Second language speakers' attitudes towards the Québec French variety: An exploration of urban and rural Hispanic speakers

Annie Bergeron

A Thesis
In the Department
of
Education

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy (Education) at
Concordia University
Montréal, Québec, Canada

December 2020

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: *Annie Bergeron*

Entitled: *Second language speakers' attitudes towards the Québec French variety: An exploration of urban and rural Hispanic speakers*

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (*Education*)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final examining committee:

_____ Chair
Dr. Ji Yae Bong

_____ External Examiner
Dr. Marilyn Steinbach

_____ External to Program
Dr. Davy Bigot

_____ Examiner
Dr. Sara Kennedy

_____ Examiner
Dr. Walcir Cardoso

_____ Thesis Supervisor
Dr. Pavel Trofimovich

Approved by _____
Dr. Sara Kennedy, Department Chair

12/10/2020 _____
Dr. Pascale Sicotte, Dean of Faculty

Abstract

Second language speakers' attitudes towards the Québec French variety: An exploration of urban and rural Hispanic speakers

Annie Bergeron, Ph.D.
Concordia University, 2020

The province of Québec has been the scene of great political and linguistic changes in the past 60 years. These changes have often challenged Québec residents to reassess their existing or to develop new attitudes towards language and language use, and towards various ethnolinguistic groups, including French- and English-speaking communities. Despite its status as the sole official language of Québec, French—and more specifically the Québec French (QF) variety—has frequently been relegated to a lower status in favor of the Parisian "norm," which is usually referred to as French from France (FF). Designated as the target variety for Radio-Canada newscasters, FF is also often adopted by teachers of French as a second language (L2) in Québec's classrooms. It is little surprise, therefore, that L2 speakers of French tend to give negative evaluations to speakers of QF while not being able to reliably distinguish between the two varieties.

However, far less is known about L2 speakers' attitudes towards the QF variety specifically, and the French variety that they would like to learn and use. There is also a lack of research examining the effects of L2 speakers' attitudes on their production of QF speech patterns, in relation to their sense of belonging towards the majority (francophone) community. But most importantly, there is a need to investigate the attitudes that L2 speakers living outside urban centers hold towards the QF variety and its speakers, and to examine whether these

attitudes change, particularly in contexts where L2 speakers such as foreign temporary workers—an essential labour force representing more than 12,000 Latin Americans yearly—are geographically and socially isolated. With a better understanding of these issues, it would be possible to create practical recommendations for L2 French teachers as well as employers and professionals in charge of hiring foreign workers. With these broad goals in mind, this doctoral dissertation includes three studies, all carried out from a sociolinguistic perspective.

Study 1 investigated L2 French speakers' attitudes towards the QF speech variety as a function of their participation in the francisation (French-language instruction) program. Fifty-eight adult L2 French speakers listened to short sentences that either included or did not include QF speech patterns, rating these sentences for pleasantness, extent of their exposure to these and similar pronunciation patterns, and their preference to choose these patterns as a pronunciation model to follow. Focusing on the same 58 L2 French speakers, **Study 2** examined the links between these speakers' acculturation towards their home culture and the Québec culture and their preference for and their production of QF speech features, separately for those with and without experience in the francisation program. Finally, **Study 3** targeted a group of 12 Guatemalan temporary workers living in rural areas, investigating longitudinally their attitudes and motivations towards learning and using L2 French, with qualitative analyses conducted to determine whether there was a change in the workers' language use, attitudes, and motivation levels throughout their work experience in a French-speaking environment.

Acknowledgements

The realization of this thesis would not have been possible without the continuous support, encouragement, guidance, and dedication of my supervisor, Dr. Pavel Trofimovich. Despite my constant worries about my English skills and my ability to complete my PhD, Pavel has always been there, constantly pushing me forward, cheering me up, and answering my every single email within minutes. With his impressive publishing and teaching experience, Pavel has greatly contributed to my professional development as a devoted instructor and rigorous researcher. For his motivation, patience, immense knowledge, and inspiring advice about academia, I will forever be grateful to him.

My sincere thanks go to my advisory committee members, Dr. Sara Kennedy and Dr. Walcir Cardoso, for their thoughtful comments and recommendations all along my PhD journey. I'm very grateful to Sarita for her thought-provoking questions and comforting presence. I will never forget her wise words, reminding me, for instance, that there are "1000 ways to do a PhD". I also want to thank Walcir for playing devil's advocate. When I thought everything was well justified, he would bring my attention to sociolinguistic issues and suggest new phonological explanations. Obridaga! I'm also thankful to Dr. Davy Bigot and Dr. Marilyn Steinbach for their priceless insights. I feel very fortunate to have had these great scholars on my committee.

I would like to thank the Department of Education at Concordia University for accepting me in their PhD program. Throughout the years, I had the chance to meet wonderful and knowledgeable professors such as Saul Carliner, Kim McDonough, and Ayaz Naseem with whom I would always have great (although too short) conversations in the elevator or in the

corridor. My experience at Concordia has also been very gratifying thanks to the moral support of my great friends Phung Dao and Mike Barcomb who were always very inspiring and helpful.

Du fond du cœur, je tiens à remercier ma merveilleuse famille. Merci à Jacob, Dalie et Jeanne qui me font un bien énorme au quotidien et qui m'ont permis de décrocher de mes « devoirs d'école ». À mes parents, Suzanne et Luc, ainsi qu'à ma sœur Julie et à mon frère Mathieu, je leur dis merci d'exister. Ils ont toujours été là, en personne ou sur Messenger, à m'écouter et à m'encourager. Sans eux, je ne serais pas là où j'en suis aujourd'hui dans la vie. Et puis, il y a ma merveilleuse amie Jennifer Hazel qui a toujours été là pour me rappeler mes forces et me rassurer concernant mes constantes remises en question de la vie. L'avoir dans ma vie est un vrai beaume pour le cœur.

Por fín, quisiera expresar mi más profundo agradecimiento a los 70 participantes que aceptaron de forma muy amable dedicarme tiempo y compartir sus historias de vida conmigo.

Contribution of Authors

The focus of this dissertation was motivated through discussions with my supervisor, Pavel Trofimovich. As the main researcher, I drafted the initial proposal, developed the relevant materials, and carried out all data collection and analysis. Thanks to my supervisor's insightful comments, I was able to complete these three research projects. Therefore, Study 1 and Study 2 will be published as two separate manuscripts, co-authored with my supervisor. Because of my substantial contribution to all aspects of Study 3, I will be the single author for the manuscript based on this study.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Definition of Key Terms

Acculturation. The term acculturation has been widely used in social psychology to refer to the psychological and cultural process of change caused by contacts between individuals and other cultural groups (Berry, 2005).

Attitudes. Attitudes typically refer to feelings, behaviours, reactions, thoughts, and beliefs observable along three dimensions: cognitive (i.e., perceptions of the speaker), affective (i.e., feelings and emotions towards the speaker), and conative (i.e., perceptions of the listener's behavioural tendencies towards the speaker) (Carrie, 2017).

Speech variety. Speech variety embraces a combination of characteristics shared among a group of speakers with distinctive and/or identifying functions. These characteristics include phonological, syntactic, lexical, morphological, and pragmatic dimensions. Speakers can constitute a group according to their geographical situation and regional background, but also according to their age, gender, education level, socioeconomic class, religious and spiritual beliefs, profession (Dolbec & Ouellon, 1999; Siegel, 2010), and ethnic affiliation (Moyer, 2013).

Chapter 1. General Introduction

"What makes Québec French so ugly in people's ears? I hear all the time how ugly it is, even from people who should have no stake in the matter. It does not seem to me like this phenomenon can be purely explained by France's more dominant position internationally. Even people who move here to Montréal often try to make a point to not learn the local French but want to learn what they call 'international French.'" (Anonymous, *Reddit*, October 7, 2015)

Language Attitudes

During the entire span of their lives, people are influenced by various experiences which transform them, shape their mind, and contribute to the development of their attitudes. Broadly speaking, attitudes refer to people's feelings, behaviours, reactions, thoughts, and beliefs about others (Carrie, 2017). To understand how attitudes might shape various aspects of language learning and use, researchers in the field of second language (L2) acquisition have studied various facets of L2 speakers' attitudes, including their attitudes towards language teachers (e.g., Dewaele et al., 2018; Serafini, 2017), learning environments (e.g., Gan et al., 2004; Gardner, 2010), target language communities (e.g., Dörnyei & Csizér, 2005; Masgoret, 2006), and language status more generally (e.g., Ushioda & Dörnyei, 2017). Among these various types of attitudes, L2 speakers' beliefs about the language or language variety that they wish to speak appear to be (directly or indirectly) relevant to how they approach language learning and use (e.g., Kang & Ahn, 2019; Yook & Lindemann, 2013).

L2 (English) Speakers' Attitudes Towards Language Varieties

The World Englishes framework, which was developed by Kachru in the late 1970s (for a historical overview, see Kachru, 1992), provides a useful lens for describing L2 speakers' attitudes towards "standard" and "non-standard" English varieties as a function of the learning context. Kachru's framework describes the target language (in this case, English) as part of three

concentric circles. In the Inner circle (which includes such countries as the US and the UK), General American English and British Received Pronunciation are traditionally privileged in language education contexts (Jenkins, 2007). The closer the English varieties are perceived to these established "norms," the more positively they tend to be rated for prestige, intelligence, and competence (Carrie, 2017; Jenkins, 2009). The Outer circle comprises countries historically associated with Britain, where English now has a special status. For instance, English is one of Nigeria's official languages and an "associate" official language in India (Kachru, 2006, p. 243), where it functions as a lingua franca for different ethnic groups in the domains of law, administration, media, and education (Strevens, 1992). The Nigerian, Indian, Philippine (Tucker & Corson, 1997), Ghanaian (Widdowson, 1997), Singaporean (Yano, 2001), Pakistani, South African (Timmis, 2002), and Hong Kongese (Sung, 2014) English varieties have been legitimized with the creation of the postcolonial "New Englishes," as a way for speakers to express their cultural background and identity.

In the Expanding circle, which encompasses countries that are outside the Inner and Outer circles (e.g., Mexico, France, Vietnam), English represents a foreign language taught through schooling. In these contexts, L2 speakers generally tend to favor the linguistic norms of the Inner circle countries. In Latin America, for example, the British variety of English has traditionally been privileged, especially in Argentina, where pedagogical materials tend to follow the UK culture (Nielsen, 2003), likely as a consequence of the commercial, educational, and cultural legacy left by the British merchants. However, with their growing exposure to the US media, Latin Americans now tend to favour American English (Nielsen, 2003).

Similarly, in Europe, Danish high school and university students rated the British variety of English higher on five dimensions related to language quality (Ladegaard & Sachdev, 2006).

British speakers using Received Pronunciation were also evaluated more positively for social status and competence, compared to speakers from the US, Australia, Scotland, and South London. These positive evaluations, coupled with teachers' emphasis on Received Pronunciation in teaching (Ladegaard, 1998), may explain why 90% of the Danish participants in Ladegaard and Sachdev's (2006) study included British features in their L2 speech. In Spain, the British variety was also evaluated as the most "correct" by university students (Carrie, 2017), likely because it was the default pronunciation model adopted by local educators (Mompeán González, 2004). However, with greater exposure to the US media, Spanish students improved in the accuracy with which they recognized pronunciation patterns typical of American English (López-Soto & Barrera-Pardo, 2007). Similarly, increased exposure to American English has been linked to greater rates of production of American English features for Norwegian speakers of English (Rindal & Piercy, 2013) and to more positive attitudes towards American English for Austrian and Alsatian speakers of English (Dalton-Puffer et al., 1997; McInerney, 2020).

In Asia, Japanese speakers' positive attitudes towards the English varieties from the Inner circle were also found to be correlated with these speakers' familiarity with those varieties and their positive opinions about English-speaking communities (Chiba et al., 1995; McKenzie, 2010). Similarly, Korean speakers of English expressed a preference for British English, but speakers of American English were also rated positively, and these scores increased when the speaker's country of origin was revealed to participants (Yook & Lindemann, 2013). In another study, when Korean speakers of English were presented with recordings of American, Korean, Indian, and Italian English voices, the speakers showed favourable attitudes towards the American and Korean voices, and their appreciation for the Indian and Italian voices increased after a semester-long instruction (Kang & Ahn, 2019).

Similar to L2 speakers residing in the Expanding circle contexts, those who live in the environments where the target language is widely spoken in the community demonstrate similar attitudes towards different English varieties. For instance, despite their greater exposure to New Zealand English, Japanese speakers of English residing in New Zealand preferred American and British English in favour of the local variety (Starks & Paltridge, 1996). Chinese students living in the US expressed a similar idea of prestige traditionally attached to the Inner circle countries, by evaluating both American and British speakers more positively than those from Australia (Zhang & Hu, 2008). In another US-based study, whereas most Asian and Latin American speakers wished to attain nativelike American pronunciation, less than a third were able to correctly identify an American English speaker (Scales et al., 2006). Finally, advanced-level speakers residing in New York were not only more accurate than intermediate-level speakers at identifying the origin of various English speakers, but they also appeared to have internalized a native-speaker hierarchy of language varieties, downgrading speakers of the Irish, New York, Hawaiian, and Black English varieties in their ratings (Eisenstein, 1982).

