mainly in English-speaking neighbourhoods, ( ) or neighbourhoods where both English and French were spoken?

76. How many years of formal schooling have you completed?

77. What kind of work do you do?

78. Where was your father born?

79. What is his mother tongue?

80. Does he speak any other languages?

81. Where was your mother born?

82. What is her mother tongue?

83. What other languages does she speak?

84. What does being bilingual mean in your opinion?

85. Do you think that people in Montreal who speak both French and English are more respected than people who speak only French or English?

INTERVIEWER RATINGS

Interviewer engages respondent in French conversation to last at least several minutes. The interviewer then rates respondent on the following two scales after the interview is completed:

86. Speaks French ( ) very well, ( ) well, ( ) with difficulty, ( ) not at all.

87. Understands French ( ) very well, ( ) well, ( ) with difficulty, ( ) not at all.

Interviewer hands respondent a news clipping of several paragraphs from a French newspaper. Interviewer probes with several questions and then makes the following rating:

88. Reads French ( ) very well, ( ) well, ( ) with difficulty, ( ) not at all.

On the basis of the procedure carried out in section 1, interviewer gives his rating of subject's degree of bilingualism based on conversational fluency, syntax and vocabulary, and accent.

89. Respondent
( ) Speaks both languages equally well
( ) English a little better than French
( ) French a little better than English
( ) English much better than French
( ) French much better than English.

Again on the basis of the procedure followed in section 1, the interviewer rates the respondent's ability to conduct a conversation in French as follows:

90. ( ) speaks French well enough to conduct a conversation

91. ( ) does not speak French well enough to conduct a conversation

APPENDIX B

CONCEPT MEASURES IN THE RECURRENT EDUCATION STUDY
(York Survey Research Center, Study 153)

Bilingualism

How well do you speak French? Very well, well, with difficulty, not at all? (York Codebook, variable 140)

Identity

Do you feel you have more in common with English-speaking Canadians or French-speaking Canadians? (York Codebook, variable 139)

Do you consider yourself to be an English Canadian, a French Canadian, a Franco-Ontarian, a Canadian, or something else? (York Codebook, variable 173)

Breadth of Exposure to the Other Culture

What language or languages did you speak at work yesterday (if applicable)? (York Codebook, variable 127)

What language or languages did you speak at home yesterday? (York Codebook, variable 128)

The last time you spoke to a close friend, what language or languages did you speak? (York Codebook, variable 129)

The last time you read a newspaper or magazine, was it in English, French or another language? (York Codebook, variable 134)

The last time you listened to the radio, was it in English, French or another language? (York Codebook, variable 135)

The last time you listened to T.V., was it in English, French or another language? (York Codebook, variable 136)

The last time you went to a movie, was the movie in English, French or another language? (York Codebook, variable 137)

Identity in the Eyes of Others

Do you speak French so well that people think you are French-speaking when you speak that language? (York Codebook, variable 141)

APPENDIX C

CONCEPT MEASURES IN THE ETHNIC RELATIONS STUDY

Bilingualism

(If principal language is English or English and another language) Do you speak French without any difficulty, with some difficulty, with a great deal of difficulty, or do you not speak it at all? (York Codebook, variable 092)

Identity

Do you feel closer to English Canadians or closer to French Canadians? (York Codebook, variable 164)

To what ethnic group do you consider that you belong: English Canadian, French Canadian, or another ethnic group (York Codebook, variable 121)

Social Distance

(Asked of English Canadians or other ethnic group)
From what you have heard about French Canadians, or judging from your contacts with them, would you say that you would like to have some among your best friends? (York Codebook, variable 132)

(Asked of English Canadians or other ethnic group)
From what you have heard about French Canadians, or judging from your contacts with them, would you say that you would like to have some among your close relatives? (York Codebook, variable 133)

Which do you prefer: to belong to associations or clubs in which all members are people of your own ethnic group, or to belong to associations or clubs in which members are people of different ethnic groups? (York Codebook, variable 243)

Prejudice

(Asked of English Canadians or other ethnic group)
From what you have heard about French Canadians, or judging from your contacts with them, would you say that they treat other people as equals or that they act as if they were above other people? (York Codebook, variable 134)

In your opinion, is the French spoken by French Canadians better, as good as, or poorer than the French spoken by Frenchmen of France? (York Codebook, variable 053)

