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Introduction

When the average group of Wellesley students hears me talking about francophones in Quebec, the response is immediate: “Don’t they want to secede from Canada?” Indeed, the sovereignty movement in Quebec is infamous, eclipsing many other facets of the province’s identity, such as its picturesque cities, powerful lumber and mining industries, and excellent maple syrup. The salience of the independence movement in Quebec to a Western audience makes sense: who wants to secede from a Western nation anymore? We perceive struggles for sovereignty to be an issue in the distant past of our countries and in developing nations, not a hot topic in the West in the 21st century. However, Quebecers have a number of reasons to want to leave Canada, and to many of them, secession is not such a far-fetched idea.

This thesis presents a historical overview of the roots of the sovereignty movement in Quebec and an analysis of the modern predictors of whether an individual Quebecker supports or does not support secession. Chapter 1 explores the history of Canada with a special emphasis on Quebec and relationships between French and English Canadians. From the French and Indian war of the 1760s to the Quiet Revolution of the 1960s, the seeds of secession are written in the history of Quebec’s conflicts with les Anglais. Chapter 2 presents the findings of a survey distributed to more than 200 Quebecers over the course of 2012 and 2013. The results of this survey provide clues into the collective psyches of francophone and anglophone residents of Quebec. Through the exploration of both the historical and
modern day causes of Quebec’s desire for secession, we can come closer to understanding why the narrative of the sovereignty movement remains compelling to this day.
In its infancy, Canada was a land inhabited by today’s First Nations people (the non-Inuit aboriginal peoples of Canada, including the Hurons, Iroquois, Blackfoot, and Cree, among many others) in the south and a group called the Dorset
peoples in the north (who were replaced by the Inuit people around 1500 CE when the Inuits moved eastward from Alaska) (McGhee, 1996).

After French exploration by Jacques Cartier, the colony of New France was established in 1534. For several decades, New France was inhabited mostly by First Nations people and French fur traders, but in 1608 Samuel de Champlain, a geographer on a fur trade voyage, founded what would later become Quebec City. When Champlain died in 1635, the Catholic Church and the Jesuits began to take hold of New France when Richelieu, a hugely influential religious and political figure in France, forbade non-Catholics to live in this new territory.

Around the same time, the British were developing their Thirteen Colonies down south, and the population there vastly outnumbered the small settlements and enclaves of fur trappers in New France. Censuses estimate that there were 270,000 settlers in the Thirteen Colonies in 1702 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1909) and only 16,417 settlers in New France in 1706 (Censuses of Canada, 1876). These numbers remained similarly disproportionate throughout the first few centuries of colonization in North America, resulting in an unbalanced power structure in the New World.

In 1710, the British captured Port-Royal, so from that point on, they owned Acadia (modern day Nova Scotia). For a few years, the British allowed the Acadians (the French people who lived in Acadia) to remain on their land, but in 1755 they expelled them from the region, believing that they were a military threat due to rising tensions with the French in other disputed areas.
Canada has been described as a country of “Two Solitudes” (MacLennan, 1945), a nation divided into discrete English and French parts, with a lack of communication and a certain degree of animosity between the two. In the early 18th century, this formation of “Two Solitudes” was reinforced by the fact that the French and the British, so often at odds in Europe, were also enemies in the New World. Many parts of North America were claimed by both the English and the French, so conflicts often broke out between the two great powers.

Military tensions between the French and the British reached a head during the French and Indian War, the North American part of a larger conflict that lasted from 1756 to 1763 and affected Europe, Africa, India, the Americas, and the Philippines. It was during this war that the British captured Montreal and Quebec City. From that point on, France’s colonies in Canada belonged to them.

The British were unsure of how to rule this odd new colony filled with French-speaking inhabitants who seemed foreign to them. The more pressing issue of growing unrest in the Thirteen Colonies did not help their uncertainty. The Quebecois were never expelled from their homes the way the Acadians had been because the French were no longer a threat to the British in North America, since the French had lost Quebec and sold their Louisiana territory to Spain. Instead, worrying that their French Canadian subjects would side with the American Revolution, the British government felt they had to gain the trust of the francophones. In 1774, British Parliament approved the Quebec Act, which expanded the province’s territory, guaranteed free practice of Catholicism (since the French Quebecers were almost all Catholic), and restored French civil law for
private matters while maintaining British common law for public ones. However, the Quebec Act also established that Quebec’s governor would be appointed by the British government and made no reference to any kind of elected government for the people of Quebec. This act seemed not to satisfy the Quebecois and was, in fact, a major contribution towards francophones’ early dissatisfaction with the British crown. The Quebec Act also angered the English speakers in the province due to its acceptance of French civil law and enraged the Americans, who named it as one of the Intolerable Acts that they were protesting in their revolution because it allowed no representation for the Quebecois.

After the American Revolution, many Loyalists who had supported the British royalty fled to Britain’s colonies in Canada, numbering approximately 35,000-40,000 (Censuses of Canada, 1876). In response to this sudden influx of English subjects, the British government passed the Constitutional Act in 1791, which split Quebec into Upper Canada (modern day Ontario) and Lower Canada (modern day Quebec). Both French and English Canadians found this act to be inadequate, but it was nonetheless relatively well received because it replaced the Quebec Act that had been almost universally disliked. Unfortunately, this act was the beginning of a firm geographical division between two already politically and culturally distinct groups, creating a system in which anglophones and francophones did not often interact.

---

1 These regions were named for the flow of the St-Lawrence Seaway, not for their geographical position.
Sadly for the francophones, who felt that their lives would be better even under British rule now that they had a home that was specifically theirs, the English continued to have a domineering presence in Lower Canada. Francophones tried to exercise the power in the assembly government that the Constitutional Act had allotted them, but they were still very much under the control of the British, since a British-elected governor could veto any law they proposed. The continued negative feelings of the French Canadians led to the Lower Canada Rebellion in 1837. The Lower Canada Rebellion also emboldened rebels in English-speaking Upper Canada, who had already been frustrated by British rule due to the economic missteps and perceived corruption of the politicians of their mother country. These rebels began
the Upper Canada Rebellion shortly after their Lower Canada counterparts, but both of the Rebellions of 1837 were crushed by British military power.

As a response to these revolts, the British government re-merged Upper and Lower Canada with the Union Act in 1840. The British hoped that by combining the colonies, they could make the French-Canadian population assimilate into the English Canadian population, so they included a clause forbidding the use of French in Canada’s Legislative Assembly. Interestingly, although there were fewer French Canadians than English Canadians (Censuses of Canada, 1876), they were not divided in their voting like the anglophones, and thus were able to force the English Canadians into asking for their support on almost every bill proposed in the Assembly. This political structure frustrated members of the Assembly on both sides, since the French Canadians could not pass their legislation without a majority, and the English Canadians were practically required to ask the French Canadians for approval on all legislation.

Due to this political gridlock and in hopes of further economic development, Canadians became interested in a change in government. At the Charlottetown Conference in 1864, the Canadian Assembly asked delegates from the Maritime provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, all of which had been separate British colonies for some time, whether they would like to form a group with continued ties to Britain and a more united central government that could take on provincial debt and work towards economic gain and stability. Canada and the Maritimes continued to meet over the next few years and invited Newfoundland to join them (the Newfoundlander refused the offer). They finalized
their plans and began drafting the British North America Act in 1867. The act was promptly approved by the British government, and the Dominion of Canada was formed out of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island. Although Lower Canada, the French-speaking province, was united with Upper Canada and the Maritimes in this endeavor, the tensions between the anglophones and the francophones continued to simmer behind their union.

By the 1860s, the United States had expanded far to the west, and the newly united Dominion of Canada had to follow suit if it did not want the Americans to seize the lands to its west. Canada’s first prime minister, John A. Macdonald, purchased Rupert’s Land and the North-Western Territory from the Hudson’s Bay Company in 1869, ensuring that Canada would own almost all of the territory west of Upper and Lower Canada. British Columbia, an English colony on the west coast that was fairly well established due to a healthy fur trade, also joined Canada in 1871 in response to fears of American annexation and economic problems, meaning that Canada now stretched from sea to sea (excluding Newfoundland and Labrador, which had not joined the Dominion formed by the other British territories in Canada).
New provinces soon began to form. Manitoba was created in 1870 in response to a Métis rebellion west of Ontario. As a result of the formation of this new province, Ontario and Manitoba were engaged in border disputes for decades. The federal government wanted to expand Manitoba’s borders eastward into areas that Ontarian politicians felt belonged to their province. They even threatened to secede from Canada, which was highly undesirable to the federal government, especially at such an early stage in the country’s history. These disputes resulted in a number of rulings for provincial rights over federal rights from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, Canada’s highest appeals court at the time. As a
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2 The Métis are a group who are the descendants of First Nations people and French explorers, and who form a distinct aboriginal group in Canada.
result, the federal government became somewhat decentralized, and provincial powers grew, setting the stage for Quebec's later growth into a very powerful, somewhat independent province.