In sum, South American, European, and Asian speakers of English often show a preference for the English varieties spoken in the Inner circle countries, with Received Pronunciation chosen as the ideal(ized) pronunciation norm, often as a consequence of the specific historical and political context of a given country and the pedagogical model adopted by teachers in classrooms and by materials developers in instructional materials. However, a change in speakers' attitudes towards their preferred language variety can emerge based on their exposure to the media, where, for instance, greater exposure to the US media—and thus greater familiarity with American English—has made this variety more attractive to L2 speakers. For speakers residing in the environments where the target language is widely used in the

community, the local variety appears to have limited impact on their preferences and residing in the target language environment does not guarantee that L2 speakers develop greater accuracy at identifying speakers of different varieties. While exposure to the local language variety might be beneficial for various aspects of L2 development (Geeslin & Long, 2014; Moyer, 2013), stereotypical views towards language varieties may develop in parallel with speakers' increased exposure to and improved proficiency in the L2.

L2 Speakers' Attitudes Towards Québec French

Although research focusing on English by far outweighs the work targeting other languages, L2 speakers' preference for an idealized variety is not specific to English, and Kachru's distinction between the Inner, Outer, and Expanding circle environments can be applied to other major world languages, including French. With respect to French, many studies have explored native and L2 speakers' attitudes towards different French varieties, traditionally juxtaposing those from the Inner circle contexts, such as France (and Paris in particular) and Québec (e.g., Chalier, 2018; d'Anglejan & Tucker, 1973; Sebkova et al., 2020). Whereas the French variety from France (FF) has typically been considered as the "legitimate" one (Beaudoin-Bégin, 2019), the Québec French (QF) variety has (at least historically) been labeled as "bastard" (Lappin, 1982, p. 93) or "as spoken in the 'bush'" (Lambert et al., 1960, p. 45; Preston, 1963, p. 5). Throughout the history, French Canadians (henceforth, Québécois) have been facing various (often conflicting) pressures, including the desire to maintain their language and culture, prescriptivism from academic institutions to "speak right" (Beaudoin-Bégin, 2017), and the need to learn foreign languages, particularly English. Against this backdrop, a clear understanding of speakers' attitudes towards QF requires at least a cursory look at how the

sociopolitical status of French evolved over time, as Québec transitioned from being an Outer to an Inner circle environment with respect to French.

The Act of Union signed in 1840 by the British colonizers to reunite the Upper and Lower Provinces of Canada is responsible for the establishment of some of the first language planning policies whose goal was to assimilate francophones to the English-speaking majority (Beaudoin-Bégin, 2017). In order to show their opposition to these policies and to express their pride in being French descendants, French-speaking intellectuals of the time actively promoted the use of French as it was spoken in France, as illustrated in the *Dictionnaire de nos fautes contre la langue française*: "*Il nous faut apprendre le français tel qu'il existe en France. Il ne peut être question pour nous de créer une langue spéciale*" [We need to learn French as it is spoken in France. There is no reason for us to create a special language] (Rinfret, 1896, p. iii). Adopting the French variety as spoken in an Inner circle country (France) was thus a way for francophones in Canada to show their affiliation to their own ethnolinguistic group and to express their resistance to the British "invader." Supported by the "powerful French Catholic Church" (Bourhis & Sioufi, 2017, p. 629), French speakers managed to maintain a strong ethnolinguistic vitality and to survive as a linguistic minority in North America (Giles et al., 1977). However, due to the economic disadvantages experienced by francophones in comparison to unilingual anglophones—a trend that was reversed in the 1970s—francophones struggled to have access to education, and the rules about how to speak "proper French" were thus confined to reference books (Bourhis & Sioufi, 2017).

The 1977 Bill 101 legislatively established French was the only official language of Québec. As a result, the francophone majority was given institutional support for the maintenance and development of their language, and children of immigrants were required to be

schooled in French until the end of their high school studies (Bourhis, 2001). In this sense, French in Québec progressed from a language spoken in the Outer circle (through a historic association to France) to the language of the Inner circle (privileged in language education). However, despite the elevated status of French, people's attitudes towards the QF variety have been slow to change. For example, multiple research teams have carried out various replications and extensions of Lambert et al.'s (1960) famous study examining francophones' and anglophones' attitudes towards speakers of French and English. Even after several decades following Bill 101, francophones in Montréal still expressed negative opinions about their own language variety, preferring English speakers to French speakers (e.g., Boulé, 2002; Genesee & Holobow, 1989; Kircher, 2014; Laur, 2014) and evaluating QF speech more negatively than FF speech (Kircher, 2012; Laur, 2001; Remysen, 2004). However, recent work has revealed more positive (implicit) attitudes from francophones towards the QF variety while also showing that various features of QF pronunciation (rather than other aspects of language such as lexis) appeared to underlie their attitudes towards QF (Chalier, 2018; Sebkova et al., 2020).

Similar to francophones, the majority of L2 French speakers (e.g., language learners, immigrants) have often expressed negative attitudes towards QF (e.g., Kircher, 2009, 2012; Maurais, 2008), especially in comparison to the FF variety, which is described—just like the English varieties from the Inner circle countries—as prestigious and formal (Calinon, 2009). For example, L2 speakers preferred for educators to use FF in language classrooms, considering this variety to be the standard pronunciation for French (French & Beaulieu, 2016). However, when asked to distinguish the QF and FF varieties, many L2 speakers struggled to pinpoint particular differences and misidentified QF speech recorded in a formal register as belonging to the FF variety (Guertin, 2017). These findings not only shed light on L2 French speakers' negative

attitudes towards QF but also reveal a lack of their sociolinguistic awareness, which at least in part is due to the fact that L2 speakers learning the language in various instructed contexts receive little explicit sociolinguistic input regarding the distinctive characteristics of QF.

Understanding the origins of L2 speakers' attitudes towards QF and its specific pronunciation features would pave the way towards changing some of these (negative) attitudes, for example, through practical recommendations for teachers of L2 French. As the main source of language input to the majority of newcomers (Calinon, 2009) and instructed language learners (Auger, 2003), teachers can provide L2 speakers with linguistic, social, and cultural knowledge to broaden their beliefs about language varieties and to enhance their language awareness. As they develop and enhance their sensitivity to QF, L2 speakers might be able to better perceive potential differences between their own pronunciation and that of QF speakers, which might result in further development of their pronunciation. More importantly, L2 speakers might then be able to make an informed decision as to whether to reject QF-specific pronunciation features as a way of reinforcing their own identity (e.g., Gatbonton et al., 2005) or, on the other hand, whether to adopt QF speech patterns, thus aligning themselves in their speech with QF speakers (e.g., Moyer, 2013).

General Motivation for Thesis Research

Conceptual Focus

To understand possible reasons for how people's speech patterns are shaped by social forces, sociolinguists have investigated links between speakers' pronunciation and identity. Labov's (1963) classic study was among the first to demonstrate how speakers can manipulate their speech to show identification with a particular group. Local residents of Martha's Vineyard—a small island community off the northeastern coast of the US—made use of

centralized diphthongs to distinguish themselves from the mass of summer visitors to the island. In the same vein, researchers have examined how various ethnolinguistic groups maintain their ethnolinguistic vitality (e.g., Giles et al., 1977), how individuals express their social identity (e.g., Tajfel & Turner, 1979), how speakers demonstrate their belonging to or affiliation with a particular group (e.g., Gatbonton & Trofimovich, 2008), and how language learners vary in their acculturation levels towards the target language community (e.g., Schumann, 1976, 1986).

Taken together, multiple strands of identity research generally posit a positive relationship between L2 speakers' speech and their integration with and acculturation to the target language group, in the sense that greater integration with and acculturation to the target language community would be associated with a closer alignment with the speech patterns typical of that community. However, previous work has revealed mixed findings, where in some cases this (expected) association emerged (e.g., Bergeron, 2013; Gatbonton et al., 2011; Hansen, 1995; Lybeck, 2002; Trofimovich et al., 2007), whereas in other situations, this association was absent (e.g., Jiang et al., 2009; Waniek-Klimczak, 2009). Such divergent findings could be attributed to the omission of one important factor in L2 identity research, namely, L2 speakers' attitudes towards the L2, which might be a better predictor of L2 pronunciation than a measure of L2 speakers' acculturation to the target culture (e.g., Moyer, 2007). Thus, it is reasonable to suggest that L2 speakers' lack of sociolinguistic competence with respect to QF, coupled with strong (and potentially negative) attitudes towards this language variety, would reduce their chances of identifying with the target (francophone) speech community and, consequently, would curtail their L2 French use and thus impair their L2 pronunciation.

Previous literature investigating links between identity and pronunciation (e.g., Gatbonton et al., 2011; Hansen, 1995; Jiang et al., 2009; Lybeck, 2002; Waniek-Klimczak, 2009)

and links between language attitudes and pronunciation (e.g., Dalton-Puffer et al., 1997; Ladegaard & Sachdev, 2006; Moyer, 2007; Rindal & Piercy, 2013) have almost exclusively focused on L2 English, with limited work on L2 Spanish (Sayahi, 2005). In L2 French, to the best of my knowledge, only one study (Bergeron, 2013) examined L2 speakers' feeling of belonging to a group in relation to their L2 pronunciation accuracy. Also, despite a great deal of research looking at L2 speakers' attitudes towards the FF and QF varieties (e.g., Calinon, 2009; Guertin, 2017; Kircher, 2009, 2012; Maurais, 2008), no study appears to have focused on potential relationships between L2 French speakers' language attitudes and their pronunciation. An examination of L2 speakers' attitudes towards the target language variety in relation to their L2 production, while also focusing on their experience with this variety, would help clarify some of the social and contextual mechanisms underlying L2 speech production (and ultimately L2 learning).

Target Context

The choice of Montréal as a city to explore L2 French speakers' attitudes is no coincidence. The only Canadian province with French as the sole official language, Québec is characterized by a relative linguistic and ethnocultural homogeneity (Bourhis, 2001; Lebrun & Lacelle, 2012), with a high percentage of French speakers in its major cities, including Québec (94%) and Sherbrooke (89%) (Statistics Canada, 2011). As the most populous city representing nearly half of Québec's population (Bourhis, 2001), Montréal is home to 81% of Québec's immigrant population, whose five top countries of origin include China, and French-speaking Algeria, France, Morocco, and Haiti (Ville de Montréal, 2017). The city is therefore home to a diverse linguistic and cultural landscape, composed of 49% of native French speakers (all speaking their own language variety), 19% of native English speakers, 31% of allophones

(speakers whose native language is neither French nor English), and 1% of bilingual French–English speakers (Statistics Canada, 2011).

While in the early 1970s linguistic minorities usually opted for English to integrate into the Québec culture and to maximize their economic mobility (Bourhis & Sioufi, 2017), the linguistic policies adopted after Bill 101 have reversed this trend to the extent that allophones are now deemed to be essential for guaranteeing the francophones' ethnolinguistic vitality in Québec and in North America (Bourhis, 2001). However, immigrants are not insensitive to Québec's complex linguistic landscape, where French is required for communication with the majority group, English is needed for work opportunities, and (at least from the L2 speaker's point of view) some knowledge of the FF variety is helpful for speaking French in formal contexts (Calinon, 2009; Paquet & Levasseur, 2019). Therefore, Montréal-based immigrants are a relevant population to target in an investigation of L2 French speakers' language attitudes.

Target Speakers

As for the specific choice of L2 French speakers, members of Montréal's Latin American community were targeted. One reason for focusing on this community was related to the (increasing) number of Hispanic speakers of L2 French in Montréal. The Hispanic community, whose links with francophone speakers are more pronounced than, for instance, for Québec's anglophones (García Lopez, 2003), has a strong ethnolinguistic presence in the city (e.g., Lamarre & Lamarre, 2006). The absence of a Latin American ethnic neighbourhood in Montréal, with Hispanic speakers residing across the entire city (García Lopez, 2003), was an additional reason to believe that this group of L2 French speakers may show at least some familiarity with the majority group's culture and language. Finally, it was hypothesized that Hispanic speakers could reveal higher sensitivity to, and awareness of sociolinguistic variation based on their own

experience as native speakers of a language which displays a high degree of sociolinguistic variation across the globe (see Díaz-Campos et al., 2018).

A Focus on Under-Researched and Socially Vulnerable Speakers

Last but not least, most research on L2 speaker attitudes—irrespective of the target language—has been carried out almost exclusively in academic contexts (e.g., Carrie, 2017; Clark & Schleef, 2010; Dalton-Puffer et al., 1997; Kang & Ahn, 2019; McKenzie, 2010; Moyer, 2007; Rindal & Piercy, 2013) and has targeted participants residing in urban areas (e.g., Eisenstein, 1982; Nielson, 2013; Sayahi, 2005). In L2 French, more specifically, participants targeted in prior work have included L2 speakers living in Montréal (e.g., Calinon, 2009; Guertin, 2017; Harvey, 2016; Kircher, 2009, 2012; Maurais, 2008) or Québec's major cities such as Trois-Rivières and Québec (e.g., Chalier, 2018; d'Anglejan & Tucker, 1973; Reinke, 2000; Sebkova et al., 2020). However, the lack of studies conducted in rural areas makes it impossible to generalize the results from previous studies conducted in Québec's biggest cities to L2 speakers in rural areas. The lack of francisation (French-language instruction) services, which are exclusively offered by the provincial government in major cities, coupled with vast differences in the quantity and quality of input that L2 speakers receive in Québec's rural areas, may impact their attitudes towards QF and their L2 development more generally.