Prejudice (cont'd)

(Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?): French Canadians are trying to gain too much influence in the political affairs of Canada. (York Codebook, variable 026)

Interpersonal Contact

(Asked of English Canadians or other ethnic group) Do you know or do you have contacts with French Canadians? (York Codebook, variable 123)

(Asked of English Canadians or other ethnic group) Do you have (or did you have) contacts with French Canadians frequently, occasionally, or rarely? (York Codebook, variable 125)

Frequency of Speaking Other Language

(If principal language is English or English and another language) Do you speak French every day, often, rarely, or never? (York Codebook, variable 093)

Mother Tongue

What is or what was the principal language of your mother, that is the language she spoke most of the time at home: English, French, or another language? (York Codebook, variable 109)

What is or what was the principal language of your father, that is the language he spoke most of the time at home: English, French, or another language? (York Codebook, variable 107)

Home Language

What is your principal language, that is, the language you speak most of the time at home: English, French, or another language? (York Codebook, variable 089)

Dominant Language

Which language do you speak best: English, French or another language? (York Codebook, variable 114)

Ethnic Origin

To which ethnic or cultural group did your paternal ancestors belong? (York Codebook, variable 120)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aellen, Carol and Wallace E. Lambert
1969 'Ethnic Identification and Personality Adjustments of Canadian Adolescents of Mixed English-French Parentage.' Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science 1(2): 69-86.

Allen, Patrick
1970 'Bilinguisme et Biculturalisme.' Action Nationale 59(6): 542-547; 59(7): 646-658; 59(9): 819-825.

Amir, Yehuda
1969 'Contact Hypothesis in Ethnic Relations.' Psychological Bulletin 71: 319-342.

Anderson, Nels
1965 'Some Comparisons of Bilingual Communities.' Community Development 13-14: 3-26.

Anderson, Nels (ed.)
1969 Studies in Multilingualism. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Anderson, T.
1960 'The Optimum Age for Beginning the Study of Modern Languages.' Revue Internationale de Pédagogie 4(3): 298-306.

Angers, François-Albert
1971 Les droits du français au Québec. Montréal: Editions du jour.

Anisfeld, Moshe and Wallace E. Lambert
1961 'Social and Psychological Variables in Learning Hebrew.' Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 63(3): 524-529.

Arès, Richard
1975 'Les francophones au Canada.' Le Devoir (June 17): 5.

Arsenian, Seth.
1945 'Bilingualism in the Post-War World.' Psychological Bulletin 42: 65-86.

Balkan, Louis
1970 'Les différences qualitatives de la maîtrise linguistique selon l'âge de l'apprentissage de la deuxième langue: aspects affectifs et convenance linguistique.' Revue de l'Institut de sociologie (Solvay) 1: 137-144.

Baum, Rainer and M. K. Baum
1973 'Socio-Political Context and the Structure of Retirement Experience in Industrial Society.' Pittsburg, Pa.: Mimeo, University of Pittsburgh.

Bégin, Yves, S. J.
1971 Evaluative and Emotional Factors in Learning a Foreign Language. Montreal: Bellarmin.

Belyayev, B. V.
1963 The Psychology of Teaching Foreign Languages. Translated by R. F. Hingley. New York: Pergamon.

Berger, Peter L.
1973 'Identity as a Problem in the Sociology of Knowledge.' Pp. 273-284 in Gunter W. Remmling (ed.), Towards the Sociology of Knowledge. London: Routledge.

Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann
1967 The Social Construction of Reality. New York: Doubleday.

Blanc, Haim
1956 'Multilingual Interviewing in Israel.' American Journal of Sociology 62(2): 205-209.

Blau, Zena Smith
1973 Old Age in a Changing Society. New York: New Viewpoints.

Bloom, Leonard
1972 'The Social Psychology of Race Relations.' Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman.

Blumer, Herbert
1958 'Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position.' Pacific Sociological Review 1(1): 3-7.

Botha, E.
1970 'The Effect of Language on Values Expressed by Bilinguals.' Journal of Social Psychology 80(2): 143-145.

Brazeau, E. Jacques
1958 'Language Differences and Occupational Experience.' Canadian Journal Economics and Political Science 24: 532-540.