Canada in 1882:

Not wanting to become a real part of Canada, many of the Métis who had rebelled moved northwest of Manitoba after its formation. In 1885, Louis Riel, the son of a respected Métis family, led them and other native peoples in another rebellion against Canada. Riel's forces ended up being surrounded by the North-West Mounted Police (today's Royal Canadian Mounted Police, or “Mounties”) and were defeated and captured when reinforcements from the Canadian militia arrived on the semi-complete Canadian Pacific Railway. Riel was hanged for treason, which caused immediate uproar among French Canadians, who felt that the federal
government was unnecessarily harsh on him because he was a francophone and a Catholic, like them. In fact, Prime Minister John Macdonald famously said in response to this controversy: “He shall die, though every dog in Quebec bark in his favour,” (Bélanger, 2007). This event strongly influenced the attitudes of francophones towards the English majority and towards the Conservative Party, which they started to call “les pendards” and “le parti des Anglais” (Bélanger, 2007). Unfortunately for the newly hated Conservative Party, another divisive language controversy would unfold quite soon.

Following the Red River Resistance, the first Manitoban rebellion, many French-speaking Métis left the province to move farther west, away from the federal government’s true areas of control. Around this time, many English Canadians were moving west due to the ease of movement facilitated by the newly completed Canadian Pacific Railway, so demographics shifted rapidly in Manitoba. The province had been largely French-speaking and Catholic, but with immigration and emigration as they were, it became mostly English-speaking and Protestant. When Manitoba was originally founded, its official languages were French and English, and all schools were religiously affiliated (mostly Catholic). However, due to the demographic shifts, changes had to be made in schooling. In 1890, Manitoba passed an act that removed funding for religious schools and replaced them with secular, publicly funded schools. At the time of this act’s passage, the government also abolished French as an official language of the province. These actions caused massive controversy among the Canadian people, dug the rift between the

---

3 The hangers
4 The party of the English
anglophones and francophones deeper, and strengthened Quebecois nationalism.

Ultimately, the Conservative Prime Minister, Mackenzie Bowell, had to step down because of fierce disagreements within his cabinet on the issue. The conflict was resolved by allowing French instruction in schools with more than 10 francophone pupils and by permitting religious instruction. Nonetheless, the anti-English and anti-Conservative sentiment from the French-Canadians was enough to put the Liberals in power in the next election in 1896, with Wilfrid Laurier as Prime Minister.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier was the first francophone Prime Minister of Canada. He held a vision of a Canadian nation that was less dependent on British authority, a united country of anglophones and francophones. He was an important leader who avoided major scandals, brought Alberta and Saskatchewan into the Confederation in 1905, and ushered Canada into a new century.
Sir Robert Borden took over from Laurier in 1911, on the eve of World War I. Since at this time Canada was still intimately connected to Great Britain, the Canadians would be required to go to war if the British did. When Britain declared war on Germany, the response was initially positive, even among French Canadians, who did not usually approve of Canada’s British connection. During the war, Canada suffered fiscally, as its economy had not been strong to begin with, and dealing with the war effort when it had had no major army beforehand was taxing. Many Canadian soldiers died or were injured in the war, and by 1917, the government needed more volunteers, but no one was offering to fight. Although Borden had not wanted to introduce conscription, he passed an act that year that allowed the government to conscript Canadian men. This act re-divided the francophones and
the anglophones. French Canadians, having lost some of their initial fervor for the war effort, felt that their main loyalty should be to Quebec, not to the British crown, so they were fiercely opposed to conscription. English Canadians felt that they should support their mother country, so they begrudgingly accepted it.

Laurier, still the leader of the Liberal Party, was left somewhat alone in his concerns that the alienation of francophones would lead to them succumbing to the intense nationalism of Henri Bourassa, a francophone who was strictly opposed to Canada’s continued close relationship with Britain. Bourassa wished for an independent Canada that did not place so much stock in British ideals and approval. Laurier was concerned that if francophones followed Bourassa, they would secede from the rest of Canada. When Borden pursued re-election in 1917 with the Union Party, a wartime collaboration of the Conservative and Liberal parties, Laurier maintained his Liberal Party position and lost spectacularly in most provinces, but won all but three of Quebec’s 65 seats, a stark reminder of the division between the francophones and the anglophones.

After the war, Canada returned to domestic affairs and did not concern itself with international politics. It was somewhat isolationist in its foreign policy, choosing instead to focus on dealing with the Great Depression. Canada was particularly hard-hit by the Depression across all its provinces, since Prime Minister Mackenzie King had initially responded to it as a mere fluctuation in the business cycle.

Towards the end of World War II, the conscription crisis began anew. Canadians took a vote on conscription, and while most anglophones voted in favor,
most francophones voted against. Because of the disparity in numbers between these two groups, conscription passed. The difference between conscription in WWI and conscription in WWII was that soldiers conscripted in WWI had to fight, while in WWII volunteers fought, but those soldiers who were conscripted did not have to do so. Conscripted soldiers in WWII merely served in domestic clerical roles during the war unless they volunteered to fight. English Canadians felt that these conscripted soldiers who remained at home were mostly lazy, unpatriotic French Canadians, a characterization which obviously did not sit well with either side.

After peace was reached, Canadian history was somewhat uneventful in terms of French-English disputes. Canada became one of the founding members of the United Nations. The Dominion of Newfoundland voted to join Canada in 1948. Canadian policies became increasingly socialist in the fifties due to a string of liberal governments. Canada also became moderately involved in the Cold War since its neighbor, the United States, was now a major global power.
The period of post-war peace between French and English Canadians ended by the 1960s. Prior to this time, Quebec was a largely poor, conservative, and Catholic province. French Canadians in general were in a poor state before the 60s, and the francophones in Quebec were no exception:

... French Canadians were condemned to economic and social inequality... poorer and less educated on average [than English Canadians], and therefore less powerful, [French Canadians] were unsuccessful in defending their schools, under attack outside Quebec... while in Quebec itself the relative poverty of the French Canadians, their subordinate positions in the economy, and the absence of French in positions of command were a constant source of humiliation. (Johnson, 1994, p. 12)

This situation would begin to shift in the 60s, a time of extreme social and political changes for Quebec that scholars later named the Quiet Revolution.
The Liberals won the 1960 Quebec provincial election, taking the province from the Union Nationale and forming a majority government with Jean Lesage as Premier. The Liberals secularized Quebec by reforming education in the province. In the 40s and 50s, schools had been unorganized and run by clergy. Only 13% of French Canadians finished Grade 11 (compared to the English Canadian rate of 36%), because of the poverty and poor organization of education in the province (Dufour, 1997). The Liberals commissioned a task force to decide their course of action for educational reforms and determined that secularization of the province’s schools would be one of their most important goals. They established a Ministry of Education in 1964 and made significant changes: schools were now run by the state (not the church), children had to remain in school until age 16 instead of 14, schooling was free until 11th grade (the final year of high school), curriculum was standardized, and outdated collèges classiques (where wealthy young scholars had studied a classically-inspired curriculum of Greek, Latin, rhetoric, and philosophy, among other subjects) were converted into public cégeps. Additionally, the Liberals created the Office de la langue française in 1961 to fight anglicisms, normalize Quebec’s French, and provide support for the government in any legislation to promote the use of French in Quebec. These changes emphasized education and literacy as a right rather than a luxury and led to the development of an educated French Canadian middle class in later years.

The reforms of the Liberal party also extended into the economy. Seeking to move Quebec into the future and create better jobs for the province’s citizens, a

---

5 Collège d'enseignement général et professionnel, essentially junior college, the step between high school and university in Quebec.
young René Lévesque, Quebec’s Minister of Natural Resources, mobilized the private Quebecois electric companies into a public utility called Hydro-Québec in 1963. Hydro-Québec was a chance for better employment, an improvement on Quebec’s hydroelectric network, a clever use of Quebec’s abundant natural resources, the proof of Quebec’s power and modernity, and an important symbol in the province’s national mythology.

Quebec’s sudden advances in education and industry empowered its people, who began to consider the idea of political independence. The secessionist movement exploded when General Charles de Gaulle, the president of France, who had been snubbing federal Canadian powers for several months, came to Expo 67 in Montreal and exclaimed at the conclusion of his speech: “Vive le Québec libre ! Vive le Canada français ! Et vive la France !”6 Needless to say, the Canadian government considered this extremely gauche speech, coming from the head of the French government and calling for Quebec’s secession, an affront to them.

Regarding the feelings of the members of the federal government on the matter of secession, support for the sovereignty movement was growing in Quebec. A year after de Gaulle’s speech at Expo 67, René Lévesque, the young politician behind Hydro-Québec, joined the forces of two political parties to form the separatist Parti Québécois (PQ). The main goal of the PQ was to ensure social, political, and economic autonomy for the province of Quebec: in essence, the party’s goal was secession. The Parti Québécois would not be elected to form a government.