In addition, Québec rural areas have witnessed a recent change in their cultural and linguistic landscape with the arrival of a new population of L2 speakers. Assisted through different government programs, temporary agricultural workers (mainly from Latin American countries) arrive in Québec yearly for employment by market gardeners and dairy farmers. In Montérégie—Québec's administrative region receiving the highest number of temporary workers (FERME, 2017)—Mexicans are traditionally hired in groups to work in agriculture on a seasonal

basis (typically from April to October). Their tasks include vegetable and fruit picking from Monday to Saturday. Every Sunday, yellow school buses bring these seasonal workers to the closest shopping mall, so they can purchase groceries as a group. As for their housing conditions, seasonal workers typically live in mobile homes, with about eight people sharing the same dwelling, and any interaction with their employer(s) or members of the general public is limited.

Another foreign-born group represented in Québec, Guatemalan workers are frequently employed by dairy farmers because of their prior experience with cattle farming. With work contracts ranging in length between four to 12 months, they have no fixed schedule and are required to work seven days per week during harvest periods. Guatemalan workers' tasks include milking and feeding cows two to three times daily, in addition to providing assistance with calving, driving and fixing tractors, soldering, cutting grass, working in grain silos, and performing other jobs when required. Some may live in their employer's basement or in a house nearby with a private room. Access to a car or a bicycle is a privilege that very few workers have; the majority rely on their employer to take them to a major city for shopping and errands. Guatemalans employed on dairy farms are thus totally dependent on their employer, who in some cases is the only person with whom they will ever interact during their entire stay in Canada. Socially and linguistically isolated, Québec temporary workers have shared their experience with scholars from sociology (e.g., Bélanger & Candiz, 2014; Faraday, 2012; Gordon, 2018), international migration (e.g., Hanley et al., 2015), as well as law and political science (e.g., Basok, 2004; Gesualdi-Fecteau, 2014). However, no L2 research has targeted temporary workers' linguistic experience.

In Québec, where French is the main language used by the local community, and more specifically by small-town employers, no instruction in L2 French is provided to temporary

workers. It thus remains unclear whether and how quickly temporary workers develop attitudes towards L2 French and whether and to what extent they show interest and actually make progress in developing their L2 French skills. In an ethnographic study, Hennebry (2012) showed that 71% of her 600 Mexican respondents in Ontario—working in vegetable and fruit picking—were interested in learning L2 English while in Canada. Their stated reasons included "greater safety, autonomy and responsibility at work, and the ability to interact with the larger community" (p. 14). In other words, Mexican temporary workers' motivation to learn English entailed both motivational and affective variables. However, it remained unclear whether temporary workers' motivations to learn the local language were also related to their working and living conditions and the status of English as a global lingua franca. Within the French-speaking context of Québec, Guatemalan temporary workers' working conditions confine them to social isolation. Therefore, measuring these workers' sense of belonging to the majority group with standard questionnaires to examine their L2 development would be impractical if not impossible, given their often low and varying levels of literacy. A different approach—one involving individual conversations, as a way of understanding these workers' lived realities while also capturing their attitudes and motivations towards learning and using L2 French—might provide more insight into temporary farm workers' linguistic integration in Québec's rural areas.

Overview of Thesis Studies

In light of the aforementioned issues, the three studies in this doctoral thesis share the goal of examining the attitudes that L2 French speakers from urban and rural areas hold towards QF. **Study 1** targeted 58 Hispanic speakers of L2 French, investigating these speakers' attitudes towards QF speech features, as a function of their participation in Québec's francisation

program. In a speech rating task, the speakers listened to 64 recorded sentences which either contained or did not contain a QF speech feature and indicated, using 1,000-point sliding scales, how frequently they had experienced a given feature in their daily lives (exposure), how pleasant it was for them to hear a given feature (pleasantness), whether they themselves would like to sound like the speaker (pronunciation model), and what they believed the speaker's origin was (origin).

Study 2 targeted the same 58 L2 French speakers from Study 1 to examine whether there was a relationship between their desire to adopt some of the most common QF speech features, including affrication, nasal vowels, high lax vowels, and apical /r/ (choice of pronunciation model), their sense of belonging to their home culture and the target group culture (acculturation), and their own production of the same QF speech features. The materials included a 34-item acculturation questionnaire (17 items targeting L2 speakers' home culture and 17 focusing on the QF community) and a delayed sentence repetition task, with 16 prompted sentences (focusing on four QF speech features, with two sentences per feature, and an equal number of distractors). The speakers' production of QF speech features was compared between the two groups (L2 speakers with and without francisation experience) and then analyzed in relation to these speakers' choice of a pronunciation model (from Study 1) and degree of their acculturation towards the home and the L2 groups.

Finally, **Study 3** targeted 12 Guatemalan temporary workers, exploring their attitudes and motivations towards learning and using L2 French. The workers were followed longitudinally, during their 4- to 12-month work contract, with three interviews in Spanish conducted individually with each worker. Adapted from the Language Contact Profile (Freed et al., 2004), the initial questions targeted the workers' language use, to assess the extent of their exposure to

and use of Spanish and French during their employment in Québec. The remaining interview questions, based on an adapted version of the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993), focused on the workers' stated reasons for using and learning L2 French (and, where relevant, L2 English) during their residence in Québec. Using a qualitative analysis, the data were thematically coded to yield insight into the workers' language use, attitudes, and motivations over time. The coded data were then compared and contrasted both within and across individual workers to determine the presence of commonalities and to identify variations over time.

Taken together, the three studies included in this doctoral thesis provide a comprehensive view of the attitudes that L2 French speakers from urban and rural areas hold towards the QF variety in a French-as-a-lingua-franca context, focusing on L2 speakers' reactions to and production of QF-specific speech features and their L2 learning experience (Studies 1–2) and their motivational orientations in relation to their living and working conditions (Study 3).

Chapter 2. Study 1

Second Language Speakers' Attitudes Towards Québec French: The Role of the Educational Setting

Introduction

In the past several decades, language attitudes have been the focus of a large body of research, mainly in social psychology (e.g., Dragojevic et al., 2018; Gallois & Callan, 1981). Among these studies, Lambert et al.'s (1960) seminal work is significant not only in terms of its experimental design but also (within Québec's sociopolitical context) its findings. Using the matched-guise technique—where bilingual speakers are recorded twice in each language (guise) without listeners being informed about the language identity of the speaker—Lambert et al. examined Montréal French and English speakers' attitudes towards their linguistic communities along such traits as solidarity (e.g., kindness, sense of humor) and social status (e.g., intelligence, self-confidence). Historically representing Québec's upper class (Bourhis & Sioufi, 2017), the English-speaking guises were evaluated positively on all status and solidarity dimensions by the English speakers. However, the English-speaking guises also elicted more favourable attitudes from the French speakers.

Further evidence of Québec French speakers' bias against their own language emerged in follow-up work. Mixing guises of both male and female speakers recorded in Canadian English, Canadian French (Québec French), and Continental French (Parisian French), Preston (1963) showed that Québec French (QF) speakers rated excerpts of Canadian English the highest, followed by the excerpts of French from France (FF), preferring both to those recorded in their own speech variety. Similarly, d'Anglejan and Tucker (1973) asked QF listeners from Alma and Montréal to evaluate speech samples recorded by upper-class FF speakers and by Montréal QF

speakers from low and high socioeconomic backgrounds. All listeners rated FF speakers more positively, including, for instance, their intelligence, education level, and ambition, once again suggesting that QF speakers hold negative attitudes towards their own variety.

Québec's nationalist movement in the 1970s gave rise to several language planning policies. Among them, the introduction of Bill 101 (Charter of the French Language) in 1977 promoted French as the only official language of Québec, which changed the status of English from a majority to a minority language. With such a dramatic shift in language policy regarding the new status of French, QF speakers' attitudes towards their language and their linguistic community would be expected to change positively. Although QF speakers might indeed have developed some linguistic security (e.g., Maurais, 2008), multiple studies targeting QF speakers from various age groups (e.g., Boulé, 2002; Genesee & Holobow, 1989; Kircher, 2014; Laur, 2014; Mazurkewich et al., 1986) and using the same data elicitation techniques with a focus on similar personality traits as Lambert et al. (1960) have demonstrated the persistence of QF speakers' more favourable attitudes towards both FF and English, compared to the attitudes towards their own speech and their own community.

Although no QF speakers would explicitly share a desire to speak French like Parisians do (Reinke & Ostiguy, 2016), QF speakers hold persisting beliefs that FF speakers are more educated and use a more prestigious variety, with a richer and more diversified vocabulary (e.g., Remysen, 2004). Some origins of these beliefs can be traced back to the establishment of the *Office de la langue française* which promoted Standard European French as the norm to be adopted in the French-speaking world (Bourhis & Lepicq, 1993). Exclusively spoken by the Parisian elite (Hansen, 2012), this variety has received different designations, including Standard French, Reference French, Academic French, Normal French, International French, Continental

French, Hexagonal French, French from the Center, and French from France. Regardless of the terminology, the normative publications by the *Office de la langue française* have established what represents the appropriate (prescribed) language use in Québec. Along with persisting negative comments from Québec academics regarding the poor quality of written and spoken French (Beaudoin-Bégin, 2019), these language policies have likely contributed to the stigmatization of both regional and urban varieties of QF locally and internationally (Auger, 2003; Bourhis & Lepicq, 1993).

In sum, with all the sociopolitical changes that have taken place in Québec since the 1970s—with a major impact in Montréal (Bourhis & Sioufi, 2017)—francophones of all ages have experienced persistent linguistic insecurity regarding their own language (e.g., Beaudoin-Bégin, 2019), and the approval of their own speech variety by QF speakers is yet to come (Laur, 2002). Against this backdrop, for second language (L2) speakers of French (e.g., long-term residents and recent immigrants in Québec), it may be even more difficult to identify with QF and its speakers, at least in part because of QF speakers' negative attitudes towards their own speech variety (Castellotti & Moore, 2002; Lasagabaster, 2006).

L2 Speakers' Attitudes Towards Québec French

The linguistic insecurity experienced by QF speakers about their own language variety—and by speakers throughout the globe whose language variety evolved from the colonizers' language (Dragojevic et al., 2013)—is also apparent in L2 speakers' attitudes. For instance, L2 French speakers are reluctant to adopt QF as a legitimate variety to learn and embrace in daily life without feeling stigmatized or limited in their professional opportunities (e.g., Laur, 2001). Similarly, recent immigrants tend to favor FF, considered from their point of view as

"international" (Calinon, 2009; Saint-Laurent, 2008), "standard," "neutral," "formal," more comprehensible, and less complicated to learn (Harvey, 2016).

Among many potential factors contributing to L2 speakers' attitudes towards QF, their lack of sociolinguistic awareness is a fundamental issue, in the sense that L2 speakers appear to be largely unaware of the actual differences between QF and FF. For instance, L2 speakers tend to confuse speech samples from both varieties, misidentifying formal registers of QF as FF (Calinon, 2009; Guertin, 2017) and classifying spontaneous speech patterns that are common in FF (e.g., schwa deletion, consonant assimilation) as belonging to QF (Harvey, 2016). Idiomatic, colloquial expressions are also labelled as being specific to QF, while these are also common in other French-speaking countries (Calinon, 2009). These findings confirm that—from the perspective of the L2 speaker—FF is a formal variety to be learned in class, while QF corresponds to the language of communication "on the street."

L2 speakers' confusion as to which speech patterns correspond to each variety may certainly contribute to their inability to correctly identify the origin of a speaker but may also impact their L2 development in the long run. For example, because of their lack of sociolinguistic awareness, L2 speakers might create stereotypes towards a linguistic community, which would reduce their chances of developing any type of affiliation with the target language group and embracing their speech (Dragojevic et al., 2018). Negative attitudes can certainly limit L2 speakers' exposure to the local language variety and potentially explain why 45% of Calinon's (2009) and five out of six of Collin and Michaud's (2017) L2 speakers had no QF-speaking acquaintances—despite an average of four years of residence in Montréal—with school being the main and only place for speaker socialization.

The learning context also appears to play a major role in the development of L2 speakers' negative attitudes. Language teachers represent the most important factor—among parents, friends, school, and media use—in the creation and change in attitudes (George, 2014; Ladegaard, 1998; Lasagabaster, 2006). For example, teachers of French in British Columbia discouraged their students from speaking QF, labeled as "incorrect," "inappropriate," "problematic," and "inauthentic" (Wernicke, 2016, p. 9). In the US, students of L2 French repeated their teachers' negative comments regarding QF, describing it as a "corrupt form of French better kept out of the classroom" (Auger, 2003, p. 78). In the same vein, when L2 speakers were asked whether they perceived any differences between the variety of French they hear "on the street" and the one they use in class, close to 62% acknowledged the presence of a contrast (Calinon, 2009), which most likely reflects teachers' preference to teach FF as the "standard" variety in the classroom (Archambault & Corbeil, 1982; French & Beaulieu, 2016; Jebali & Bigot, 2011; Piechowiak, 2009).