Brazeau, Jacques
1968 'La question linguistique à Montréal.' Revue de l'Institut de sociologie (Solvay) 1: 31-62.

Brossard, James H. S.
1945 'The Bilingual as a Person - Linguistic Identification with Status.' American Sociological Review 10: 699-709.

Brown, Roger
1965 Social Psychology. New York: Free Press.

Burstall, C. et al.
1974 Primary French in the Balance. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press.

Butler, Robert N.
1968 'The Life-Review: An Interpretation of Reminiscence in the Aged.' Pp. 486-496 in Neugarten, Bernice L. (ed.). Middle Age and Aging. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Buxbaum, Edith
1949 'The Role of a Second Language in the Formation of Ego and Super-ego.' Psychological Quarterly 18: 278-289.

Capell, A.
1969 'The Limits of Second Language Learning.' La Monda Lingvo-Problemo 1: 19-26.

Carlos, Serge
1973 L'utilisation du français dans le monde du travail au Québec. Etude (E3) réalisée pour le compte de la Commission d'enquête sur la situation de la langue française et sur les droits linguistiques au Québec. Québec: l'Editeur officiel du Québec.

Carroll, John B.
1962 'The Prediction of Success in Intensive Foreign Language Training.' Pp. 87-136 in Robert Glaser (ed.), Training Research and Education. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Carroll, John B.
1975 The Teaching of Franch as a Foreign Language in Eight Countries. New York: Wiley.

Castonguay, Charles
1974a 'Dimensions des transferts linguistiques entre groupes anglophone, francophone et autre d'après le recensement canadien de 1971.' Paper presented at the ACFAS meetings, Quebec (May).

Castonguay, Charles
1974b 'Dynamique de l'assimilation'. Le Droit (March 15): 7; (March 16): 7.

Castonguay, Charles and Jacques Marion
In Press 'L'anglicisation du Canada.' La Monda Lingvo-Problemo.

Centers, Richard
1949 The Psychology of Social Classes. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Chance, Norman A.
1965 'Acculturation, Self-Identification, and Personality Adjustment.' American Anthropologist 67: 372-393.

Christophersen, Paul
1948 Bilingualism. London: Published for the University College, Ibadan, by Methuen.

Church, Joseph
1961 Language and the Discovery of Reality. New York: Vintage Books.

Conseil de la vie française en Amérique
1964 Bilinguisme et biculturalisme au Canada. Québec: Les Editions Ferland.

Conseil de la vie française en Amérique
1967 Nothing More Nothing Less: A French-Canadian View of Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Toronto, Montreal: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Cooley, Charles Horton
1909 Social Organization: A Study of the Larger Mind. New York: Scribners.

Cooper, Robert L.
1969 'Two Contextualized Measures of Degree of Bilingualism.' Modern Language Journal 53(3):

Cooper, Robert L. and Lawrence Greenfield
1969 'Word Frequency Estimation as a Measure of Degree of Bilingualism.' Modern Language Journal 53(3): 163-166.

Currie, Ian D.
1970 'The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis.' Pp. 403-421 in James E. Curtis and John W. Petras (eds.), The Sociology of Knowledge: A Reader. New York: Praeger.

D'Anglejean, Alison and G. R. Tucker
1971 'Academic Report: The St. Lambert Program of High-School Language Shift.' Modern Language Journal 55: 99-101.

Darbelnet, J.
1964 'Reflections sur le bilinguisme.' Culture 25: 255-266.

Darcy, Nathlie T.
1953 'A Review of the Literature on the Effects of Bilingualism upon the Measurement of Intelligence.' The Journal of Genetic Psychology 82: 21-57.

Dashefsky, Arnold
1972 'And the Search Goes On: The Meaning of Religio-Ethnic Identity and Identification.' Sociological Analysis 33(4): 239-245.

DeCoster, Sylvain, Huguette LeClercq and Louis Vande Velde
1970 'Etude précoce de langues vivantes autres que la langue maternelle.' Revue de l'Institut de sociologie (Solvay) 1: 91-105.

DeGreve, Marcel et Frans Van Passel
1970 'Quelques considérations sur le bilinguisme précoce.' Revue de l'Institut de sociologie (Solvay) 1: 125-136.