6 Long live free Quebec, long live French Canada, and long live France!
in Quebec until 1976, but the seeds were sown, and the Belle Province was on the road to a powerful sovereignty movement.

In 1968, Prime Minister Lester Pearson announced that he would be stepping down from Liberal party leadership. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, the Minister of Justice at the time, ran for and became the federal head of the Liberals, and thus, the Prime Minister of Canada. Trudeau was an extremely important figure in Canadian politics, holding the office of Prime Minister for 15 years throughout the 60s, 70s, and 80s. He had a very high approval rating and was the subject of what many called “Trudeaumania,” especially in his early years. Most important for our discussion, Trudeau was a French Canadian from Quebec who despised Quebecois nationalism, emphasizing pan-Canadian nationalism over what he saw as the misguided fight of a backward group of radicals (Guibernau, 2006). He sought to curb the sovereignty movement whenever he could and focus attention on Canadian multiculturalism.

However, the PQ and the mainstream sovereignty movement were the least of the federal government’s worries. A small, radical offshoot of the young separatist movement had been stealing from various businesses to support their cause and placing explosives in certain targeted locations since 1963, hoping for fast action on secession. The Front de libération du Québec (FLQ), as they were called, gained steam in 1969, when they all but destroyed the Montreal Stock Exchange, seen to be a very English location because of the economic dominance of anglophones in Quebec, with a powerful bomb and injured 27 people in February (Laurendeau, n.d.). In September, after detonating various other explosives, they placed a bomb in the mayor of Montreal’s house. They also rioted throughout the year and began to
plan a military secession from Canada. Finally, in early October of 1970, the FLQ’s efforts reached their height. At the time, many of the organization's members were imprisoned, and the FLQ wanted them back. As a solution to this issue, the free members disguised themselves as delivery men and kidnapped James Cross, the British Trade Commissioner, on October 4th.

Five days later, a different cell of the FLQ kidnapped Pierre Laporte, Quebec’s Minister of Labour. Police searched frantically for the captives, and the Canadian military began to patrol Ottawa, Canada’s capital, amidst fears of a violent francophone uprising and further FLQ attacks. Students in Montreal organized protests in support of the FLQ. Politicians in Quebec called for the federal government to negotiate with the kidnappers. On October 16th, at the request of Robert Bourassa, the Premier of Quebec, Trudeau implemented the War Measures Act (which suspends habeas corpus) for its only peacetime use in Canadian history. The next day, the FLQ came out with a list of demands and stated that they had killed Laporte, whom they referred to as the “Minister of unemployment and assimilation.” On November 6th, the police found the FLQ cell that had kidnapped and killed Laporte and charged its members with murder. A month later, on December 3rd, James Cross was released after a series of negotiations. In return, the FLQ members who kidnapped him got safe passage to Cuba. Three members returned to Canada in the late 1970s and spent several years in prison. The October Crisis, as this harrowing event came to be called, greatly minimized desire for violent solutions to Quebec’s nationhood, essentially ended the FLQ, and, with its loudness and violence, marked the end of the Quiet Revolution.
After the Quiet Revolution and the October Crisis, the sovereignty movement was no longer a fringe cause in Quebecois society, but a given. The 1970s saw a sudden increase in debates and policies surrounding language in Quebec, with fierce opposition to these policies from Pierre Trudeau. Trudeau always supported official bilingualism, in contrast to the Quebecois government, which preferred French-only laws. These French-only laws protected, in the provincial government’s view, a minority language that could otherwise easily be crushed since it was surrounded by a sea of English speakers in the rest of Canada and the United States. To the PQ, laws to support the usage of French were a form of Quebecois self-preservation.

Up to this point, Quebec (and the rest of Canada) had been operating under Section 133 of the British North America (BNA) act for their language policies. However, this section did not define the official languages of Canada or its provinces, but merely allowed for use of both English and French in the federal and Quebec legislatures, courts, and records. In 1969, the provincial government passed Bill 63, a law that softly nudged the public towards using French by making French courses available to all students in Quebec and slightly expanding the mandate of the Office québécois de la langue française. The fear of linguistic erasure of the francophone population of Quebec had begun to grow, so the protections of the BNA act and Bill 63 were not enough. Anxious about the loss of their language since they were just a small enclave of French speakers surrounded by English, they commissioned a study of the usage and rights of the French and English languages in Quebec.

The Commission turned out several hundred pages of information, compiling case studies and statistics, and recommended that the province declare French its
official language (the language of government, schools, etc.) and both French and English its national languages (more a symbolic gesture than a practical one). The idea that a part of a nation could declare official and national languages regardless of the behavior of the nation as a whole seemed completely acceptable to people in Quebec. This acceptance stemmed from the perception of Quebecois separatist ideology as normal at this time.

In response to the Commission’s output, the provincial government enacted Bill 22, the Official Language Act of 1974 (not to be confused with a federal act with a similar name), which made French the sole official language of Quebec (and made no comments about national languages). Several anglophone lawyers in Quebec tried to argue against the act, saying that declaring French the official language went against the provisions of the British North America act because the latter declares French and English the official languages of Quebec. However, since the BNA act, in fact, makes no such statement, Bill 22 was upheld. Years later, Trudeau referred to Bill 22 as a “slap in the face” because it ran directly counter to his efforts to promote federal bilingualism (Trudeau, 1993). This simple piece of legislature was the beginning of Quebec’s later, more radical measures to maintain and protect the French language and a significant support for the continued rise of Quebecois separatism.

In 1976, two years after Bill 22 was passed, the Parti Québécois was elected to form a provincial government in Quebec for the first time, with René Lévesque as its Premier. Disgruntled anglophones had already been leaving the Belle Province, but after this election, their emigration escalated (Stats Canada, 2010). The effects of
the anglophone exodus of the 1970s and 80s are still felt today; anglophones who would have been giving birth to young English speakers left Quebec, so now the anglophone birth rate is very low, and its population is not growing as it otherwise would have been, as shown in this chart of the anglophone population's age:

![Figure 3: Age structure of the English mother tongue population, Quebec, 1971 and 2006](Standing Senate Committee on Official Languages, 2011)

Many young anglophones left Quebec between 1971 and today, leaving a visible dent in the English-speaking population of the Belle Province. There has also been a 59.3% decrease in enrollment in English language schools and educational programs since this time due to this exodus and laws that require children to attend French schools (Standing Senate Committee on Official Languages, 2011). The
election of the PQ and the various language acts privileging French only encouraged the steady emigration of anglophones from Quebec.

Although the PQ was primarily working toward Quebec’s independence from Canada, its members also had language issues to legislate. In 1977, the PQ government passed Bill 101, the Charter of the French Language. This bill reiterated that French was the official language of Quebec (except in certain areas, where Quebec must conform to the BNA act, such as the courts), established French as the working language of all provincial government offices, protected French speakers in employment, disallowed requiring knowledge of any other language for hiring unless the job’s duties include use of the language, said all labels must be written in French, and stated that all children must go to French schools unless one of their parents was educated in an English school in Quebec. This bill was obviously extremely controversial and a significant step towards more intensive language policies. The legacy of Bill 101 is still felt today, and discussions of the policies it created continue.

With a separatist party in control of the provincial government, more and more aggressive language laws, and rising nationalism, it should come as no surprise that in 1980, the PQ initiated a referendum on secession. The question read:
The text of the referendum was confusing to many in Quebec, but what the government meant to ask was whether it should attempt to negotiate for sovereignty with a continued friendly relationship with Canada. Trudeau, as one might expect, favored a “no” vote on this question. Several days before the vote, he promised to change the Canadian constitution if the motion were rejected, which most people in Quebec interpreted as a change to satisfy their demands. The people of Quebec ended up turning down the motion, with 40.4% approving it and 59.6% rejecting it, which is a fairly wide margin. Despite the rejection of its referendum, the PQ was re-elected in 1981.

Trudeau held true on his offer to a certain degree. He began to negotiate a new constitution with the Premiers of the ten provinces, hoping to find an agreement that would result in full sovereignty for Canada. Up to this point, Canada’s constitution had been a British law (the BNA act) that could only be
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7 The Government of Quebec has made public its proposal to negotiate a new agreement with the rest of Canada, based on the equality of nations; this agreement would enable Quebec to acquire the exclusive power to make its laws, levy its taxes and establish relations abroad - in other words, sovereignty - and at the same time to maintain with Canada an economic association including a common currency; any change in political status resulting from these negotiations will only be implemented with popular approval through another referendum; on these terms, do you give the Government of Quebec the mandate to negotiate the proposed agreement between Quebec and Canada?
modified by British parliament. In practice, this situation meant that Canada would send the British an update to their constitution and the parliament would approve it, but patriation, the “homecoming” of the constitution, would make Canada independent and be an important symbolic step. It was difficult to get all of the provinces on board, but the Premiers all eventually signed an initial document, which, as it turns out, would later be edited. Unfortunately, René Lévesque misunderstood and believed that what he had signed was a final document. As a result, he was upset when the clause that allowed provinces to opt out of certain federal decisions was removed after he left the conference to go to bed. The next day, he learned of the new plan and withdrew his support. Quebec announced that it was officially going to veto the plan several days later. However, Trudeau went forward with it anyway, and the veto was not legally allowed. Canada gained a new constitution, and resentment toward Trudeau began to simmer in Quebec over what Lévesque called a “stab in the back.”