The Francisation Program and Its Role in the Development of Language Attitudes

The French learning options offered by the Government of Québec to L2 speakers are part of the so-called *francisation*. Initially under the exclusive guidance of the Ministry of Education, Recreation, and Sports—nowadays called Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE)—L2 French courses were offered to adults, regardless of their country of origin and length of Québec residence, using similar materials to those used in high schools with French-speaking adolescents (Calinon, 2009). In 1981, the Ministry of Immigration and Cultural Communities—today called the Ministry of Immigration, Diversity, and Inclusion (MIDI)—developed its own linguistic program adapted to immigrants' priority needs of finding a home, a job, and a school for their children. Various resources (e.g., social worker, advisor, specialist in

remedial education) are now offered as part of the francisation program to promote L2 French speakers' linguistic and socioeconomic integration through in-class and (since 2008) full- and part-time online courses (Amireault et al., 2019). Exclusively offered to recent immigrants with fewer than five years of Québec residency, the MIDI program serves approximately 60% of all immigrants (Provencher, 2019). The most recent version of the program is based on the MEHE's curriculum which (in addition to language training) now also provides learners with support for their socioprofessional integration (Calinon, 2009).

A closer look at Québec's francisation program may provide some explanations regarding teachers' reluctance to use and teach the linguistic features of QF. The culturally-based French courses initially appeared to be attractive but they also received several criticisms, for example, regarding lower effectiveness of coursework delivered online (Amireault et al., 2019) and the program's inadequate focus on history, arts, and geography in its cultural component, where the discussion was limited to beliefs and values (Olivencia, 2008). Teachers also appeared to struggle to abandon a traditional grammar-based approach in favour of a communicative component, citing the lack of time, materials, and experience in teaching L2 French oral communication (Bélanger, 2017). With the online publication of the francisation program's main objective, which was *"Apprendre le français écrit et parlé au Québec (un français international)"* [To learn French as written and spoken in Québec (international French)] (Government of Québec, 2018), there are also reasons to believe that the teachers employed in this program do not have access to sufficient or adequate materials to expose their students to the local speech variety.

Teachers' lack of experience with cultural and sociolinguistic instruction, especially in the francisation program, may have dramatic consequences for L2 speakers. By promoting the

use of FF in Québec's educational settings, teachers effectively prevent L2 speakers from developing sociolinguistic awareness and indirectly contribute to the stigmatization of the local speech variety. Exposure to QF outside coursework could partially fill this gap; however, according to prior research, L2 speakers' social networks appear limited (Calinon, 2009; Collin & Michaud, 2017). As a consequence, L2 speakers miss the opportunity to tune their perception to the local variety and also to interact and possibly identify with QF speakers, whose speech would also sound more comprehensible (Bélanger, 2017) and pleasant to them. In fact, sounding pleasant is a strong indicator of in-group solidarity (Ryan et al., 1982) and a determining factor in a person's attitudes towards a language variety (e.g., Boughton, 2006; Evans, 2002). It is thus crucial for teachers to make the connection between the language they use in class and the language variety spoken outside the classroom (e.g., Dalton-Puffer et al., 1997; Hedge, 2000) so that they can enable L2 speakers to successfully communicate in real-life situations.

Phonetic Differences Between QF and FF

To investigate L2 speakers' attitudes towards QF, as distinct from their attitudes towards FF, it is important to establish precisely how the two varieties differ. Based on more than 70 years of research published by phonologists, phoneticians, and sociolinguists (e.g., Blondeau et al., 2002; Dolbec & Ouellon, 1999, Ostiguy & Tousignant, 2008), Paradis and Dolbec (2008) created a list of 44 distinctive features reported to be used by the majority of QF speakers and/or perceived as being characteristic of QF. The key distinguishing features of QF include:

1. affrication of /t/ and /d/ in front of /i/ and /y/ ([ts] and [dz], as in *tu* "you" and *dix* "ten");
2. high lax vowels in closed syllables, except in front of the continuant consonants /r/, /v/, /z/, and /ʒ/ ([I], [U], and [Y], as in *vite* "fast," *lune* "moon," and *plume* "feather");

3. nasal vowels: anterior ([ã] instead of the FF [ɑ̃], as in *enfant* "child") and opposition between /œ̃/ and /ɛ̃/ (as in *brun* "brown" and *brin* "blade of grass");
4. opposition between /e/ and /ɛ/ in final open syllables (as in *lirai* "will read" and *lirais* "would read");
5. vowel backing in open ending syllables ([ɑ] and even [ɔ], as in *là* "there");
6. diphthongs in closed syllables (e.g., [paᵉʁ] as in *père* "father"), also used to indicate a semantic distinction between words such as *faites* [fɛt] and *fête* [faᵉt] or *patte* [pat] and *pâtes* [pawt].

In addition, the apical /r/ ([r]), still widely produced by a generation of older QF speakers, is gradually replaced by its dorsal counterpart ([ʁ]) (Côté, 2016; Sankoff & Blondeau, 2007). For a long time, one of the main phonetic distinctions between the ways of speaking in the western (from Montréal towards the west) and eastern (from Mauricie towards the east) regions of Québec was the articulation of /r/ (Dolbec & Ouellon, 1999). In the 1940s, more than 80% of Montrealers were using [r], compared to 16% in the rest of the province (Vinay, 1950). Based on speech recorded a few decades later, Santerre (1979) documented a decrease in the use of the apical pronunciation in Montréal, with only 39.5% of the speakers still producing it. With its tendency to disappear in the speech of younger generations (Dolbec & Ouellon, 1999) and even in the speech of the same adults recorded in 1971, 1984, and 1995 (Blondeau et al., 2002), the apical /r/ is a strong sociolinguistic marker of older QF speakers from Montréal.

The Current Study

As mentioned previously, both QF speakers and L2 speakers of French seem to have maintained, up to now, negative attitudes towards QF. To positively influence L2 speakers' attitudes, it is necessary to determine the origin of such attitudes. According to prior research,

potential sources of negative attitudes include language teachers' ideologies favouring certain French varieties over others and L2 French speakers' limited interactions with QF speakers outside the classroom. In addition, L2 speakers appear to be unable to distinguish different French varieties (especially in a formal register) and to identify the phonetic features related to each. Therefore, to understand which language varieties L2 speakers evaluate negatively and ultimately, to clarify what they understand these varieties to be, it is important to first investigate L2 speakers' exposure to the characteristic features of the local variety, especially in such educational contexts as those available through the francisation program. From these findings, it would then be reasonable to expect that L2 French speakers' sensitivity to and preference for QF speech features may reveal not only their attitudes towards QF and its speakers but also whether L2 speakers would like to embrace some of these features in their own pronunciation.

The current study therefore sought to investigate L2 speakers' attitudes towards specific QF speech features. Conceptualized within a sociolinguistic perspective, the study's aim was to answer the following research question: What are the links between L2 French speakers' ratings of exposure and pleasantness, their preference for a pronunciation model, and their sensitivity to QF phonetic features (e.g., affrication, lax vowels), as a function of their participation in Québec's francisation program? The assumption underlying this work was that positive reactions to QF would be related to L2 speakers' ability to correctly identify specific QF phonetic features, which in turn would be reflective of their experience with QF (both inside and outside formal education settings). To address the study's question, 58 participants with and without experience in Québec's francisation program were recruited, on the assumption that L2 speakers who have participated in this program would have a different exposure to QF than those acquiring French outside the program. All speakers were presented with speech samples that differed only in the

critical features distinguishing the QF and FF varieties to evaluate their preference for, their exposure and sensitivity to, and their desire to embrace these features in their own pronunciation.

Method

Participants

Speakers

Two native speakers of QF with experience in acting were recruited to record the QF and FF speech stimuli. Because the focus was on L2 participants' preference for phonetic features at the segmental level, it was important to control for prosodic markers—which are different in the QF and FF varieties (Ménard, 1998)—by selecting speakers of the same variety (in this case, QF). Females were recruited to avoid a gender effect on participant evaluations (e.g., Carrie, 2017; Labov, 2006; Laur, 2008, 2014; Preston, 1963), and having two speakers (as opposed to one) also helped increase the reliability of speech judgments (Kircher, 2016). Both speakers were born in Québec and had resided in Montréal for more than 10 years. The first speaker (33 years old) graduated from the *Conservatoire d'art dramatique de Montréal* in 2011; the second speaker (44 years old) graduated from the *Conservatoire d'art dramatique de Québec* in 1995. Both received training in diction and phonetics, as part of their coursework, which covered reading and writing using the International Phonetic Alphabet. In terms of their field-specific expertise, each had on average 10 years of acting experience in QF-speaking TV shows and advertising.

Listeners

Fifty-eight Hispanic speakers of L2 French (21 males, 37 females) living in Montréal (*M* = 5.60 years, *range* = 6 months–22 years) were recruited as participants from the researcher's personal networks. The study targeted only Hispanic speakers from the Latin American countries

whose Spanish varieties share the core aspects of phonology (Díaz-Campos et al., 2018). Most participants were born in Colombia (42), but participants from other countries such as Mexico (6), Venezuela (5), Peru (2), Chile, Guatemala, and Cuba (1 each) were also included. The participant sample (M_{age} = 36.53 years, *range* = 20–66) contained 25 full-time professionals, 31 full-time students, and two retired individuals. All participants started learning French after age 18 (*M* = 26.53 years, *range* = 12–39), although three completed a one-year French course during adolescence.

To increase the chances that the participants had developed at least some (sociolinguistic) awareness of different French varieties (e.g., Clark & Schleef, 2010; Eisenstein, 1982), they were required to speak French at an advanced level, which was checked through an informal prescreening interview with the researcher, participant self-ratings of their L2 proficiency, and an independent listening comprehension test—*Test d'évaluation du français adapté au Québec* (TEFAQ). For self-ratings, the participants used a 9-point scale (1 = "extremely difficult," 9 = "extremely easy") to self-assess their L2 French writing (*M* = 6.26, *range* = 2–9), reading (*M* = 7.83, *range* = 4–9), speaking (*M* = 7.22, *range* = 4–9), and comprehension (*M* = 7.72, *range* = 4–9). They also obtained relatively high scores (from a total of 26 points) on the TEFAQ (*M* = 21.72, *range* = 13–26). Half of the participants were aware of the existence of the TEFAQ to assess L2 speakers' French proficiency, but only one had passed it (eight years before); this participant indicated that he could not remember any of the questions or answers.

In response to the question targeting whether and why it was important for them to speak French, all participants responded positively, with each providing multiple reasons, namely, to speak Québec's official language (27), to find a (good) job (18), to help their integration in the L2 environment (15), to be able to communicate with locals and make friends (13), and to learn a

beautiful language (10). In addition to French, the participants reported being proficient in L2 English writing (*M* = 5.41, *range* = 1–9), reading (*M* = 6.38, *range* = 1–9), speaking (*M* = 5.41, *range* = 1–9), and comprehension (*M* = 5.84, *range* = 1–9). As shown through the participants' self-ratings of their daily use of L2 French (*M* = 46.81%, *range* = 10–90%) versus L2 English (*M* = 15.60%, *range* = 0–70%) and through their self-ratings in French versus English, they were more proficient in French than in English.

Based on their background information (summarized in Table 2.1), the participants were assigned to two groups: those who completed Québec's MIDI francisation program (*n* = 31) and those who did not participate in the francisation program (*n* = 27). The participants in the former group had enrolled in the program as part-time (8) or full-time students (23) for a period of 6 months (*n* = 8), one year (*n* = 17), or up to two years (*n* = 6). The participants in the latter group mostly learned French in an informal context, upon their arrival in Québec. Seven participants learned French through work or with a QF-speaking partner at home (in Montréal); four participated in a summer exchange program in France; and 16 reported having taken L2 French classes in their home country, as part-time students in a university (3) or a language school (5), or at the *Alliance française* (8). Although the participants in the francisation group also had various formal and informal language learning experiences before their arrival in Québec and after the completion of their francisation coursework, a critical difference between the two groups was the participation in the francisation program offered by the Government of Québec to newcomers. As shown in Table 2.1, the two groups otherwise appeared to be relatively homogenous.

Table 2.1 *Mean Values (Standard Deviations) for Participants' Background Characteristics*

Background variable	Francisation (*n* = 31)	No francisation (*n* = 27)

L1	Spanish	Spanish
Gender (M/F)	11/20	10/17
Age	36.39 (5.65)	36.70 (10.07)
Number years in Québec (LOR)	6.19 (3.88)	4.93 (5.14)
Age of onset	28.13 (6.75)	24.70 (5.56)
TEFAQ score (0–26)	21.65 (2.70)	21.81 (2.50)
Main occupation (P/S/R)	19/12/0	11/14/2
Daily use of French (0–100%)	48.39 (20.67)	45.00 (16.58)
Media use in French (0–100%)	53.23 (28.91)	58.89 (29.26)
Interactions with French speakers (0–100%)	63.55 (26.27)	59.26 (30.50)
L2 French speaking (1–9)	7.06 (1.06)	7.41 (0.97)
L2 French comprehension (1–9)	7.58 (1.15)	7.89 (0.80)
L2 French reading (1–9)	7.77 (1.18)	7.89 (0.89)
L2 French writing (1–9)	6.39 (1.58)	6.11 (1.78)

Note. P = professionals, S = students, and R = retirees.

Materials

The first instrument was a language background questionnaire containing 34 questions (Appendix A), with 11 questions targeting the participants' sociodemographic information (e.g., age, education level, city of birth) and 18 questions focusing on their linguistic experience, which included their self-rated language use and proficiency. The last five questions (adapted from Rindal, 2010) examined the participants' choices for their preferred L2 French pronunciation model to learn and speak.