Dickie-Clark, H. F.
1966 The Marginal Situation - A Sociological Study of A Coloured Group. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Diebold, A. Richard, Jr.
1968 'The Consequences of Early Bilingualism in Cognitive Development and Personality Formation.' Pp. 218-245 in Edward Norbeck et al. (eds.), The Study of Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Dohrenwend, Bruce P., and Robert J. Smith
1962 'Toward a Theory of Acculturation.' Southwestern Journal of Anthropology 18: 30-39.

Elkin, Frederick and Mary B. Hill
1965 'Bicultural and Bilingual Adaptations in French Canada: The Example of Retail Advertising.' Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 7: 132-148.

Enloe, Cynthia H.
1973 Ethnic Conflict and Political Development. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Erikson, Erik H.
1959 'Identity and the Life-Cycle.' Psychological Issues 1: Monograph No. 1.

Erikson, Erik H.
1963 Childhood and Society. New York: Norton & Company (Second Revised Edition).

Erikson, Erik H.
1968 Identity: Youth and Crisis. New York: Norton.

Ervin, Susan M.
1964 'Language and TAT Content in Bilinguals.' Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 68(5): 500-507.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan M.
1969 'Sociolinguistics.' Pp. 91-165 in Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 4. New York: Academic Press.

Ervin, Susan M. and C.E. Osgood
1954 'Second Language Learning and Bilingualism.' Pp. 139-147 in Supplement to Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 49(4, part 2): 139-147.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1964 'Language Maintenance and Language Shift as a Field of Inquiry.' Linguistics 9: 32-70.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1965 'Bilingualism, Intelligence and Language Learning.' Modern Language Journal 49(4): 227-237.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1968 'Sociolinguistic Perspective on the Study of Bilingualism.' Linguistics 39: 21-49.

Fishman, Joshua A. and Robert L. Cooper
1969a 'Alternative Measures of Bilingualism.' Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior 8: 276-282.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1969b 'The Measurement and Description of Widespread and Relatively Stable Bilingualism.' Modern Language Journal 53(3): 152-156.

Fishman, Joshua A., Vladimir C. Nahirny, John E. Hofman and Robert G. Hayden
1966 Language Loyalty in the United States - The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother Tongues by American Ethnic and Religious Groups. The Hague: Mouton.

Fox, Robin
1968 'Multilingualism in Two Communities.' Man 3(3): 456-464.

Gagné, Raymond
1970 'Le Canada français: Les rapports intimes entre culture, langue et personnalité.' Interprétation 4(3): 25-53.

Gardner, Robert C.
1973 'Motivation and Second Language Acquisition.' Research Bulletin No. 276. London, Ontario: Department of Psychology, The University of Western Ontario.

Gardner Robert C. and Wallace E. Lambert
1959 'Motivational Variables in Second Language Acquisition.' Canadian Journal of Psychology 13(4): 266-272.

Gardner, Robert C. and Wallace E. Lambert
1965 'Language Aptitude, Intelligence, and Second-Language Achievement.' Journal of Educational Psychology 56: 191-199.

Gardner, Robert C. and Wallace E. Lambert
1972 Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Gardner, Robert C. and P.C. Smythe
1973a 'Second-Language Acquisition: Motivational Considerations.' Research Bulletin No. 274. London, Ontario: Department of Psychology, The University of Western Ontario.

Gardner, Robert C. and P.C. Smythe
1973b 'The Integrative Motive in Second Language Acquisition.' Research Bulletin No. 275. London, Ontario: Department of Psychology, The University of Western Ontario.

Gelfand, Donald E. and Russell D. Lee
1973 Ethnic Conflicts and Power: A Cross-National Perspective. New York: Wiley.

Giglioli, Pier Pado
1972 Language and Social Context. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.

Giles, Howard, Donald M. Taylor, and Richard Bourhis
1973 'Towards a Theory of Interpersonal Accommodation Through Language: Some Canadian Data.' Language and Society 2: 177-192.

Glaser, Daniel
1958 'Dynamics of Ethnic Identification.' American Sociological Review 23: 31-40.

Goodenough, Ward H.
1965 'Rethinking 'Status' and 'Role' - Toward a General Model of the Cultural Organization of Social Relationships.' Pp. 1-24 in Max Gluckmann and Fred Eggler (eds.), The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology. New York: Praeger.