In 1984, however, Lévesque’s resentment of Trudeau was no longer relevant on the national stage when the Progressive Conservatives came into power and Brian Mulroney was elected PM. Where Trudeau had been vehemently opposed to the sovereignty movement in Quebec and refused to pander to separatists, Mulroney tried to appease them. In 1987, he attempted to organize the Meech Lake Accord, a potential amendment to the Constitution of Canada. He meant for this agreement, which would recognize Quebec as a “distinct society,” allow all provinces a constitutional veto, and let provinces opt out of certain federal services, to increase Quebecers’ interest in their province remaining part of Canada.
Unfortunately, it had the opposite effect, increasing Quebecers’ desire for separation, because the English provinces rejected the Meech Lake Accord as giving Quebec special status with the “distinct society” clause. As a reaction to this rejection by English Canada, Robert Bourassa (the Liberal Premier of Quebec at the time) said: “...English Canada must clearly understand that, no matter what is said or done, Quebec is, today and forever, a distinct society, that is free and able to assume the control of its destiny and development.” Thus, English Canada’s rejection of Quebec’s uniqueness in the Meech Lake Accord caused separatist sentiments to rise in the Belle Province.

The turmoil caused by the Meech Lake Accord continued throughout the late 80s. In 1991, members of the Liberal and Progressive Conservative parties broke off to form a federal separatist party called the Bloc Québécois. In 1992, the Premiers and Prime Minister met again to negotiate the Charlottetown Accord. This accord was another set of proposed amendments that tried in one of its clauses to recognize Quebec as a distinct society. However, it also emphasized egalitarianism within Canada, which the Meech Lake Accord had not done. It was extremely long, and as campaigning for the referendum went on, many groups found something with which they disagreed in its pages. It did not pass.

Quebec’s dissatisfaction came to a head again in 1995 over another referendum on sovereignty put out by the newly elected PQ. This time, though, the referendum asked about negotiating sovereignty with an optional association with Canada, not a certain promise of a friendly relationship. The question asked:
Early on in the season, it seemed that Quebecers would overwhelmingly vote “no,” but as campaigning went on, the polls crept up until responses were more and more equal. Prime Minister Jean Chrétien held a widely attended forum in Quebec about how he would be willing to make reforms to satisfy Quebecois demands and made a bilingual address to the nation asking for Quebec to stay a part of Canada. Three days before the vote on the referendum, 100,000 Canadians from other provinces came to Quebec to hold a rally, begging the province to stay. 94% of registered voters in Quebec voted on the referendum, an unbelievably high turnout. 60% of francophones in Quebec voted “yes,” but anglophones strongly favored “no,” resulting in 49.5% of the province voting “yes” and 50.5% voting “no” (Drolet, 1995). Such a close race was shocking and sobering for the rest of Canada, and incredibly frustrating to those francophone Quebecers who voted “yes.” The PQ was re-elected in 1998, but chose not to introduce another referendum, waiting for a time when they would be more likely to win the ability to pursue sovereignty. They lost the election to the Liberals and Jean Charest in 2003, so they did not have the opportunity to do so again.

The Conservatives won the 2003 federal election and appointed Stephen Harper as their Prime Minister. In 2006, a member of the Bloc Québécois proposed a federal motion to recognize Quebecers as a nation. He knew that the motion would

---

8 Do you agree that Quebec should become sovereign after having made a formal offer to Canada for a new economic and political partnership within the scope of the bill respecting the future of Quebec and of the agreement signed on June 12, 1995?
not pass, but he felt that he could use its rejection as a tool for showing Canadians that they did not recognize the Québécois identity. Instead, Stephen Harper revised the motion, and it was passed in its new form, saying: “That this House recognize that the Québécois form a nation within a united Canada,” (39th Parliament, 2006). Popular support was divided on this issue, but francophones generally felt positively about it (Bauch, 2006).

For now, this concession seems to have placated Quebecers. However, the PQ was just re-elected on September 4, 2012. They say that a referendum is not conceivable for the time being, but if history is destined to repeat itself, Quebec and the federal government may be fighting again quite soon.

Québécois memory is long: the province’s motto is actually “je me souviens,” which means “I remember.” You can see it emblazoned on the license plate of every car in Quebec. The history of the conflicts between French and English Canadians is so important for our understanding of modern-day resentment between the groups specifically because of this tendency for long memory and century-old grudges. From early resentment of the English conquest and the British crown’s decision to split up the French and English parts of their colonies in North America in the 18th century to the FLQ’s kidnappings in 1970, from outrage over Louis Riel’s execution in the 1880s to the first referendum on sovereignty in the 1980s, the history of French-English conflict sets the stage for the present study of the sovereignty movement as it relates to language attitudes.
Chapter 2
Language Attitudes and Backgrounds: Secession in Quebec

1. Introduction

Because of Quebec’s history, many of its inhabitants have specific reasons to develop a strong regional identity and to want to secede from Canada. One of these reasons appears to be language; this study explores the sovereignty debate in Quebec from a sociolinguistic standpoint. Do some Quebecers want to secede from Canada because of linguistic differences from the rest of the nation? The Quebecois people are not a monolith; not everyone in the province is in agreement as to what language policies to enact, how to school their children, whether to form a sovereign nation, or any number of other provincial issues. For this reason, an exploration of the individual differences among Quebecers is warranted so that we can come to understand what sociolinguistic factors affect opinions on the question of secession in Quebec.

Demographic factors could explain some of the differences in opinion when it comes to separatism. Factors such as age, gender, cultural background, and language background have been shown affect language attitudes (Baker, 1992). Age and language background seem to be particularly interesting in this case. In terms of language background, native French speakers may be more likely to want to separate from Canada, whereas native English speakers might want to stay connected to the rest of the (mainly English-speaking) country. This idea seems to be borne out in real life: in the 1995 referendum on Quebec’s sovereignty,
approximately 60% of francophones voted to secede while 95% of anglophones voted against secession (Schmid, 2001). Young francophones in Quebec are more positive about English now than they have been in the past (Oakes, 2010). Older residents of the Belle Province, people who came of age during the Quiet Revolution or around the time of the passage of Bill 101, might be more strongly nationalist than young Quebecers today, who have spent their entire lives in a Quebec where French is the dominant language of business, law, and day-to-day life.

However, demographic factors are certainly not the only predictors of Quebecois opinions on the sovereignty movement. Contact with members of the opposite language group could play a role. Contact Theory refers to the idea that interaction with other social groups can increase intercultural understanding and acceptance (Allport, 1954). This theory has not always proved viable, but with some revisions, it may better model inter-group contact. The groups must be of equal status, they must be pursuing common goals, and supportive social systems must exist for their interaction (Breton, Reitz, & Valentine, 1980; Forbes, 1997). A previous study found that individuals who had more friends and relatives from the other language group (francophone or anglophone) were more likely to support the notion of a bilingual Canada (Adsett & Morin, 2004). This study was carried out across Canada rather than solely in Quebec and measured support for a bilingual nation, so it would presumably produce different results than a study measuring support for and against Quebecois secession. Nonetheless, contact between sociolinguistic groups in Quebec may also affect perceptions of the sovereignty movement.
In a similar vein, language proficiency in both French and English could predict support or lack thereof for secession. Quebecers with little proficiency in English might feel bitter that they had to learn the language of the Rest of Canada (ROC). As of 2001, only 18% of Canadians could carry on a conversation in the other official language, and most of them were francophones: assimilation rates for French speakers are as high as 75% in some parts of the country, while very few anglophones have to assimilate to French (Cardinal, 2010), except for those in Quebec, of whom approximately 67% speak French at some level (Bourhis, Montreuil, Helly, & Jantzen, 2007). The rates of bilingualism are highest in French-speaking provinces (Quebec and New Brunswick), and francophones have the highest rates of bilingualism overall, compared to anglophones and native speakers of languages other than French or English (Conrick, 2006). These realities can be upsetting to francophones, especially those who are committed to their language and/or culture. Perhaps, then, proficiency in English could predict more support for secession.