The second instrument included a listening proficiency test adapted from the TEFAQ, developed by the *Chambre de commerce et d'industrie de Paris, Île-de-France* (2013). Listed

among the eight assessments recognized by the MIDI, the TEFAQ, which is available online in a reduced version of 26 questions, contains four sections targeting different objectives. In Section A (three questions), the participants had to associate brief oral descriptions with the correct image. Section B (10 questions) assessed the participants' ability to understand short audio messages (e.g., radio announcements), and longer recordings testing their comprehension of different opinions were presented in Section C (10 questions). Finally, the last three questions (Section D) asked the participants to indicate whether written sentences corresponded to spoken utterances. Among the 26 test audios, three were recorded in QF and 23 in FF. Most lexical items (e.g., *pulls*, *chaussettes*) were also specific to FF.

The final instrument was a phonemic rating task targeting several speech features distinguishing the FF and QF varieties (Appendix B). Because this study focused on formal QF speech from Montréal, only those features that are both frequent and socially unstigmatized were selected for inclusion. Therefore, of the six features listed earlier (i.e., affrication, lax vowels, nasal vowels, opposition of /e/ and /ɛ/, /a/ vowel backing, and diphthongs), the following three fit these criteria: affrication, lax vowels, and nasal vowels (i.e., the opposition of /œ̃/ and /ɛ̃/ and the anterior nasal vowel). In addition, because this study targeted adult speakers' language attitudes in Montréal, a fourth phonetic feature (apical /r/) was also included, on the assumption that L2 speakers' sensitivity to it would be revealing of their exposure to QF spoken by an older generation of speakers.

The four target features were manipulated across two sets of utterances, such that the QF features were included in one set whereas their FF variants were included in the other, otherwise identical set. All utterances were five syllables in length, to increase the chances that the participants might perceive the relevant contrasts. Across both sets, all utterances also included

identical, simple, and frequent vocabulary items used by speakers of both varieties and traditionally acquired in the early stages of L2 development (e.g., *petit*, *bébé*, *lait*, *froid*, *fille*). The initial list of utterances (shown in full in Appendix C) included 40 sentences with QF features (4 features × 10 utterances) and 40 equivalent sentences with FF features, such that the only difference between the two sets was the pronunciation of the target feature (see Table 2.2 for sample utterances).

Table 2.2 *Sample Stimuli for Each Speech Feature*

Phonetic feature	Sample stimulus	QF variety	FF variety
Affrication	*Le petit bébé.*	[pətˢi]	[pəti]
Apical /r/	*Il est beau, le parc.*	[park]	[paʁk]
High lax vowels	*La fille était là.*	[fIj]	[fij]
Nasal vowels	*Oui, elle en veut un.*	[œ̃]	[ɛ̃]

Target Recordings

The two speakers recorded the target utterances in an individual session with the researcher. First, the speaker read through the 40 utterances, and the researcher demonstrated the target speech pattern for each utterance. The speaker was then asked to produce, in isolation, each distinction (e.g., /tˢy/ and /ty/), and after a few repetitions, to read each target sentence with and without a given QF feature, resulting in an otherwise identical sentence that either included the QF feature or its FF variant. The recording, which was carred out using a digital voice recorder (VN-8100PC), was stopped in cases of inaccurate productions, background noise, hesitations, and self-repairs. The speaker's recording was then spliced into individual audio files (one per utterance), with four additional sentences recorded by each speaker for use as practice

items to familiarize the participants with the phonemic rating task, the rating interface, and the rating categories.

Because it was crucial to ensure that the sole difference between the QF and FF utterance sets was the targeted feature, cross-splicing was used to maintain the same sentential frame across the two sets, with only the target phonetic feature replaced (Brasseur, 2009). All QF utterances served as the base frames for both QF and FF utterance sets and therefore remained intact as QF-specific items. However, to create the FF versions of the utterances, the target phoneme from the FF pronunciations (e.g., /ɑ̃/) was isolated and the full syllable containing this phoneme (e.g., /dɑ̃/) was used to replace the relevant QF content within the same syllable. Cross-splicing thus ensured that 40 target utterances produced by each of the two speakers (4 features × 10 utterances) included the relevant QF feature and the other 40 included the FF feature, but that the rest of the sentential frame was identical in phonetic content.

Stimulus Piloting

To ensure that each target utterance indeed corresponded to the relevant French variety, 11 QF speakers (M_{age} = 37.91 years, *range* = 26–61) with no experience in linguistics were recruited for a norming study and were tested individually in a quiet location. These pilot participants self-rated their exposure to different French varieties at a mean of 4.45 (*range* = 1–8) on a 9-point scale (1 = "I am only used to hearing the QF variety," 9 = "I am extremely used to hearing different French varieties"). During the session, the pilot participants used a computer-based rating interface (see Procedure) and headsets to listen to the 160 utterances (presented in a unique random order to each participant) and to indicate, for each item, whether the speaker originated from France, Québec, or somewhere else. The participants identified the speaker's origin accurately on average for 132 (82.50%) of the 160 utterances (*range* = 117–149). Based

on this information, all utterances that were not identified by nine or more pilot participants (82% accuracy threshold) were replaced by another utterance which was developed following the same procedure with the two original speakers. Also, because one of the two speakers tended to elicit more accurate identifications for her QF utterances, while the other speaker elicited more accurate identifications for her FF utterances (which likely reflected each speaker's acting experience), a decision was made to keep only one recording per utterance while maintaining an equal number of items recorded by each speaker for each target feature within each variety. Avoiding the repetition of each speaker's voice for a given base utterance was also necessary, because the pilot participants became familiar with the speakers' voices, commenting that they had recognized that each speaker was saying the same sentence twice but with a different feature.

The next set of recordings included 80 utterances, with 39 items recorded by one speaker and 41 items recorded by the other speaker. These recordings were evaluated in another round of pilot testing by an additional group of pilot participants, following the same procedure. The pilot participants included 10 native QF speakers (M_{age} = 35.10 years, *range* = 26–56), who on average self-rated their exposure to different French varieties at a mean of 6.40 (*range* = 3–9) using the same 9-point scale described previously. The pilot participants succeeded in correctly identifying the speaker origin for 75 (93.95%) of the 80 utterances (*range* = 70–80% accuracy per individual item). However, here again it was important to remove all problematic items, which meant that the utterances that were not identified accurately by nine or more participants (90% accuracy threshold) were eliminated. In order to keep the same number of recordings per target feature within a given variety, an equal number of items featuring the relevant pattern spoken in the other variety was also discarded through random selection.

In sum, the prerating of the target stimuli was essential in ensuring that the targeted differences between the presence and absence of the QF features were indeed perceptible to francophones who had grown up and resided in Montréal and that the targeted phonetic realizations represented what a QF speaker might perceive and produce as such. Therefore, following this extensive materials development and pilot testing procedure, the final set of 64 target utterances was retained (4 features × 8 utterances × 2 varieties) of which 31 were recorded by one of the two speakers and 33 were recorded by the other speaker, with no overlap in speaker voice for each utterance across the two varieties. These 64 recordings were used as the main stimuli in the phonemic rating task completed by the L2 French speakers.

Procedure

Each of the 58 L2 speakers was met individually in a quiet location. Because all L2 speakers were proficient in French, the rating session was conducted in French using French-language materials. The researcher first explained the goal of the study, and the participants read and signed the consent form. The participants were then invited to complete the background questionnaire and to complete the TEFAQ test to ensure that their listening comprehension level corresponded to that of advanced L2 speakers. The test was administered through the TEF website (http://www.lefrancaisdesaffaires.fr/wp-content/uploads/fichiers-clf/Tutoriel-de-Comprehension-orale-TEF--Storyline-output/story_html5.html). The questions were presented on a computer screen, with the corresponding audio files played through computer speakers and the participants being able to listen to them as many times as needed. A short booklet was also provided for the participants to record their answers.

For the phonemic rating task, the participants were first shown a computer-based rating interface in *Z-Lab* (Yao et al., 2013), a custom-designed MATLAB program (Appendix B). The

interface included three 1,000-point sliding scales, each targeting a question in French with the relevant endpoint descriptors (illustrated in Table 2.3). Similar 1,000-point scales have been used recently with various types of listeners, revealing high rating consistency (e.g., Bergeron & Trofimovich, 2017; Crowther et al., 2018; Saito et al., 2017). The participants made three judgments, evaluating (a) the extent to which they had been exposed to each pronunciation (exposure), (b) the degree to which they themselves wished to have the same pronunciation (pronunciation model), and (c) the extent to which they found each pronunciation pleasant to listen to (pleasantness). All three scales were presented simultaneously (on the same screen) for each utterance because repeated presentations of the same utterance for separate ratings appear to negatively influence listener evaluations (O'Brien, 2016). Besides evaluating each utterance using the three sliding scales, the participants also indicated whether the speaker originated from France, Québec, or somewhere else (presented in French as *Autre*), using the three options that appeared at the bottom of the screen (Appendix B).

Table 2.3 *Questions and Endpoint Descriptors (in French, with English Translations)*

Question	Left endpoint	Right endpoint
À quelle fréquence entendez-vous cette prononciation?	*Jamais*	*Plusieurs fois par jour*
How often do you hear this pronunciation?	Never	Many times a day
Aimeriez-vous avoir la même prononciation que ce locuteur?	*Pas du tout*	*J'adorerais*
Would you like to have this speaker's pronunciation?	Not at all	I would love to

Cette prononciation est-elle agréable à écouter?	*Pas du tout*	*Très plaisante*
Is this pronunciation pleasant to hear?	Not at all	Very pleasant

Before listening to the 64 target utterances, which were presented to each participant in a unique randomized order, the participants first heard the researcher explain and illustrate the rating categories (with examples) and then took part in a practice session (using four practice items) to ensure that they could clarify any questions they might have about the procedure and to ascertain that they were comfortable using the software and understood the meaning of the rating categories and endpoint descriptors. Because this study's focus was on L2 speakers' attitudes rather than their ability to retain information in short-term memory, as in prior research (e.g., Baker et al., 2009), the participants were allowed to hear each sentence as many times as they wished, but the software did not permit them to rate the utterance until it was played entirely.

Data Analysis

First, the participants' scores (out of 1,000) were checked for internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) separately for the four speech features within the two participant groups (those with and without francisation experience). Most values exceeded the recommended benchmark of .70–.80 (see Table 2.4), although four values ranged between .60 and .70, nevertheless revealing medium effect sizes (Larson-Hall, 2016). For the lowest alpha value of .44, each participant's rating (for exposure to affrication) was examined to see whether some participants produced outlier datapoints. However, no datapoints were identified which would cause a drastic increase in the reliability index, so all data were retained. As acknowledged in prior research, although reliability values ranging from .40 to .50 are weak, such data are still suited for further analyses (e.g., Munro et al., 2006). Based on these generally reliable response

patterns, the participants' ratings were averaged across the eight tokens for each target feature (i.e., affrication, apical /r/, high lax vowels, and nasal vowels), separately within each participant group.

Table 2.4 *Rater Consistency (Cronbach's α) for Speech Features by Rated Category and Group*

	Exposure		Pronunciation model		Pleasantness	
Phonetic feature	With FR	No FR	With FR	No FR	With FR	No FR
Affrication	.44	.69	.80	.84	.80	.82
Apical /r/	.82	.78	.95	.96	.94	.95
High lax vowels	.78	.69	.75	.86	.70	.85
Nasal vowels	.67	.64	.88	.81	.87	.75

Note. FR = francisation

For the rated question that assessed the participants' ability to associate each phonetic feature with a particular French variety, a binary scoring method was used. A score of 1 was given per utterance when the participant attributed the phonetic feature to the correct French variety, and a score of 0 was given when the participant attributed the phonetic feature to the wrong variety. However, to take into consideration potential response biases (e.g., participants providing the same response to all speech samples) and to more accurately measure the participants' sensitivity to the phonetic feature in question (i.e., choosing the speaker's origin ostensibly based only on the targeted phonetic feature), a *d*′ analysis was conducted (Macmillan & Creelman, 1991), accounting for the number of "hits," or correct identifications of the phonetic feature (e.g., when the participant selected "Québec" for an utterance with a QF pronunciation), and the number of "false alarms" (e.g., when the participant chose "Québec" in response to an utterance with a FF pronunciation). The *d*′ measure—expressed as a difference in

z scores between the number of hits and false alarms, defined in this manner—could thus be interpreted as each participant's sensitivity to a given QF phonetic feature (e.g., Keating, 2005).

Results

The participants' ratings of their exposure, choice of a pronunciation model, and pleasantness (summarized in Table 2.5) ranged on average between 359 and 733 (on a 1,000-point scale), with a reasonable variation across the participants (shown through standard deviation values), indicating that the participants provided varying degrees of opinion in response to the target features.