Goodenough, Ward H.
1971 Culture, Language, and Society. Addison-Wesley Modular Publications. Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley.

Gordon, Milton M.
1964 Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press.

Graves, Theodore D.
1967 'Psychological Acculturation in a Tri-Ethnic Community.' Southwestern Journal of Anthropology 23(4): 337-350.

Greene, Judith
1972 Psycholinguistics: Chomsky and Psychology. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.

Grindstaff, Carl F., Wilda Galloway and Joanne Nixon
1973 'Racial and Cultural Identification among Canadian Indian Children.' Phylon 34(4): 368-377.

Guboglo, M.N.
1974 'Socioethnic Consequences of Bilingualism.' Soviet Sociology 12(1-2): 93-113.

Hall, Robert A., Jr.
1964 Introductory Linguistics. New-York: Chilton.

Haugen, Einar
1950 'Problems of Bilingualism.' Lingua 2: 271-290.

Henkel, Ramon E.
1975a 'Part-Whole Correlations and the Treatment of Ordinal Data as Quasi-Interval Data.' Pacific Sociological Review 18(1): 3-26.

Henkel, Ramon E.
1975b 'Reply to Labovitz's Paper.' Pacific Sociological Review 18(1): 36-39.

Henripin, Jacques
1974 L'immigration et le déséquilibre linguistique. Ottawa: Information Canada

Hittinger, Martha S.
1969 'Bilingualism and Self-Identity.' Educational Leadership 27: 247-249.

Hogenraad, Robert
1970 'L'individu bilingue: orientations récentes de la recherche.' Revue de la Psychologie des Sciences Educatives 5: 131-140.

Hornung, Carl A.
1975 'Errors of Omission and Commission in "On the Validity of Measures of Association: The Nominal-Nominal, Two-by-Two Case".' American Journal of Sociology 80(4): 975-981.

Henry, William E.
1968 'Personality Change in Middle and Old Age.' Pp. 209-217 in Edward Norbeck et al. (eds.), The Study of Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Hunt, Chester L.
1966 'Language Choice in a Multilingual Society.' Pp. 112-125 in Stanley Lieberson (ed.), Explorations in Sociolinguistics. The Hague: Mouton.

Hunter, A. A.
1973 'On the Validity of Measures of Association: The Nominal-Nominal, Two-by-Two Case.' American Journal of Sociology 79(1): 99-109.

Hunter, A. A.
1975 'Reply and Further Elaboration.' American Journal of Sociology 80(4): 993-1002.

Hymes, Dell H.
1961 'Linguistic Aspects of Cross Cultural Personality Study.' Pp. 313-359 in Bert Kaplan (ed.) Studying Personality Cross-Culturally. New-York: Harper and Row.

Hymes, Dell H.
1964 Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology. New York: Harper and Row.

Johnstone, John C.
1969 Young People's Images of Canadian Society. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Joy, Richard J.
1972 Languages in Conflict. The Carleton Library No. 61. Toronto McClelland and Stewart.

Joy, Richard J.
In Press 'Some Weaknesses of The Census Publications with Particular Reference to those Affecting the Study of Language Transfer.' In Paul Lamy (ed.), Language Maintenance and Language Shift in Canada: New Dimensions in the Use of Census Language Data. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Johnson, Granville. B., Jr.
1951 'The Relationship Existing Between Bilingualism and Racial Attitude.' Journal of Educational Psychology 42: 357-365.

Jones, W. R.
1949 'Attitudes towards Welsh as a Second Language: A Preliminary Investigation.' British Journal of Educational Psychology 19: 44-52.

Jones, W. R.
1950 'Attitudes towards Welsh as a Second Language: A Further Investigation.' British Journal of Educational Psychology 20: 117-132.

Kagan, Jerome
1958 'The Concept of Identification.' Psychological Review 65: 296-305.

Kelly, L. G. (ed.)
1967 Description and Measurement of Bilingualism. Toronto: Published in association with Canadian National Commission for Unesco by University of Toronto Press.

Kralt, John
1974 'Some Measures of Linguistic Assimilation Using 1971 Census Data.' Paper presented at the meetings of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, Toronto.

Labovitz, Sanford
1970 'The Assignment of Numbers to Rank Order Categories.' American Sociological Review 35(3): 515-524.