On the other hand, in the same study on Contact Theory, the researchers determined that outside of Quebec, language proficiency was the best predictor of attitudes towards bilingualism, where higher proficiency levels in both official languages corresponded to more support for societal bilingualism. They suggested that Quebec did not show the same results as the other provinces because the meaning of bilingualism is different within the Belle Province than in the ROC, so Quebecers might respond differently to the idea of societal bilingualism than other Canadians would (Adsett & Morin, 2004). Since our study does not ask about
societal bilingualism but rather whether or not Quebec should secede, we might find that greater proficiency in English in Quebec could increase empathy for anglophones, who make up most of the ROC, and decrease support for secession.

Many researchers on language attitudes have found that attitudes toward a language are similar to or predictive of attitudes toward a group. When people perceive certain languages to be beautiful, intelligent, and generally good, they also perceive the people who speak that language positively (Appel & Muysken, 1987; Pöll, 2005). Incidentally, this information is unfortunate for francophone Quebecers because many people perceive their variety of French to be ugly or uneducated (Salien, 1998; Auger & Valdman, 1999). This research on attitudes about a language predicting attitudes about the group that speaks it would suggest that negative attitudes toward English among francophones could be predictive of negative attitudes toward English speakers, and thus, support for secession.

Lastly, views on political and social issues involving language might be predictive of separatist sentiments. A study on young Quebecers found that they were very diverse in their opinions on linguistic issues in their province (Oakes, 2010), and it is certainly possible that these individual variations account for variation in separatist sentiments, since both issues are mainly political. Quebecois people who feel more negatively about the use of English in Quebec and more positively about legislation maintaining the French language might be more likely to want to secede from Canada.

To sum up, we predict that the Quebecers who would be most likely to want to secede from Canada are older and French-speaking, have fewer anglophone
friends, feel more negatively about English, and hold more negative political/social views about English in Quebec. We make no predictions about proficiency in English, but expect that it is involved.

2. Methods

This study made use of a questionnaire distributed in both French and English. It was originally written in English, and the questions were translated into French and sent to a bilingual Canadian translator to be checked. Some of the questions were taken from another study (Oakes, 2010). Responses were collected online. To get younger participants, we advertised the survey on the McGill University, Concordia University, and Université de Québec à Montréal campuses. We found older participants through familial or other social connections and asked them to contact other Quebecers to tell them about the study. All participants were entered in a drawing to win one of ten $20 CAD gift cards for Amazon.ca.

Demographic questions ascertained the age, gender, and language identity group (francophone, anglophone, or other) of the respondents. We also asked how long the participants had lived in Canada and in Quebec. Another set of questions sought to clarify language background, asking what language(s) the respondent spoke before the age of six, what language(s) the respondent’s parents spoke before age six, and how proficient the respondent currently is in French and English.

Next we inquired about attitudes toward French and English: how prestigious and beautiful they are, how much the participants enjoy speaking them,  

---

9 The participants we obtained through familial connections tend to have considerable levels of bilingual contact because their families have both anglophones and francophones. As a result, they also may be somewhat similar in their opinions on secession.
and how useful they are for employment. These four questions were chosen to attempt to determine whether general perceptions toward these two languages are more positive or negative. Participants were also asked which language they preferred to read, write, hear, and speak and which language they preferred to use in general. These preference questions were also meant to look at perceptions of French and English since we expected that some of the responses would be due to respondents’ language proficiency but thought that some might be due to perceptions of the language’s prestige, beauty, or goodness.

Respondents were also asked a variety of questions having to do with political and social issues relating to language in Quebec, such as whether politicians should master English, how intensively English should be taught in schools, and whether legislation is necessary to preserve French in Quebec. These questions were taken from Oakes’s (2010) study on young Quebecers’ attitudes towards English and French. We wrote the rest of the questions in the survey.

Next, the respondents were asked their opinion about secession. Specifically, we asked “Should Quebec separate from Canada and form its own nation?” and offered only two responses, yes and no, in the style of Quebec’s referenda on secession. Respondents were asked what factors led to their response; we gave them the option to choose multiple factors out of a list of economic, job-related, linguistic, nationalistic, political, social, and religious possibilities. We also asked those participants who were old enough to vote in 1980 or 1995 how they voted on the issue of sovereignty, offering an option for “prefer not to answer.” We hoped to
be able to use the responses to these questions to measure what factors predict separatist sentiments.

Lastly, we asked questions similar to those in Adsett & Morin’s (2004) study on language proficiency and contact between linguistic groups in Canada. Inspired by their results, this section included questions on the level of education the respondents received in their non-native official language. It also asked how many close friends and relatives they have from the opposite linguistic group. A copy of the entire questionnaire in English and French can be found in Appendix A.

3. Results

3.1. The participants

We collected response data from 239 residents of the province of Quebec. However, only 190 of these participants finished the entire survey. The highest percentage of respondents came from the 18- to 25-year-old group. Percentages for each age range can be found in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants’ Age</th>
<th>No. of participants</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants’ language was evaluated in three ways: identity, language(s)
spoken before age six, and language(s) spoken by the participant's parents before age six. The frequencies of participants in each category are shown in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2

Participants’ Language by Identity, Native Language, and Parents’ Native Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language identity</th>
<th>No. of participants</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francophone</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglophone</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual (French-English)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native language</th>
<th>No. of participants</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French and English</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents’ native language</th>
<th>No. of participants</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both French</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both English</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or both bilingual</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One French, one English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding native English speakers in Quebec was difficult, so more native French speakers participated in this survey than native English speakers. Still, the sample is not representative of Quebec’s population because there is a higher proportion of anglophones in the sample than in the general population: 21.7%-26.1% in this study compared to 7.7% in Quebec according to the 2006 Canadian census (Statistics Canada, 2006). This higher proportion of English speakers is due to a concerted effort to find anglophones as a comparison group by advertising on the McGill and Concordia campuses and by asking older participants to send the survey on specifically to English speakers in Quebec.
3.2. Native language, parents’ native language, and language identity

The data were not normally distributed and the key dependent variable was a dichotomous categorical variable, so chi square tests were used for most of the analyses. The results for all tests involving linguistic identity, native language, and parents’ native language were the same. From this point on, all analyses are reported with the native language variable because the parents’ native language variable does not directly describe the participants’ language and the linguistic identity variable could confound native language and opinions on secession (e.g., a native speaker of both French and English could identify as a francophone or a native speaker of French could identify as a bilingual for political reasons).

There was a significant association between native language and whether participants wanted to secede from Canada ($\chi^2(1, N = 136) = 17.88, p < .001, V = .363$). The number and percentage of participants in each category is shown in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3

Secession Choice Based on Native Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes to secession</th>
<th>No to secession</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>French</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. residual</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. residual</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This association seems to be mostly due to the fact that, based on the odds ratio, the odds of participants wanting to secede from Canada are 13.7 times higher if they are native French speakers than if they are native English speakers. The proportions of participants within each group that wanted to secede or not secede from Canada are shown in Figure 3.1.

**Figure 3.1**

*Secession Choice Based on Native Language*

Full chi square tests comparing native speakers of French, English, both, and other languages can be found in Appendix B.

### 3.3. Age

Within the francophones, who are the group most likely to support secession, there was a significant association between the age of the participants (split into 18-35 year olds and people over the age of 55) and whether they said yes or no to Quebec leaving Canada ($\chi^2(1, N = 68) = 7.37, p < .01, V = .329$), as seen in Table 3.4.
Table 3.4

Secession Choice Based on Age of Native French Speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes to secession</th>
<th>No to secession</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Younger French</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18-35) Observed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. residual</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Older French</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(55+) Observed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. residual</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The odds of younger francophones wanting to secede were 4.6 times higher than the odds of older francophones wanting to do so. The percentage of each group that supports secession from Canada can be found in Figure 3.2.

Figure 3.2

Secession Choice Based on Age of Native French Speakers

![Bar chart showing secession choice based on age of native French speakers]
The direction of this finding is contrary to the hypothesis that older participants would be more likely than younger participants to want to secede from Canada. There were no other significant effects of age.

### 3.4. Contact

Since only two native speakers of English supported secession, we only analyzed the results of francophones for a number of these tests. Among native speakers of French, the number of participants who supported secession differed significantly by the number of close friends and relatives they claimed to have who were native speakers of English ($\chi^2(1, N = 78) = 6.72, p < .05, V = .294$), as seen in Table 3.5.

#### Table 3.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secession Choice Based on Native French Speakers’ Number of English-Speaking Friends and Relatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0-5 friends</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Std. residual</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6+ friends</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Std. residual</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the odds ratio, francophones with zero to five anglophone friends or relatives were 4.15 times more likely to want to secede than were francophones with six or more anglophone friends or relatives.
3.5. Language proficiency

There was no significant effect of proficiency in French or English or of years studying French or English in school on participants’ responses to the secession question, even when separated out by native language. However, francophones’ English proficiency and their positivity towards English (in terms of beauty, prestige, utility, and enjoyment) were moderately correlated, \( r(95) = .45, p < .01 \).