Table 2.5 *Means (Standard Deviations) for QF Speech Features by Rated Category and Group (0–1,000 Scale)*

	Exposure		Pronunciation model		Pleasantness	
Phonetic feature	With FR	No FR	With FR	No FR	With FR	No FR
Affrication	655 (116)	695 (174)	671 (100)	731 (154)	694 (96)	733 (152)
Apical /r/	505 (187)	560 (241)	378 (189)	359 (212)	451 (191)	400 (224)
High lax vowels	669 (133)	680 (143)	662 (117)	667 (131)	687 (100)	670 (137)
Nasal vowels	650 (138)	677 (133)	610 (115)	644 (146)	640 (115)	643 (158)

Note. FR = francisation

Exposure

To examine the participants' self-assessed degree of exposure to QF and FF phonetic features, as a function of their instructional setting, their exposure ratings were submitted to a series of two-way ANOVAs, carried out separately for each phonetic feature, with group (with vs. without francisation) as a between-participants factor and French variety (QF vs. FF) as a within-participants factor (see Table 2.5 for descriptive statistics). All ANOVAs yielded only a

significant main effect of French variety: for affrication, $F(1, 56) = 10.10$, $p = .002$, $\eta_\rho^2 = .15$; for lax vowels, $F(1, 56) = 12.75$, $p = .001$, $\eta_\rho^2 = .19$; for nasal vowels, $F(1, 56) = 11.94$, $p = .001$, $\eta_\rho^2 = .18$; and for apical /r/, $F(1, 56) = 22.23$, $p < .001$, $\eta_\rho^2 = .28$. For the first three phonetic features (affrication, high lax, and nasal vowels), the finding was similar: irrespective of the group, the participants appeared to have had greater exposure to the QF than to the FF features. For apical /r/, the pattern was in the opposite direction: irrespective of the group, the participants rated their exposure to the QF feature (apical /r/) as being lower than their exposure to the FF feature (dorsal [ʁ]).

Pronunciation Model

To establish which features both participant groups wished to include in their pronunciation model, similar two-way ANOVAs were conducted, separately for each speech feature (see Table 5). The ANOVAs first showed a significant main effect of group only for affrication, $F(1, 56) = 7.56$, $p = .008$, $\eta_\rho^2 = .12$. This finding implied that the participants who had benefited from Québec's francisation program were significantly less likely to adopt the QF pattern (affrication) as their own, compared to the participants receiving no formal language instruction in Québec. In addition, a significant main effect of French variety emerged for apical /r/, $F(1, 56) = 143.06$, $p < .001$, $\eta_\rho^2 = .72$. Whether or not the participants took part in the francisation program, they were more likely to adopt the pronunciation that they gave higher exposure ratings to, namely, dorsal [ʁ] (commonly used in both QF and FF varieties), compared to apical /r/.

Pleasantness

The participants' ratings targeting how pleasant each pronunciation was for them to listen to were compared using similar two-way ANOVAs, performed separately for each phonetic

feature. These analyses yielded no significant main or interaction effects for three of the four phonetic features: affrication, lax vowels, and nasal vowels ($p > .076$). However, a significant main effect of French variety emerged for apical /r/, $F(1, 56) = 122.28$, $p < .001$, $\eta_\rho^2 = .69$, suggesting that, of the four phonetic features, the only QF pattern that sounded less appealing to the participants was the use of apical /r/.

Sensitivity to QF Features

With respect to the participants' sensitivity to the QF speech features (being able to identify the origin of the speaker based on the phonetic feature alone), all participants generally appeared to have very limited awareness of the features defining the QF speech variety, with 12.5–56.0% accuracy scores, implying mostly below-chance performance (see Table 2.6).

Table 2.6 *Participant Accuracy (Percent Correct, d') in Identifying the Origin of the Speaker for Speech Features by Group and Speech Variety*

	With francisation			Without francisation		
Phonetic feature	QF variety	FF variety	*d′*	QF variety	FF variety	*d′*
Affrication	54.84	45.97	.49	41.20	37.04	–.57
Apical /r/	12.51	39.92	–.05	17.13	39.81	.05
High lax vowels	45.97	43.55	.47	43.98	39.35	–.53
Nasal vowels	49.19	33.47	–.01	56.02	24.07	.01

Using *d′* scores, a series of independent-samples *t* tests was conducted to compare the participants' sensitivity to the QF features between the two participant groups. Among the four tests, only two showed a significant difference between the groups: for affrication, $t(56) = 3.05$, $p = .004$, $d = .80$, and for lax vowels, $t(56) = 2.68$, $p = .010$, $d = .71$. In both cases, the participants who had experience with the francisation program showed more sensitivity to the relevant QF feature than the participants with no francisation experience.

Relationships Between Participant Ratings

The aim of the final analysis was to determine whether there were relationships between the participants' exposure, preference, and sensitivity scores. For this analysis, Pearson correlations were computed among all participants' responses targeting the relevant QF phonetic features (affrication, apical /r/, high lax, and nasal vowels). Because previous analyses revealed minimal differences between the two participant groups (with and without francisation experience), these correlations were run on the entire dataset (n = 58). Correlational analyses revealed the same pattern of findings for affrication, lax vowels, and nasal vowels. There were significant positive relationships between the participants' exposure and pleasantness ratings (r = .49–.62), between their pleasantness ratings and their rated likelihood to adopt the relevant QF feature as their pronunciation model (r = .90–.94), and between their exposure rating and their rated likelihood to adopt the relevant QF feature as their pronunciation model (r = .49–.69). Slightly different results were obtained for apical /r/, with a significant positive relationship between the participants' rated exposure to that feature and their choice of that feature as their pronunciation model (r = .44), which was in turn strongly positively correlated with how pleasant apical /r/ was to listen to (r = .78). In sum, exposure, pronunciation model, and pleasantness all appeared to be interlinked, albeit in slightly different ways, which was a pattern observed for all targeted QF speech features. All correlation values were medium to large in strength (r = .44–.94), according to Plonsky and Oswald's (2014) guidelines. Most importantly, the participants' sensitivity to the QF phonetic features (measured through d') was unrelated to any of their ratings targeting these QF features.

Discussion

The objective of this study was to investigate L2 French speakers' attitudes towards QF

through an examination of L2 speakers' ratings of exposure and pleasantness, their preference for a pronunciation model, and their sensitivity to QF speech patterns with respect to four specific QF phonetic features (affrication, apical /r/, lax vowels, and nasal vowels). Ratings of both speaker groups (with and without experience in the francisation program) were compared, revealing three significant between-group differences, more specifically, in relation to the speakers' desire *not* to include affrication in their pronunciation model and their increased sensitivity to QF affrication and QF use of lax vowels. In addition, all speakers (regardless of their participation in the francisation program) self-assessed their exposure to QF affrication as well as to QF lax and nasal vowels as being greater than their exposure to the FF variants of these features, although all speakers rated their exposure to apical /r/ significantly lower. Finally, the speakers were less likely to adopt apical /r/ as their pronunciation model and rated it as notably less pleasant to listen to.

Exposure to QF

The current findings showed that both L2 speaker groups—regardless of their participation in Québec's francisation program—self-assessed their exposure to be significantly higher for QF affrication as well as for QF high lax and nasal vowels, compared to their exposure to the respective FF features. These findings are in full agreement with the speakers' reported exposure to the French varieties in the language background questionnaire. When asked to mention the French varieties they had been most exposed to, 75% of those who experienced the francisation program and 83% of those who did not take part in this program indicated QF as their main source of French input. All in all, QF was the chief source of input for 93% of the 58 participants in their everyday life. In contrast, as expected, the apical /r/ was not a feature that the speakers were used to hearing. In fact, the uvular [ʁ], which is used in both QF and FF varieties,

received higher ratings in this category. These findings indicate that both speaker groups, regardless of their instructional experience and irrespective of their greater exposure to other QF phonetic features, were more limited in terms of their interaction with a generation of older QF speakers—presumably those who still use apical /r/ in their speech (Côté, 2016; Sankoff & Blondeau, 2007).

Although the speakers demonstrated greater exposure to the targeted QF features, compared to their exposure to FF features, their actual ratings showed only a slight (albeit significant) exposure advantage for the QF variety (48–55 points on a 1,000-point scale). However, it is safe to assume that the advanced-level participants in this study were aware of existing phonemic differences in French, because they provided different exposure ratings in response to the utterances that included a QF feature and those that did not (at least for three of the four targeted features). These results also align with L2 speakers' sensitivity to a perceptible discrepancy between what they hear "on the street" and the language they are exposed to in the classroom (Calinon, 2009; Tarone & Swain, 1995). But so far, these findings are inconclusive as to L2 French speakers' sociolinguistic awareness of the phonetic features that clearly belong to the QF and FF speech varieties—at least in terms of the kind of sociolinguistic awareness that would extend beyond exposure differences.

Choice of QF As a Pronunciation Model

With respect to the speakers' choice of a pronunciation model to follow, the participants who benefited from Québec's francisation program appeared to be significantly less willing to integrate QF affrication into their speech, compared to those who generally were exposed to QF outside language instruction after their arrival in Québec. Because the participants from the francisation program rated their exposure to affrication to be greater than their exposure to its FF

variant (lack of affrication)—which implied that they were capable of perceiving a difference between its presence and absence—their choice to avoid using affrication might suggest that they have developed negative attitudes towards that specific feature. With the instructional setting being the main difference between the speaker groups, these results are compatible with prior findings revealing French teachers' preference for the FF variety in their teaching (Archambault & Corbeil, 1982; Calinon, 2009; French & Beaulieu, 2016; Piechowiak, 2009). Also, because all speakers who had completed the francisation program were at the time of the study no longer enrolled in French coursework—for an average of more than five years (*range* = 0.5–21 years)—it may well be that the (negative) attitudes that develop through instructional experiences are robust and might persist over the course of many years.

What remains unclear, however, is whether the language teachers involved in Québec's francisation program tend to eliminate (consciously or not) all QF speech patterns—or affrication exclusively—from their speech and/or whether they generally approach French sociophonetics in a way that impacts learner attitudes (e.g., Kang & Ahn, 2019). In this sense, it is important to mention that, in the past few years, a new cohort of French language teachers have entered the Montréal job market and that these teachers are not native speakers of QF. In fact, some individuals who graduated from the same francisation program are now teaching L2 French to the next generations of L2 speakers (Bayliss & Vignola, 2007). With their rich linguistic and cultural background, these teachers could certainly provide learners with a diverse type of input. Exposure to different varieties (and accents) in L2 French is certainly beneficial to speakers' L2 development, provided that a sociolinguistic component is integrated in the curriculum (Bigot & Papen, 2013).

Pleasantness of QF Speech

Among the four QF phonetic features targeted, there was a unique main effect of French variety for apical /r/, meaning that all speakers, regardless of their educational experience, agreed that apical /r/ was less pleasant to listen to than dorsal [r]. As discussed previously, this finding is unsurprising, given the speakers' limited exposure to apical /r/ (e.g., Baker et al., 2009; Dragojevic et al., 2018), which is also consistent with their choice to exclude this feature from their preferred L2 French pronunciation model. As for affrication, high lax vowels, and nasal vowels, the speakers did not appear to particularly like or dislike these features. The absence of strong effects for these phonetic features may not be rooted in the speakers' lack of exposure, since they showed (through their ratings) to be perceptually aware of the difference between the QF and the FF varieties and to be more exposed to the former. It may well be that the speakers' pleasantness ratings—and thus their choice to adopt these features—may be determined not by the quantity of their exposure but by the quality of their personal experience. Put differently, what determines the pleasantness of a speech pattern is likely not L2 speakers' amount of exposure or length of residence in a target environment but rather their (positive) experience interacting with the speakers of the target variety, which has been shown to predict L2 speakers' desire to keep using the L2 and adopt the local speech patterns (e.g., Drummond, 2012; Kinginger, 2008).

Sensitivity to QF Speech Patterns

Looking more specifically at L2 French speakers' sociolinguistic awareness, assessed here through the participants' accuracy of identifying speaker origin, the speakers who had experience with the francisation program appeared to be more sensitive to speaker origin than those without this experience for two of the four QF speech features (affrication and lax vowels).

The first explanation for this finding may pertain to the frequency of these features in the speakers' input. Affrication has been shown to be socially neutral and widely used in formal contexts, such as QF broadcasting and media in general (e.g., Bigot & Papen, 2013; Chalier, 2018; Cox, 1998; Reinke, 2000). Regarding lax vowels, there is no clear consensus on its status since government organizations such as Radio-Canada disapprove its use (Ostiguy & Tousignant, 2008). However, most scholars agree that in both formal and informal contexts, speakers regularly use that feature, making it a frequent one in L2 speakers' input (Bigot & Papen, 2013; Cox, 1998; Ostiguy & Tousignant, 2008; Reinke, 2005; Reinke & Ostiguy, 2016). With most of their daily exposure to French restricted to the media, L2 speakers thus have multiple chances to be exposed to these two frequent and likely unstigmatized phonetic features of QF and in turn show higher sensitivity to them (Carrie, 2017; López-Soto & Barrera-Pardo, 2007; McInerney, 2020; Rindal & Piercy, 2013)

Another reason for this finding may be related to the salience of affrication and lax vowels in L2 speakers' input. Among the speech features listed as typical of QF, affrication appears to be the most salient and most distinguishing feature of QF. Dolbec and Paradis (1998), who examined which specific features best predicted the accuracy with which listeners identify QF speakers, showed that a single occurrence of one instance of affrication, an anterior nasal [ã], or a lax vowel was sufficient for listeners to detect a native speaker of QF. To understand the sociolinguistic weight of each of these features, Brasseur (2009) used cross-splicing to create sentences composed of three content words, each containing one, two, or three of the features targeted by Dolbec and Paradis (1998). Brasseur (2009) reported a hierarchy of feature relevance, with affrication emerging as the strongest marker of QF, followed by lax vowels and

the anterior nasal vowel [ã]. These findings may explain, in part, why both affrication and lax vowels specifically appeared as finer perceptual cues to QF.