Labovitz, Sanford
1970 'The Assignment of Numbers to Rank Order Categories.' American Sociological Review 35(3): 515-524.

Labovitz, Sanford
1975 'Comment to Henkel's Paper.' Pacific Sociological Review 18(1): 27-35.

Lambert, Wallace E.
1963 'Psychological Approches to the Study of Language.' Modern Language Journal 47(2): 51-62; 47(3): 114-121.

Lambert, Wallace E.
1967 'A Social Psychology of Bilingualism.' Journal of Social Issues 23(2): 91-109.

Lambert, Wallace E.
1970 'What are They like, these Canadians? A Social-Psychological Analysis.' Canadian Psychologist 11(4): 303-333.

Lambert, Wallace E.
1972 Language, Psychology and Culture. Essays Selected and Introduced by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Lambert, Wallace E. et al.
1960 'Evaluational Reactions to Spoken Languages.' Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 60(1): 44-51.

Lambert Wallace E. and Elizabeth Anisfeld
1969 'A Note on the Relationship of Bilingualism and Intelligence.' Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science 1(2): 123-128.

Lambert, Wallace E., R.C. Gardner, H.C. Barik and K. Tunstall
1963 'Attitudinal and Cognitive Aspects of Intensive Study of a Second Language.' Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology (66): 358-368.

Lambert, Wallace E., J. Havelka, and C. Crosby
1958 'The Influence of Language-Acquisition Contexts on Bilingualism.' Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology (56): 239-244.

Lambert, Wallace E., Howard Giles and Omar Picard
1972 'Language Attitudes in a French-American Community.' Montreal: Mimeo.

Lamy, Paul G.
1969 A Study of the Social and Political Orientations of a Sample of Quebec French-Speaking and Ontario English-Speaking School Children. M. A. Thesis, McMaster University.

Lebel, Maurice
1951 'The Problems and Advantages of Bilingual Culture in Canada.' Culture 12: 35-42.

Levine, Henry
1969 'Bilingualism: Its Effect on Emotional Development.' Journal of Secondary Education 44(2): 69-73.

LeVine, Robert A. and Donald T. Campbell
1972 Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes, and Group Behavior. New York: Wiley.

Lieberson, Stanley
1965 'Bilingualism in Montreal; A Demographic Analysis.' American Journal of Sociology 71(1): 10-25.

Lieberson, Stanley
1966a 'Language Questions in Censuses.' Sociological Inquiry 36(2): 262-279.

Lieberson, Stanley (ed.)
1966b Explorations in Sociolinguistics. The Hague: Mouton.

Lieberson, Stanley
1969 'How Can we Describe and Measure the Incidence and Distribution of Bilingualism.' Pp. 286-295 in L. G. Kelly (ed.), Description and Measurement of Bilingualism. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Lieberson, Stanley
1970 Language and Ethnic Relations in Canada. New York: Wiley.

Mackey, William F.
1952 'Bilingualism and Education.' Pédagogie-Orientation 2(6): 135-147.

Mackey, William F.
1962 'The Description of Bilingualism'. Canadian Journal of Linguistics 7(2): 1-35.

Mackey, William F.
1966 'The Measurement of Bilingual Behavior.' Canadian Psychologist 7a(2): 75-92.

Mackey, William F.
1972 International Bibliography on Bilingualism Quebec: Laval University Press.

Macnamara, John
1967 'The Bilingual's Linguistic Performance - A Psychological Overview.' Journal of Social Issues 33(2): 58-90.

Macnamara, John
1969 'How Can One Measure the Extent of a Person's Bilingual Proficiency?' Pp. 80-97 in L.G. Kelly (ed.), Description and Measurement of Bilingualism. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Maxwell, A.E.
1961 Analysing Qualitative Data. London: Methuen.

Maxwell, Thomas R.
1971 'La population d'origine française de l'agglomération métropolitaine de Toronto.' Recherches sociographiques 12(3): 319-344.

Mead, George Herbert
1964 George Herbert Mead on Social Psychology: Selected Papers. Edited and with an Introduction by Anselm Strauss. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Meisel, John
1970 'Language Continua and Political Alignment.' Paper presented at the VIIth World Congress of Sociology, Varna, Bulgaria.