---

\[10\] Some participants seem to have misunderstood the question about years of schooling in English and French because a number of them selected answers that did not make sense (e.g. 0 years of English but also 6-10 years). We did not count any completely contradictory answers such as the example above and we used the highest number of years selected in non-contradictory answers (e.g. if the participant selected 1-5, and 6-10 years of English, we used 6-10 years). Still, the misunderstanding could have affected the results. Some participants gave confusing results on the language proficiency questions as well. For example, some respondents who indicated that they were native speakers of French did not mark their proficiency in French as native. We cut the proficiency responses into three groups (high, medium, and low) and hoped that some of this confusion would be evened out by the cut because responses were generally in the right third even if they did not make perfect sense.
3.6. Attitudes about the other language

For the final two research questions, we chose to use a binary logistic regression for its ability to predict a dichotomous categorical dependent variable with a continuous independent variable. We averaged four questions about English (how much participants enjoy speaking it as well as how beautiful, prestigious, and useful for finding a job it is) and found that in francophone populations, there was a significant effect of these attitudes on secession; the higher the positivity towards English, the more likely francophone participants were to want to remain a part of Canada (p < .01). Another regression on the same attitudes towards French was not significant.

Table 3.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>e^B</th>
<th>95% C.I. for e^B</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Questions</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>1.616**</td>
<td>1.128 - 2.317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Questions</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.492 - 2.032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.935</td>
<td>2.438</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05

3.7. Political/social attitudes about language in Quebec

This part of the study used a selection of questions from Oakes’ survey on young francophone Quebecers’ opinions on various issues relating to language to form a measure on positivity or negativity to the use of English. The questions used can be found in Appendix A. Some of the questions were reverse-coded, and all of the questions were averaged to create a measure where higher numbers represent greater levels of positivity towards English in Quebec.
Table 3.7

*Secession Choice Based on Francophones’ Social Attitudes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>e^B</th>
<th>95% C.I. for e^B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social attitudes</td>
<td>1.321</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>3.748 ***</td>
<td>2.121 - 6.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-5.170</td>
<td>1.239</td>
<td>.006 ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05

A binary logistic regression showed that there was a significant effect of political and social attitudes related to language on secession; the higher francophones’ positivity towards the use of English in Quebec, the more likely they were to not want to secede from Canada (p < .001). Table 3.7 summarizes these results.

4. Discussion

4.1. Demographic factors

In light of the history of Quebec and Oakes’ study about young francophones, it seems that there should be some relationships between age, native language or language identity, and feelings of separatism. We predicted that francophones would be more likely to want to secede from Canada because of Quebec’s history of francophone and anglophone conflict. Indeed, francophones in our study were almost fourteen times more likely to support secession than anglophones. Still, more francophones wanted to stay part of Canada than to secede. These numbers are in keeping with votes on the 1980 and 1995 referenda – neither referendum passed, so more people want to stay part of Canada than not, and anglophones were much less likely to vote yes than francophones; 90% of anglophones voted no compared to 40% of francophones (Drouilly, 1999). The fact that the francophones in our study
were more likely to want to secede than the anglophones is not at all surprising when considered in light of the previous votes.

However, our prediction about age was not substantiated. It seemed that older francophones, having witnessed the violent acts of the FLQ and the militaristic reaction of the Prime Minister and having lived through at least some of the Quiet Revolution, might have been more supportive of leaving Canada. Years of resentment could have built up into a fierce desire to secede from the nation that had done them wrong. Instead, we found that younger francophones (aged 18–35) were over four times more likely to want to secede than older francophones (aged 55 and over). This result can be explained one of three ways. First, it could be that our sample is skewed. The younger francophones were mostly recruited through a French-speaking university, so they are people who most likely know more francophones than anglophones, may not be as proficient in English as some other native speakers of French in Quebec, and specifically chose to attend an all-French university. The older francophones were mostly recruited by a snowball-like method, so they are likely more similar to each other than a randomly selected group would be. This similarity may bias our results, especially in terms of opinions on secession. Sometimes debate about the sovereignty movement can be so divisive that family members who disagree do not speak to each other, so it stands to reason that participants who are anti-secession (as many of the initial participants in the older group were) would know more participants who are also anti-secession.

Still, our sample might not be the reason for this difference. Younger francophones might actually be more likely to want to secede from Canada. Though
Oakes found that younger francophones are more positive about English now than they have been in the past (2010), our study did not find a difference between younger and older francophone participants’ positivity towards English or political/social attitudes about English. The province-wide votes on secession from Canada seem to support an interpretation of the data where younger people want to secede from Canada more than older people. The margin between the secession and anti-secession sides was much tighter in the more recent 1995 referendum than in 1980: 50.5% no to 49.5% yes in 1995 compared to 59.6% no to 40.4% yes in 1980. This difference in percentages could be seen as an increase in support for secession between 1980 and 1995 rather than as a reflection of how the question was worded or as a result of PM Pierre Trudeau’s promise to change the relationship between Quebec and Canada, as it has otherwise been explained.

Lastly, older francophones could be the reason for the difference. Although we hypothesized that witnessing the violence and discord of the language debates of the 1960s and 70s in Quebec would make the older francophones dislike anglophones and the ROC and thus want to secede, another explanation is possible. Maybe living through such disharmonious times made older francophones realize how difficult it can be to have such intense conflict and caused them to yearn for peace rather than secession.

4.2. Contact

The demographic factors of age and native language are not the only factors that predict support for secession. Another factor is contact. Adsett & Morin found that Canadians with more friends and relatives from the opposite language group
are more likely to avow a bilingual national identity (2004). Consequently, we predicted that Quebecers would follow this pattern in terms of secession: that with more contact with the opposite group, they would be less likely to want to secede from Canada.

Since only two native English speakers said they wanted to secede from Canada, we ran tests only for native French speakers and found that francophones with few anglophone friends or relatives (0-5 friends/relatives) were about four times more likely to want to secede than francophones with many anglophone friends or relatives (6 or more). It stands to reason that francophones who are close to more anglophones would better understand the other side. Not only that, but they may be opposed to secession since if Quebec were its own nation, it could be even tougher on English speakers, meaning that those close friends and relatives might choose to move away.

4.3. Proficiency

Adsett & Morin also found that proficiency in both official languages was the strongest predictor of avowing a bilingual national identity in the ROC, and they suggested that Quebec did not follow the trend of the other provinces due to a different societal meaning of bilingualism in the Belle Province. They explain these results by saying that since Quebec is a monolingual French province, bilingualism could be seen as a defeat or a concession to the anglophone ROC instead of the symbol of Canadian unity that it might be elsewhere (2004). Because the question of secession in our survey does not mention bilingualism, we hypothesized that our participants might follow the larger pattern of results from the other provinces in
Adsett & Morin’s study. It seemed that francophones with a higher level of proficiency in English would be less likely to want to secede from Canada because greater proficiency in English would bring them into contact with more anglophones and give them a connection to English speakers. On the other hand, francophones might have greater proficiency in English because they are forced to learn English to live in an English-dominated world, something that they could come to resent.

In the end, we found no significant differences in opinion on secession based on proficiency in French or English. Perhaps francophones’ proficiency in English is just not important to the question of secession. However, we found a positive correlation between francophones’ proficiency in and positivity towards English, so it does seem that there is something to be said for a connection between language proficiency and secession. In fact, our two hypotheses could be pulling the results in both directions: some francophones with high levels of proficiency in English might resent the reason for their proficiency while others have come to appreciate anglophones due to their proficiency in English.

4.4. Attitudes about French and English

Since attitudes towards a language are somewhat predictive of attitudes towards the group of people who speak that language (Appel & Muysken, 1987; Pöll, 2005) and since the roots of the sovereignty movement in Quebec seem to come from dislike or mistrust of anglophones, we hypothesized that francophone attitudes towards English would predict their opinion on secession. In fact, we did
find an effect, in that higher positivity towards English predicted higher probability of not wanting to secede from Canada.

4.5. Political/social attitudes

Lastly, it seemed clear that participants’ political and social attitudes about language in Quebec would be predictive of their opinions on secession. If someone is extremely negative about people speaking English in Quebec, schools being bilingual, and other related topics, that person will most likely be more inclined to want to secede from Canada. Indeed, we did find a direct relationship between negativity towards political and social issues that privilege English and support of secession. The means of our participants’ responses to the questions taken from Oakes’s 2010 study were fairly similar to her results.

4.6. Importance of these findings

The results of this study give us important insight into the roots of the sovereignty movement in Quebec as well as information on the current linguistic situation in the Belle Province. The knowledge that native speakers of French are more likely to want to secede from Canada is not surprising, but the finding that younger francophones support secession more than older francophones is. This information means that Quebecois secession could potentially be more likely in the future than in the present day if younger francophones become more and more disillusioned with Canada.