However, what makes the speakers with experience in the francisation program different (and better) in their sensitivity to these two phonetic features could stem from the discrepancy between the varieties that they had experienced inside and outside the classroom. As a result of a teaching approach that likely favored the "standard" form of French (FF speech patterns), the speakers with experience in the francisation program were most likely able to notice the patterns that deviated from the variety that they were mainly exposed to inside the classroom. This might also explain, at least in part, why instructed L2 speakers tend to associate the pronunciations they hear "on the street" with a more informal register leading them to believe that QF is "informal" in nature (Guertin, 2017). It is important to mention, though, that despite their relative success insofar as the speakers' sensitivity to QF was concerned, the speakers nevertheless demonstrated a clear lack of sociolinguistic awareness with respect to a *range* of phonetic features distinguishing the QF and FF varieties, highlighting a generally low sensitivity (especially for speakers with no francisation experience) to features distinguishing the two varieties. Overall, these findings support Guertin's (2017) observations regarding L2 French speakers' general lack of sociolinguistic awareness and shed light on speakers' misconceptions about their idealized target variety as a factor interfering with their sensitivity to phonetic variability (e.g., Hu & Lindemann, 2009; Scales et al., 2006).

In short, the speakers who had experienced the francisation program may have benefited from being exposed to one variety of French inside the classroom and a different one outside instruction. This rich input may thus have enabled these speakers to develop greater sensitivity to at least some QF speech features, especially those that are both frequent and unstigmatized.

Although this sensitivity may have discouraged these speakers from developing negative attitudes towards QF speakers (see Dragojevic et al., 2018), teachers' insistence on the use of the FF variety inside language classrooms may have led these speakers away from embracing Québec culture and community practices (e.g., Ladegaard, 1998; Mompeán González, 2004). These findings are important in that they accentuate the need for language institutions in Québec to provide L2 speakers with the adequate tools to develop their sociolinguistic awareness (and competence) in a QF-speaking environment.

L2 Speakers' Attitudes Towards QF Speech Features

Finally, the associations between all target measures focusing on QF speech features demonstrated similar patterns for affrication as well as lax and nasal vowels, regardless of the speaker group. Essentially, for these three features, exposure was linked to pleasantness, which was in turn highly correlated with the choice of a pronunciation model, a variable also associated with exposure. Although the statistical procedure employed here cannot imply causality, the speakers' comments about their preferred L2 French pronunciation model to follow (from the language background questionnaire) support these findings. For example, for approximately an equal number of participants with (16) and without (14) the experience in the francisation program, their preferred speech variety would include both QF and FF linguistic features, so that they could communicate with and understand speakers from both contexts (France, Québec). In addition to the eight participants who showed no preference for any French variety, 10 speakers mentioned QF as their favorite variety to use, providing reasons such as desire to be understood by and understand the locals, instrumental opportunities for professional and personal advancement, and feelings of belonging to the majority culture, as exemplified in the following sample comments:

- "I am in Québec. It's important to use Québec expressions" ["*Je suis au Québec. C'est important de utiliser des expressions québécoise*"] (Luis Enrique, with francisation)
- "Because Canadian French is more 'resounding' and I think it's prettier than European French. Also, I think people could understand me better if I speak the Québec French variety because I studied European French" ["*Parce que le français du Canada c'est plus « sonore » et je le trouve plus jolie que le français d'Europe. De plus, je pense que les gens pourraient comprendre mieux si je parle la variante du Québec parce que j'étudié le français d'Europe*"] (Heiver, without francisation)
- "To adapt to people here, at the job, with my neighbors, etc. But if I travel to France, I would try to speak the French variety. [Québec French] is faster. There is a lot of new expressions for me. And the contractions!" ["*Pour m'adapter aux gens ici, au travail, avec mes voisin, etc. Mais si je voyage à la France, j'essairais de parler la variante de français de la France. [Le français québécois] c 'est plus rapide. Il y a beaucoup des nouvelles expressions pour moi. Et les contractions*!"] (Laura, without francisation)
- "It's more natural for me. To speak with a different accent would be a little weird, like pretending I belong to another community" ["*C'est plus naturel pour moi. Parler avec un autre accent serait un peu bizarre, comme pretendre appartenir à une autre communauté*"] (Victoria M., with francisation)

On the other hand, FF was the variety that nine speakers would prefer to speak for reasons that included its linguistic "quality" and its "standard" status. The speakers justified their choices through reference to their negative attitudes towards QF and to their French learning experience in their home country, as illustrated in the following sample quotes:

- "It's clearer and comprehensible because Québécois, they eat the sentences" ["*C'est plus net et comprensible parce que les quebecois, ils mangent les frases*"] (Ana, without francisation)
- "Because I learned the French from France when I was young. Québécois speak too fast; also, they mix up French with English" ["*Car c'est le français de France que j'ai appris quand j'étais jeune. Le quebecois parlent trop vite; de plus ils melangent le français avec l'anglais*"] (José, without francisation)
- "That variety is easier. [In Québec French] I think they cut words all the time, the pronouns change, the liaisons are random" ["*Cette variante est plus facile. [En français québécois] je trouve que les mots sont coupés tout le temps, les pronoms changent, les liaisons sont faites de façon variable*"] (Carmen, with francisation)
- "It's more commercial, also because in the Québec language, people cut words. And a lot of Québécois with a bad orthography. It's very difficult and it's weird in the written and oral forms because Québec adults who learn how to write French, it's weird." ["*C'est plus commercial, aussi parce que dans la langue Québécoise, les personnes coupent des mots. Et beaucoup de Quebecoise avec mauvaise orthographe. C'est très difficile et c'est bizarre à l'écrit et à l'oral parce que des adultes québécoise qui apprenent à écrire le français, c'est bizarre*."] (Diana, with francisation).

These results highlight, once again, that the speakers' reasons to opt for the FF variety were either due to its perceived social status or reflected their negative reactions to QF. Although QF was perceived by some participants as an essential part of their identity, this variety was mostly used by these speakers to communicate locally within Québec. Taken together, this evidence implies that exposure to QF is essential for L2 speakers to develop their appreciation of

different speech features in order to eventually incorporate them in their own L2 pronunciation. L2 speakers might therefore need to seek more opportunities to interact with the target language community or at least to increase their exposure to the local QF media in a way that would increase their exposure to QF speech patterns.

With respect to apical /r/, which was rated low in self-assessed exposure, the speakers' preference for a pronunciation model was associated with their rating of pleasantness and also with their exposure to this feature. Thus, regardless of the speakers' limited exposure to apical /r/, pleasantness seemed to play a major role in their pronunciation model choice, suggesting that L2 speakers' preference for a pronunciation model to follow may depend on their affective response to it (Carrie, 2017). Last but not least, the speakers made recurring comments about apical /r/ throughout data collection. Whereas some would laugh when listening to the utterances featuring apical /r/, others would take off their headset and comment about how embarrassing it was for them to hear the speakers whom they imagined to be accented Spanish-speaking learners of French. These reactions suggested that apical /r/ (a feature also present in the Spanish phonemic repertoire) was associated with accented L2 French. To better capture speaker beliefs and to further understand the origins of their affective and behavioural responses to apical /r/, Hispanic speakers' attitudes towards this socially marked feature of QF should be examined in more detail in future research.

Implications

Although the L2 speakers were generally familiar with several phonetic features of QF, their negative attitudes towards QF appeared to be deep-rooted. French language instructors may therefore need to enhance their students' awareness of how the local and the students' preferred varieties differ across multiple registers. For instance, a recent classroom study has shown

positive changes in L2 English learners' attitudes after a 16-week semester which included critical group discussions of the linguistic and cultural diversity across different varieties of English as well as exposure to various media (e.g., songs, advertisements, TV shows) featuring English speakers from the Outer (e.g., India) and Expanding (e.g., Thailand, Italy) circle countries. In this sense, francisation classroom activities that would use authentic materials to expose L2 speakers to different French varieties (in addition to the local one) are essential in order to prevent the development of new and to modify existing negative attitudes. Put simply, the francisation curriculum must include awareness raising activities, preferably early in the learning process, so that teachers could foster L2 speakers' social competence (French & Beaulieu, 2016). The value of such training extends beyond L2 speaker knowledge of different speech varieties and includes measurable benefits for their segmental accuracy (Kennedy et al., 2014; Mora et al., 2014), their L2 pronunciation (Kennedy & Trofimovich, 2010), and their L2 listening (Kennedy & Blanchet, 2014). Above all, awareness training has the potential to positively influence L2 speakers' attitudes towards the variety there are learning, thus making them more prepared to meet the challenges of real-life language use outside the language classroom.

Limitations and Future Research

Although many methodological decisions were taken to ensure the validity of the current findings, several limitations cannot be ignored. First, the fact that the researcher is a native speaker of QF may have impacted the speakers' willingness to share their opinions. To ensure that the speakers were proficient in L2 French, all (written) communication before the scheduled meeting was carried out in French, and in no case was it mentioned that the researcher is a near-native speaker of Spanish. Nevertheless, although the entire session was conducted in (formal)

QF, Spanish pronunciations were used to address each participant by name. From this single phonetic cue, almost half of the participants commented post-rating on the researcher's ethnic origin, suggesting Spanish or FF as her native speech variety. When informed of the researcher's linguistic background, the participants would either react with pride, verbalizing their ability to understand a QF speaker, or with discomfort, remembering the negative comments they had just shared about QF. Considering their generally limited sociolinguistic awareness, at least with respect to QF, the participants may not have been dramatically affected by their knowledge of the researcher's ethnolinguistic background. Nevertheless, it has been shown that the researcher's speech variety (Hay et al., 2010) and social biases (Taylor Reid et al., 2019) could affect listener behaviours. Therefore, future research should examine potential links between L2 speakers' performance and their attitudes and beliefs regarding the researcher's ethnolinguistic background.

In relation to the targeted group of L2 speakers, it may be interesting to survey speakers whose native language is different from Spanish, immigrants from the same country, or speakers from multiple language backgrounds more generally. This research would help determine whether negative attitudes towards QF are limited to specific groups of L2 speakers. Also, more information should be obtained from participants regarding their learning experience, to capture details about the number and length of coursework, type of studies, educational systems, and teacher backgrounds. While it was clear whether or not each participant had participated in Québec's francisation program, it was impossible to ascertain whether the participants' attitudes towards QF were first influenced by their French learning experience in their home country, their experience at a language school and/or university, or for instance, their studies at the Alliance française, where FF is the favoured variety.

As for the methodology, both advantages and disadvantages have been discussed in prior research regarding the measurement of speaker sensitivity to various speech patterns using multiple-choice options or scalar ratings versus open-ended responses (Dragojevic et al., 2018). However, to better capture participants' actual perceptions (such as the belief that apical /r/ is characteristic of the speech by Spanish speakers of L2 French) and their awareness regarding the targeted speech features, using open-ended data elicitation tools might be more appropriate. In addition, because L2 speakers are rarely given the opportunity to voice the challenges that they experience throughout their immigration and settlement such as applying for jobs, finding a place of residence, or securing a school for children, while also trying to learn French, stimulated recalls or in-depth interviews should be included in future work to elicit rich qualitative data from participants. These data would provide additional information regarding the origin and manifestations of potential negative attitudes, for example, in terms of whether and how various personal and professional experiences might colour L2 speakers' attitudes towards QF, thus allowing for a better understanding of L2 speakers' linguistic integration in Québec's French-speaking environment.

Finally, the current findings shed light on the need to examine further the objectives of the francisation program in terms of L2 French speakers' cultural and linguistic development in relation to the program's instructional approach, for instance, by evaluating the program's curriculum and the training and materials available to language teachers. Just as importantly, researchers should investigate French language instructors' teaching approaches and their beliefs regarding their focus on the QF and FF speech varieties in the classroom. Teachers' opinions about awareness training focused on the development of L2 speakers' sociolinguistic competence also deserve attention from scholars. The overarching goal of these future research

projects would be to promote the legitimacy of QF in Québec's language classrooms as well as in educational settings outside Québec where French is taught as a foreign language.

Conclusion

The present study provided evidence in support of previous research findings regarding L2 French speakers' negative attitudes towards QF, targeting more specifically the role of the francisation program as a source of information about this variety. L2 speakers' participation in the francisation program appeared to discourage them from seeing affrication (one of the main distinguishing features of QF) as a desirable feature to be included in their pronunciation. Also, L2 speakers demonstrated greater sensitivity to at least some QF speech features as a function of their prior experience taking francisation coursework, likely because they were exposed to different varieties of French in class and outside instruction which enhanced their awareness of cross-variety differences. These findings are useful in that they provide information about at least some origins of the negative attitudes that L2 French speakers might hold towards QF.

Link Between Study 1 and Study 2

For many individuals, learning a second language (L2) may be perceived as the considerable challenge of memorizing grammar rules and lexical items while sounding nativelike (Horwitz, 1988). But one's success in communicating in the L2 is not limited to the use of the correct verb tense or accurate vocabulary, nor is the success determined by the absence of accent. According to Canale and Swain's (1980) view of communicative competence, a learner's L2 competence rather entails three different types of knowledge: grammatical (accurate use of L2 lexicon and of morphological, syntactic, and phonological rules), strategic (knowledge of strategies used to repair communication breakdowns), and sociolinguistic (ability to interpret meaning according to social factors).