Meisel, John
1972 Working Paper on Canadian Politics. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Merton, Robert
1957 Social Theory and Social Structure. Revised edition. New York: Free Press.

Moscovici, Serge (ed.)
1972 The Psychosociology of Language. Chicago: Markham.

Mussen, Paul
1967 'Early Socialization: Learning and Identification.' Pp. 76-110 in New Directions in Psychology, III. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

O'Bryan, K. G., J. G. Reitz, and O. Kuplowska
1975 Non-Official Languages: A Study in Canadian Multiculturalism. Ottawa: Office of the Minister Responsible for Multiculturalism.

Osgood, Charles E., George J. Suci and Percy H. Tannenbaum
1967 The Measurement of Meaning, Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Parsons, Talcott
1974 'Culture and Social System Revisited.' Pp. 33-46 in Louis Schneider and Charles M. Bonjean (eds.), The Idea of Culture in the Social Sciences. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Peal, Elizabeth and Wallace E. Lambert
1962 'The Relation of Bilingualism to Intelligence.' Psychological Monographs 76(27): 546.

Piaget, Jean
1959 The Language and Thought of the Child. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Pieris, Ralph
1951 'Bilingualism and Cultural Marginality.' British Journal of Sociology 2: 328-339.

Pineo, Peter C. and John Porter
1967 'Occupational Prestige in Canada.' Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 4(1): 24-40.

Plax, Martin
1972 'On Studying Ethnicity.' Public Opinion Quarterly 36(1): 99-104.

Pool, Jonathan
1974 'You Are What You Speak?: Language and National Identity.' Paper presented at the VIIIth World Congress of Sociology, Toronto.

Preston, M. S.
1963 Evaluational Reactions to English Canadian French and European French Voices. Dissertation, McGill University.

Randhawa, Bikkar A. and Susan M. Korpan
1973 'Assessment of Some Significant Affective Variables and the Prediction of Achievement in French.' Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science 5(1): 24-33.

Rao, T. S.
1969 'Bilingualism and Adjustment Difficulties.' Indian Educational Review 4(1): 57-66.

Reitz, Jeffrey G.
1974 'Language and Ethnic Community Survival.' Pp. 104-122 in Raymond Breton (ed.), Aspects of Canadian Society. Montreal: Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association.

Report of the Commission of Inquiry on the Position of the French Language and on Language Rights in Québec
1972a Book I: The Language of Work. Québec: l'Editeur officiel du Québec.

Report of the Commission of Inquiry on the Position of The French Language and on Language Rights in Quebec
1972b Book II: Language Rights. Québec: l'Editeur officiel du Québec.

Report of the Commission of Inquiry on the Position of the French Language and on Language Rights in Quebec
1972c Book III: The Ethnic Groups. Québec: l'Editeur officiel du Québec.

Rex, John
1974 'Sociology and the Demystification of the Modern World.' London: Routledge.

Richardson, Alan
1967 'A Theory and a Method for the Psychological Study of Assimilation International Migration Review II: 3-30.

Roseborough, Howard and Raymond Breton
1968 'Perceptions of the Relative Economic and Political Advantages of Ethnic Groups in Canada.' Pp. 604-629 in Bernard K. Blishen et al. (eds.), Canadian Society: Sociological Perspectives, Third Edition. Toronto: Macmillan.

Rosen, Bernard C.
1968 'Conflicting Group Memberships: A Study of Parent-Peer Group Cross-Pressures.' Pp. 402-412 in Herbert H. Hyman and Eleanor Singer (eds.), Readings in Reference Group Theory and Research. New York: The Free Press.

Ross, Aileen D.
1954 'Ethnic Group Contacts and Status Dilemma.' Phylon 15: 267-275.

Ross, Aileen D.
1965 'Some Social Implications of Multilingualism.' Pp. 212-236 in T. K. N. Unnithan, Indra Deva and Yogendra Singh (eds.), Towards a Sociology of Culture in India. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism
1965 Preliminary Report. Ottawa: The Queen's Printer.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism
1967 Book I: The Official Languages, Ottawa: The Queen's Printer.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism
1968 Book II: Education. Ottawa: The Queen's Printer.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism
1969a Book III: The Work World. Ottawa: The Queen's Printer.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism
1969b Book IV: The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups. Ottawa: The Queen's Printer.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism
1970a Book V: The Federal Capital. Ottawa: The Queen's Printer.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism
1970b Book VI: Voluntary Associations. Ottawa: The Queen's Printer.