However, supporters of a Canada that includes Quebec need not despair: perhaps there are ways to work towards keeping the province connected to the ROC. Francophones who have more close connections with native speakers of
English are less likely want to secede from Canada. There appears to be some kind of relationship between contact and lower likelihood of desire for secession. Not wanting to secede from Canada could make participants more likely to have higher numbers of anglophone friends or some third factor could explain both not wanting to secede and having anglophone friends, but no reasonable factors that would explain both come to mind. Either way, it would not hurt Quebecers who are pro-Canada to try to create more situations in which francophones and anglophones interact by, for example, educating native speakers of French and English in the same schools or establishing bilingual community organizations.

On a more general scale, the results about contact between anglophones and francophones can be taken as further support for the validity of Contact Theory (Allport, 1954), and the finding that positivity towards English predicts not wanting to secede supports, to some degree, the idea that language attitudes are actually societal or group attitudes (Appel & Muysken, 1987; Pöll, 2005).

4.7. Limitations of this study

Of course, there are some limitations to this study. First, we relied a sample of convenience. It is difficult to reach a wide variety of Quebecers, especially when you are distributing a survey from another country. Because part of our sample was gleaned from familial and friendly connections, it might not have been representative of Quebec as a whole since friends and family tend to be similar along a number of dimensions. Future studies might try recruiting a more representative sample through some crowdsourcing platform or by handing out cards with the survey URL on the street in various locations in the province of
Quebec. Second, we only measured one dependent variable, a yes/no answer on a question about secession. In order to obtain more depth on the question, future studies could also ask a scale question about how strongly respondents feel on the subject and, in addition to the strength question, provide an open response question where participants can explain why they answered the way they did. Third, some respondents seemed to have misunderstood a few of the questions in this study, especially questions about language proficiency, length of residence in Quebec/Canada, and years of English/French studied in school. As a result, tests of these questions could have somewhat muddled results.

4.8. Opportunities for future research

Future research on the topics covered in this study should be more cautious in its distribution methods to try to find the most representative sample possible and should measure the dependent variable, secession, in more than one way. If these issues are fixed, we may see different results along age lines or, if the results do not change, data could be collected via these improved designs to explain why younger francophones are more supportive of secession than older francophones.

The topic of language proficiency is another one that needs to be further explored. Although this study did not find an effect of proficiency in English on desire for secession, there was a positive correlation between English proficiency and positivity towards English, and positivity towards English predicted less desire for secession. For this reason, we suspect that language proficiency may somehow be involved in differences in opinion about secession. Future research could ask the
proficiency question in a different way or create a proficiency test and use the results of the test to try to predict opinions on secession.

5. Conclusion

Quebecers differ in many ways, including whether or not they support secession from Canada. With a survey of over 200 Quebecers, we found that native language, age, contact with speakers of Canada’s other official language, attitudes about French and English, and political and social attitudes can predict an individual resident of Quebec’s opinion on secession. Though this survey is limited by its sample, our results provide insight into the sovereignty movement in Quebec and a starting point for future research on this topic.

This research has implications for Quebec, but it also reaches beyond Canada. Many countries in the world struggle with maintaining a strong sense of nationhood despite having their citizens split into regions along language lines, including Spain, Belgium, and Switzerland. Indeed, Belgium has recently faced a very real possibility of splitting in two (Cendrowicz, 2010). Contact between groups and attitudes about the other side’s language can predict desire for secession in Quebec, so perhaps these same factors could predict similar desires in other countries like Canada. Knowing that contact and language attitudes are so important, governments that are against the splitting of their countries can enact policies that will put opposing groups in contact and mount campaigns to increase positivity towards both languages.
Conclusion

A combined analysis of the historical and modern day predictors of separatism allows us to explore the question of Quebec's sovereignty in greater depth. Without the knowledge of the historical conflict, we would not truly see why the demographic factors of age and native language are related to opinions of secession, and without the knowledge of the modern predictors of contact and language attitudes, we would not fully understand why the segregation of linguistic groups from an early point in Canada's history affects the sovereignty movement.

As it stands now, there is no proposal for another referendum on secession, but the titles of recent news articles reveal the still-turbulent nature of a Quebec run by the Parti Quebecois: “Quebec’s War on English: Language Politics Intensify in Canadian Province” (Brenhouse, 2013), “Outraged in Quebec? Wait 10 minutes— you'll be outraged again” (Patriquin, 2013), “Quebec sovereignty needs rebranding” (CBC News, 2013). In a recent poll, 42% of anglophones in Quebec say they have considered leaving the province since the PQ was elected in September (Brenhouse, 2013). Language remains a divisive issue: in March, the PQ proposed a series of changes to Bill 101 that would make laws about learning and using French even more stringent. The books on the issues of secession and language politics in Quebec are far from closed, and the story of Canada continues to write itself in this province full of controversies over language and identity.
Appendix A

Please select your language in the top right hand corner of this page.

Veuillez sélectionner votre langue en haut à droite.

This survey will ask questions about language, opinions on government policies, and the sovereignty movement in Quebec. Your responses to the questions will be kept anonymous.

Do you consent to participate in this study?
- Yes
- No

How old are you?
- 18-25
- 26-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- 56-65
- Over 65

What term best describes your gender?
- Male
- Female
- Other

Are you an Aboriginal person?
Choose all that apply.
- No
- Yes, North American Indian
- Yes, Métis
- Yes, Inuit/Eskimo

How would you identify yourself?
Choose all that apply.
- Francophone/French Canadian
- Anglophone/English Canadian
- Other
Since what age have you lived in Canada?
- 0-9
- 10-19
- 20-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50+

Since what age have you lived in Quebec?
- 0-9
- 10-19
- 20-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50+

What language(s) did you speak before age 6?
Choose all that apply.
- French
- English
- Other

What language(s) did your parents speak before age 6?
Choose all that apply.
Parent 1 Parent 2
- French - French
- English - English
- Other - Other
- I don’t know - I don’t know

At what level do you speak English?
- Not at all
- Elementary proficiency
- Limited proficiency
- Professional proficiency
- Full proficiency
- Native proficiency

At what level do you speak French?
- Not at all
- Elementary proficiency
- Limited proficiency
- Professional proficiency
- Full proficiency
- Native proficiency
Answer some questions about English.

How much do you enjoy speaking English? Not at all A lot
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
How prestigious is English? Not at all A lot
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
How beautiful is English? Not at all A lot
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
How useful is English for getting a job? Not at all A lot
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Answer some questions about French.

How much do you enjoy speaking French? Not at all A lot
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
How prestigious is French? Not at all A lot
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
How beautiful is French? Not at all A lot
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
How useful is French for getting a job? Not at all A lot
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Which language do you prefer...

to speak? English French

to hear?
to read?
to write?
in general?

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? [selected from Oakes (2010)]

Quebecers already know English sufficiently
Francophone politicians in Quebec should master English
Quebec should be a bilingual (French-English) province
English threatens the survival of French in Quebec
The use of English in public signage bothers me
English should be taught more intensively in French schools
Young francophone Quebecers will be handicapped in the world of work tomorrow if they don't know enough English
Francophone Quebecers who speak English amongst themselves are in a way rejecting their identity
Legislation (e.g. Bill 101) is necessary to protect French from English
Official policy concerning English in Quebec is out of step with the realities of the 21st century

Should Quebec separate from Canada and form its own nation?
- Yes
- No
What factors led to your response?  
Choose all that apply.
- Economic
- Job-related
- Linguistic
- Nationalistic
- Political
- Religious
- Social

Did you vote in the 1980 or 1995 Quebec referendums on sovereignty?
- Yes, in both
- Yes, in 1980
- Yes, in 1995
- No

How did you vote in 1980?  [Shown if participant said “yes, in both” or “yes, in 1980”]
- Yes, separate from Canada
- No, don't separate from Canada
- Prefer not to answer

How did you vote in 1995?  [Shown if participant said “yes, in both” or “yes, in 1995”]
- Yes, separate from Canada
- No, don't separate from Canada
- Prefer not to answer

Do you think the conversation about sovereignty should continue in Quebec?
- Yes
- No

Did you go to school in Canada?
- Yes
- No

Did you have a good opportunity to learn French, English, or both in school?  

French  English
Yes, I had many opportunities
Yes, but there could have been more opportunities
No, I didn't have good opportunities
Did you study one of the official languages (English and French) as a foreign language in school?

French

- Yes, for 1-5 years
- Yes, for 6-10 years
- Yes, for 11-15 years
- Yes, for 16 or more years
- No

English

How many close friends and relatives do you have who are native speakers of a different official language (French or English) from you?

- 0
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- Over 20
- I consider myself a native speaker of both official languages

We will now direct you to another site where you can enter your e-mail to have the chance to win a $20 gift card from Amazon.ca.

Your responses to the survey that you have just filled out will not be connected to the e-mail address that you will submit to the new site.

Click the >> button.
Ce questionnaire pose des questions sur la langue et sollicite des opinions sur les politiques gouvernementales et la question de la souveraineté du Québec. Vos réponses aux questions seront anonymes.

Consentez-vous à participer à cette étude?
- Oui
- Non

Quel âge avez-vous?
- 18-25 ans
- 26-35 ans
- 36-45 ans
- 46-55 ans
- 56-65 ans
- Plus de 65 ans

Vous êtes de sexe…
- masculin
- féminin
- autre

Êtes-vous en Autochtone?
Sélectionnez les réponses applicables.
- Non
- Oui, Indien(ne) de l'Amérique du Nord
- Oui, Métis
- Oui, Inuit

Comment vous identifiez-vous?
Sélectionnez les réponses applicables.
- Francophone/Canadien-français
- Anglophone/Canadien-anglais
- Autre
Vous habitez au Canada depuis quel âge?
- 0-9 ans
- 10-19 ans
- 20-29 ans
- 30-39 ans
- 40-49 ans
- 50 ans ou plus

Vous habitez au Québec depuis quel âge?
- 0-9 ans
- 10-19 ans
- 20-29 ans
- 30-39 ans
- 40-49 ans
- 50 ans ou plus

Quelle(s) langue(s) parliez-vous avant l'âge de 6 ans?
Sélectionnez les réponses applicables.
- Le français
- L'anglais
- Autre

Quelle(s) langue(s) parlaient vos parents avant l'âge de 6 ans?
Sélectionnez les réponses applicables.
Parent 1 Parent 2
- Le français - Le français
- L'anglais - L'anglais
- Autre - Autre
- Je ne sais pas - Je ne sais pas

Quelles sont vos aptitudes linguistiques en anglais?
- Aucune
- Élémentaires
- Limitées
- Professionnelles
- Perfectionnées
- Langue maternelle

Quelles sont vos aptitudes linguistiques en français?
- Aucune
- Élémentaires
- Limitées
- Professionnelles
- Perfectionnées
- Langue maternelle
Veuillez répondre à quelques questions sur l’anglais.

À quel point aimez-vous parler anglais?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Quel est le prestige de l’anglais pour vous?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Quelle est la beauté de l’anglais pour vous?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Quelle est l’utilité de l’anglais pour trouver du travail?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Veuillez répondre à quelques questions sur le français

À quel point aimez-vous parler français?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Quel est le prestige du français pour vous?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Quelle est la beauté du français pour vous?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Quelle est l’utilité du français pour trouver du travail?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Quelle langue préférez-vous…

L’anglais Le français

parler?
entendre?
lire?
écrire?
en général?

À quel point êtes-vous d’accord ou pas d’accord avec les énoncés suivants?
[Selected from Oakes (2010)]

Les Québécois ont des connaissances suffisantes de l’anglais
Les politiciens francophones du Québec devraient maîtriser l’anglais
Le Québec devrait être une province bilingue (français-anglais)
L’anglais menace la survie du français au Québec
L’usage de l’anglais sur les panneaux publics me préoccupe
L’anglais devrait être enseigné plus intensivement dans des écoles françaises
Les jeunes Québécois francophones seront handicapés dans le monde de travail futur s’ils ne connaissent pas suffisamment l’anglais
Les Québécois francophones qui parlent en anglais entre eux rejettent leur identité
Il est nécessaire de promulguer des lois (par exemple, la Loi 101) pour protéger le français
La politique officielle sur la langue anglaise au Québec ne correspond pas aux réalités du 21ème siècle
Le Québec devrait-il se séparer du Canada et former son propre pays?
- Oui
- Non

Quels facteurs ont influencé votre réponse à la question précédente? 
Sélectionnez les réponses applicables.
- Facteurs économiques
- Facteurs reliés au travail
- Facteurs linguistiques
- Facteurs de nationalisme
- Facteurs politiques
- Facteurs religieux
- facteurs sociaux

Avez-vous voté lors des référendums québécois de 1980 ou de 1995 sur la souveraineté?
- Oui, aux deux
- Oui, en 1980
- Oui, en 1995
- Non

Quel a été votre vote en 1980? [Shown if participant said “yes, in both” or “yes, in 1980”]
- Oui, la séparation du Canada
- Non, pas de séparation du Canada
- Je préfère de ne pas répondre

Quel a été votre vote en 1995? [Shown if participant said “yes, in both” or “yes, in 1995”]
- Oui, la séparation du Canada
- Non, pas de séparation du Canada
- Je préfère de ne pas répondre

Croyez-vous que le sujet de la souveraineté devrait continuer à être débattu au Québec?
- Oui
- Non

Avez-vous fréquenté l’école au Canada?
- Oui
- Non
Avez-vous eu suffisamment d'opportunités à l'école pour apprendre le français, l'anglais, ou les deux?

Le français   L'anglais

Oui, j'ai eu beaucoup d'opportunités
Oui, mais il y aurait pu y en avoir plus
Non, je n'ai pas eu beaucoup d'opportunités

Avez-vous étudié l'une des langues officielles (l'anglais ou le français) comme langue étrangère à l'école?

Le français   L'anglais

Oui, pendant 1-5 ans
Oui, pendant 6-10 ans
Oui, pendant 11-15 ans
Oui, pendant 16 ans ou plus
Non

Combien d'amis intimes et de parents connaissez-vous dont la langue maternelle est une langue officielle (le français ou l'anglais) qui n'est pas la vôtre?

- 0
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- Plus de 20
- Je considère que les deux langues officielles sont mes langues d'origine

On va vous transférer à un autre site où vous pouvez soumettre votre adresse e-mail, ce qui vous donnera la possibilité de gagner une carte cadeau de $20 de Amazon.ca.

Les réponses au sondage que vous venez de remplir ne seront pas associées à l'adresse e-mail de l'autre site.

Cliquez sur le bouton >>.
1. Native language differences in opinion on secession (all groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NativeLangTotal * Should Quebec separate from Canada and form its own nation? Crosstabulation</th>
<th>Should Quebec separate from Canada and form its own nation?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French and English</td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>32.577</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>37.627</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>23.474</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.43.

Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal</td>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>0.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Should Quebec separate from Canada and form its own nation?

**Native Lang Total**

- French
- English
- French and English
- Other
### 2. Francophones’ opinions on secession by age (only native French)

**AgeCut * Should Quebec separate from Canada and form its own nation?**

**Crosstabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AgeCut</th>
<th>Should Quebec separate from Canada and form its own nation?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
<td>-.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chi-Square Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>8.735&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>8.968</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>8.073</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of Valid Cases 87

* 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.99.

**Symmetric Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. Friends/relatives of the opposite language group and opinions on secession (all groups)

FriendsAndRelativesCut2 * Should Quebec separate from Canada and form its own nation? Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FriendsAndRelativesCut2</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Expected Count</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Std. Residual</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Expected Count</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Std. Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Few (0-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many (6+)</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>20.266</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction</td>
<td>18.588</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>21.631</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher’s Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>20.144</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of Valid Cases: 165

Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal Phi</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal Cramer's V</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.18.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table
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4. Differences between native language groups on political/social negativity towards English in Quebec (all groups)

**Kruskal-Wallis Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NativeLangTotal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>122.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>71.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French and English</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OakesTotal</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.869</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: NativeLangTotal
5. Differences between age groups on political/social negativity towards English in Quebec (all groups)

Descriptives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.0915</td>
<td>1.18300</td>
<td>12202</td>
<td>2.8492 to 3.3338</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.7176</td>
<td>1.19201</td>
<td>20443</td>
<td>2.3017 to 3.1336</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.5678</td>
<td>1.23211</td>
<td>16041</td>
<td>2.2467 to 2.8889</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2.8583</td>
<td>1.21782</td>
<td>08906</td>
<td>2.6826 to 3.0340</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>10.763</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.382</td>
<td>3.735</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>265.091</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1.441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>275.855</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1.441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Post Hoc Tests

#### Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: OakesTotal

**Bonferroni**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) AgeCut</th>
<th>(J) AgeCut</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>.37384</td>
<td>.24021</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>-.2065 - .9542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>.52369*</td>
<td>.19936</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.0420 - 1.0054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>-.37384</td>
<td>.24021</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>-.9542 - .2065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>.14985</td>
<td>.25844</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.4746 - .7743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>-.52369*</td>
<td>.19936</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-1.0054 - -.0420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>-.14985</td>
<td>.25844</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.7743 - .4746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.
6. Native language and friends/relatives of the opposite language group (all groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NativeLangTotal * FriendsAndRelativesCut2 Crosstabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>19.734a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>20.151</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>12.036</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.35.
## Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar Chart](chart.png)
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