Rubin, Joan
1968 National Bilingualism in Paraguay. The Hague: Mouton.

Ryder, N. B.
1955 'The Interpretation of Origin Statistics.' Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science 21: 466-479.

Sapir, Edward
1929 'The Status of Linguistics as a Science.' Language 5: 207-214.

Sapir, Edward
1968 Selected Writings of Edward Sapir in Language, Culture, and Personality. David G. Mandelbaum (ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schermerhorn, R. A.
1970 Comparative Ethnic Relations. New York: Random House.

Schutz, Alfred
1964 Collected Papers, II. Alvin Brodersen (ed.). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Sechrest, Lee, Luis Flores, and Lourdes Arellano
1968 'Language and Social Interaction in a Bilingual Culture.' Journal of Social Psychology 76: 155-161.

Segalowitz, Norman
1974 'Psychological Perspectives on Bilingual Education.' Montreal: Mimeo and Forthcoming in B. Spolsky and R.L. Cooper (eds.). Current Trends in Bilingual Education. The Hague: Mouton.

Simmel, Georg
1964 'Conflict and the Web of Group-Affiliations.' Translated by Kurt H. Wolff and Reinhard Bendix. New York: Free Press.

Social Research Group
1965 A Study of Interethnic Relations in Canada. Montreal: Mimeo.

Soffietti, James P.
1955 'Bilingualism and Biculturalism.' Journal of Educational Psychology 46: 222-227.

Smythe, P.C., et al.
1973 'Second Language Retention over Varying Intervals.' Modern Language Journal 57(8): 400-405.

Spoerl, Dorothy Tilden
1943 'Bilinguality and Emotional Adjustment.' Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 38: 37-57.

Spolsky, Bernard
1969 'Attitudinal Aspects of Second Language Learning.' Language Learning 19(3,4): 271-283.

Stern, H.H.
1968-1969 'Foreign Language Learning and the New View of First Language Acquisition.' Child Study 30(4): 25-36.

Stonequist, Everett V.
1937 The Marginal Man. New York: Russell.

Strauss, Anselm L.
1969 Mirrors and Masks: The Search for Identity. San Francisco: The Sociology Press.

Taylor, Donald M., Lise M. Simard, and Frances E. Aboud
1972 'Ethnic Identification in Canada: A Cross-Cultural Investigation.' Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science 4(1): 13-29.

Tucker, G. Richard and Helen Gedalof
1970 'Bilinguals as Linguistic Mediators.' Psychonometric Science 20(9): 369-370.

Vallée, Frank G.
1969 'Regionalism and Ethnicity: The French-Canadian Case.' Pp. 19-25 in B. Y. Card (ed.), Perspectives on Regions and Regionalism. Edmonton, Alberta: Western Association of Sociology and Anthropology.

Vallée, Frank G., and Albert Dufour
1974 'The Bilingual Belt: A Garrotte for the French?' Laurentian University Review 6(2): 19-48.

Van den Berghe, Pierre L.
1970 Race and Ethnicity: Essays in Comparative Sociology. New York: Basic Books.

Van den Berghe, Pierre (ed.)
1972 Intergroup Relations: Sociological Perspectives. New York: Basic Books.

Van Overbeke, Maurice
1972 Introduction au problème du bilinguisme. Paris: Nathan.

Vildomec, Veroboj
1963 Multilingualism. Leyden: A. W. Sythoff.

Wallace, Anthony F. C.
1968 'Identity Processes in Personality and in Culture.' Pp. 62-89 in Richard Jessor and Seymour Feshbach (eds.), Cognition, Personality, and Clinical Psychology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weber, Max
1964 'The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Edited and with an Introduction by Talcott Parsons. New York: Free Press.

Weinreich, Uriel
1968 Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems. The Hague: Mouton.

Whorf, Benjamin Lee
1936 'The Punctual and Segmentative Aspects of Verbs in Hopi.' Language 12: 127-131

Wood, Mary Margaret
1934 The Stranger: A Study in Social Relationships. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ziller, Robert C.
1973 The Social Self. New York: Pergamon Press.