Highly context-dependent, the development of sociolinguistic competence is essential for learners to express and perceive linguistic as well as non-linguistic information related to patterns of variation (Geeslin & Long, 2014). However, research on L2 French has shown that classroom language learners tend to overuse grammatical (e.g., first person plural subject *nous*) and phonological (e.g., retention of schwa) forms, demonstrating gaps in their knowledge of how these forms are used in different social contexts (for a review, see Howard et al., 2013). Learners' knowledge of sociolinguistic variation can be increased through focused instruction, whereby learners develop their sensitivity towards linguistic features, adapt their speech to convey social meanings, and express their identity (van Compernolle & Williams, 2012). Similarly, learners' knowledge of sociolinguistic variation can be enhanced through exposure. For instance, L2 French learners exposed to the local variety of French spoken in Québec City appeared to feel more comfortable using L2 French and also improved in their ability to

understand and be understood by French speakers (Beaulieu et al., 2018). These findings suggest that exposure to the target language variety (in this case, Québec French) outside language classrooms may have the potential to overcome a lack of classroom instruction on L2 variation and also likely prevent L2 speakers from developing negative attitudes towards the target speech variety and its speakers.

Although prior work points to the crucial role of L2 French learners' exposure to the target language variety in the development of their sociolinguistic competence and (potentially) the expression of their identity, many questions remain unanswered: (a) whether learners actually have a preference for specific features characterizing the local target variety, (b) how learners' attitudes extend to their actual use of these specific features, and (c) whether their classroom experience (or lack of such experience) impacts their preference for and use of these specific features. Therefore, as a follow-up to Study 1—which showed the effects of the learning context on L2 learners' preference for using specific speech features characterizing Québec French—and to gain a clearer insight into the relationship between the preference for and actual use of speech features and the construct of learner identity, Study 2 explored the links between L2 learners' language attitudes, their production of these speech features, and group acculturation, as a function of their L2 educational setting. Similar to Study 1, which focused on L2 learners' attitudes towards Québec French, Study 2 investigated the relationship between the expression of one's identity and L2 speech from a sociolinguistic perspective.

Chapter 3. Study 2

Language Attitudes and Production of L2 French Variants in the Acculturation Process: The Role of the Learning Context

Introduction

Language Attitudes and Acquisition of L2 Speech Variants

Second language (L2) speakers' attitudes have a pronounced influence on their pronunciation accuracy (Moyer, 2007) and pronunciation choices (Drummond, 2012). For instance, in a study of Danish learners of English (Laadegard & Sachdev, 2006), the rate at which the learners adopted the features characterizing Received Pronunciation was predicted by their desire to adopt this variety and by their positive attitudes towards its speakers on the dimensions of status and competence (e.g., intelligence, education), social attractiveness (e.g., reliability, helpfulness), and quality of language (e.g., aesthetic quality, fluency, correctness). Similarly, those L2 speakers of English who voiced a preference for a specific variety and also expressed positive attitudes towards its speakers and its culture appeared to engage in more interactions with the target language community and put more effort into learning (and using) that variety (Clark & Schleef, 2010; Schleef et al., 2011).

By contrast, in L2 Spanish, previous research examining the acquisition of the interdental fricative /θ/ (theta)—a salient and unstigmatized feature used in most areas in Spain—has shown that despite learners' desire to integrate into the L2 culture and to adopt that feature, very few instances of theta were found, even among the most proficient speakers (Geeslin & Gudmestad, 2008; George, 2014; Knouse, 2013; Ringer-Hilfinger, 2012; Willis et al., 2009). As revealed in George's (2014) qualitative data, some L2 speakers associated Spanish theta with a person-

specific speech impediment (lisp), suggesting that short stay-abroad experiences may be insufficient for L2 speakers to develop a feeling of membership in the target community and to use some of the distinctive phonetic features typical of this community's language variety.

In L2 French, a large body of research has revealed L2 speakers' negative attitudes towards specific varieties, including Québec French (QF), without a clear understanding of how each variety is different from French from France (FF). For example, L2 speakers in Montréal tend to associate informal French with QF while attributing discourse in a formal register to FF, irrespective of the actual variety heard (Guertin, 2017; Harvey, 2016). In the same vein, L2 speakers typically describe the FF variety as "international," "standard," "neutral," "formal," comprehensible, and less complicated to learn (Calinon, 2009; Harvey, 2016; Saint-Laurent, 2008). Teachers of French (both in local and international contexts) also frequently refer to QF as "incorrect," "inappropriate," "problematic," and "inauthentic" (Auger, 2003; Wernicke, 2016), contributing to the creation and maintenance of L2 speakers' negative stereotypes.

For many L2 speakers, their negative attitudes towards QF might be explained through small or non-existent social networks involving QF speakers (e.g., Calinon, 2009; Collin & Michaud, 2017). For example, in a study investigating L2 speakers' preference for and production of QF features, Blondeau et al. (2002) examined the rate of affrication of /t/ and /d/ in L2 French by English speakers in Montréal. Although these specific features of QF were barely addressed in language classrooms, which was also the case for L2 French speakers residing in the rural city of Granby (Beaudoin, 2019), greater frequency of interaction with QF speakers outside the classroom contributed to the development of the speakers' positive attitudes towards the QF community, enhanced sensitivity to and preference for the local variety, and greater rates of production of these features.

In sum, often despite the lack of instruction targeting sociolinguistic variation, L2 speakers may still develop positive attitudes through informal experiences with the L2, whereby they might become familiar with its characteristic speech features and might adopt these features into their pronunciation, possibly as a way of integrating into the L2 community.

The Acculturation Construct

Since Redfield et al.'s (1936) appeal for the study of acculturation, an extensive body of research in social psychology has looked at the process of change resulting from contact between individuals from different cultures (e.g., Berry, 1997; Doucerain et al., 2017; Montreuil et al., 2004). An early conceptualization of acculturation assumed that changes in an individual's identity were observable on a single continuum (through a unidimensional measure). This view implied that members of a specific group would, as a result of contact with another group, adopt the values and behaviours of this group to the detriment of their own. More recently, however, scholars have argued for an alternative understanding of acculturation where exchanges could be made through multiple cultural identities independently of each other (Berry, 1980; Berry et al., 1989). That is, individuals have the capacity to resort to one of their multiple cultural identities (consciously or not), showing their sense of belonging to each independently and to various degrees (Berry, 1997; Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2001).

According to Berry's (1980) acculturation framework, acculturation is a nonlinear process occurring along two independent dimensions, with four acculturation strategies possible: assimilation (abandoning one's cultural identity and adopting the culture of the majority group), integration (maintaining one's cultural identity while adopting the culture of the majority group), separation (maintaining one's cultural identity while avoiding relations with members of the majority group), and marginalization (abandoning one's cultural identity while avoiding relations

with members of the majority group). Research conducted among immigrants from diverse cultural groups in the US (e.g., Cuéllar et al., 1995; Miller, 2007; Stephenson, 2000) and Canada (e.g., Dere et al., 2010; Donà & Berry, 1994) has yielded a wealth of supporting evidence for this framework. It thus leaded researchers to adopt multidimensional measures of acculturation (for review, see Testa et al., 2019), for instance, to identify variables affecting L2 speakers' feeling of belonging (e.g., Hou et al., 2017), degree of their social participation in the L2 community (e.g., Doucerain et al., 2017), and their life satisfaction and mental health (e.g., Berry & Hou, 2016).

Acculturation in L2 Acquisition

In the field of L2 acquisition, Schumann's (1976, 1986) acculturation model is the most developed framework focusing on L2 development, with acculturation defined as L2 speakers' social and psychological distance from the target L2 group. This model stipulates that L2 acquisition is triggered by L2 speakers' social and psychological integration into the target language group. Greater integration leads to increased interaction with this group's speakers, which provides L2 speakers with "appropriate input" for language development (Schumann, 1986, p. 385). In contrast, other scholars have proposed the opposite relationship, where high L2 proficiency is a necessary condition for L2 speakers to acculturate to the target L2 group (Berry, 2005). In actuality, however, it appears that the links between acculturation and L2 development are both positive and reciprocal and may develop simultaneously (Jia et al., 2016), in the sense that both constructs reinforce each other (e.g., Al-Qahtani, 2016; Hammer & Dewaele, 2015).

There is some evidence suggesting that acculturation plays a role in L2 pronunciation learning. For instance, focusing on German speakers of L2 English residing in the US, Hansen (1995) found a significant relationship between the speakers' accentedness and acculturation, such that the more acculturated L2 speakers felt towards the American culture, the least accented

they sounded in L2 English (see also Lybeck, 2002). In contrast, Waniek-Klimczak (2009) found no significant relationship between the acculturative orientation of Polish speakers of L2 English and their pronunciation accuracy (operationalized as voice onset time values for stop consonants). In another study, Jiang et al. (2009) showed that Chinese speakers of L2 English who were more oriented towards the L2 culture obtained higher oral proficiency scores than those who were less acculturated, but reported no relationship between the speakers' acculturation levels and their L2 pronunciation.

In L2 French, Bergeron (2013) investigated the relationships between L2 speakers' global pronunciation accuracy, their production of QF-specific phonetic features, and their sense of belonging to their home and the Québec cultures. A positive association was found between the speakers' acculturation towards the Québec culture and their global L2 pronunciation accuracy, but no relationship between the speakers' acculturation and their production of QF-specific phonetic features. The speakers' low-intermediate oral proficiency may provide some explanation, given that high-proficiency L2 speakers are most likely to show knowledge of L2 variation in their perception and production performance (Blondeau et al., 2002; Drummond, 2012; Geeslin & Gudmestad, 2008). Also, because the participants in Bergeron's (2013) study were enrolled in formal French-language courses, it may be that their greater exposure to FF inside the classroom, which is the variety favoured by teachers in formal instructional settings (Archambault & Corbeil, 1982; Calinon, 2009; French & Beaulieu, 2016), had slowed down their learning of QF-specific speech patterns (van Compernolle & Williams, 2011). It is thus possible that the speakers' low L2 proficiency and their limited knowledge of French sociolinguistic variation have dissuaded them from interacting with QF speakers outside the classroom (Berry, 2005). Alternatively, the speakers may have preferred not to integrate into the

target language group, at least in part due to their negative attitudes, thus limiting their exposure to and development of the L2 (Schumann, 1986). Regardless of the directionality of the acculturation–development links, it nevertheless remains unclear whether more proficient L2 French speakers with different exposure profiles (with and without formal French instruction in Québec) might show different results in terms of the relationship between their acculturation towards the Québec culture and their production of QF-specific phonetic features.

Québec's Francisation Program

Québec's francisation program provides newcomers to Québec, especially those whose first language is not French, with the opportunity to acquire French within the first five years of their residence. Highly popular among immigrants (Provencher, 2019), the program aims to promote L2 speakers' linguistic and socioeconomic integration by offering financial incentives and tools for immigrants to use in their search for a home, a job, and a school for their children. Despite the program's focus on Québec and its language, it has been frequently reported that teachers are reluctant to use and teach the linguistic features associated with the local French variety (Bélanger, 2017). By focusing on FF, at the expense of QF, teachers likely prevent L2 speakers from developing their sociolinguistic awareness, which may have consequences for their linguistic development. For example, L2 speakers may miss the opportunity to tune their perception to the local variety, to practice the language that they are likely to encounter outside the classroom, and to interact and possibly identify with QF speakers, whose speech would also sound more comprehensible (Bélanger, 2017) and pleasant to them. Thus, a comparison between L2 speakers who have and have not completed the francisation program may provide some insight into L2 speakers' preference to adopt and use specific QF features in their L2 speech and into the role of these features in the expression of L2 speaker identity.

The Current Study

Working from various perspectives, researchers have demonstrated a relationship between L2 speakers' identity and language, highlighting the crucial role played in this relationship by the learning context (e.g., Gardner, 1985; George, 2014; van Compernolle & Williams, 2012). For instance, Schumann's (1986) acculturation model has been tested from qualitative and quantitative perspectives using different populations of L2 speakers in various multilingual and multicultural contexts, revealing links between L2 speakers' oral proficiency and their acculturation, as measured through their contact with native speakers of the target variety (e.g., Al-Qahtani, 2016; Jia et al., 2016). However, similar links between L2 speakers' pronunciation and their acculturation to the L2 community have failed to find unanimous support (e.g., Bergeron, 2013; Jiang et al., 2009).

If pronunciation is indeed one way in which speakers express their sociocultural identity (Moyer, 2013; Schleef et al., 2011), a link should be observed between acculturation and production of QF-specific speech features among L2 French speakers residing and learning French in Québec. However, this relationship may be mediated by L2 speakers' attitudes towards the L2, based on their learning experience inside or outside the language classroom. For example, L2 French speakers (and teachers) are often reluctant to adopt QF pronunciation, expressing negative attitudes towards QF in various educational contexts (Beaulieu et al., 2018; Calinon, 2009; Harvey, 2016). It would thus be important to examine L2 French speakers' production of specific phonetic features as a function of their acculturation while also taking into consideration the potential role of their attitudes towards using the target L2 variety. With this goal in mind, the following research question was asked in Study 2: What are the links between

L2 French speakers' acculturation and their preference for and production of QF-specific speech features, as a function of the educational context in which they learn the L2?

To examine this question, 58 L2 French speakers with and without experience with Québec's francisation program completed two tasks: (a) a questionnaire targeting the speakers' acculturation towards their home culture and the Québec culture and (b) a sentence repetition task assessing their production of four distinguishing features of QF (affrication, diphthongs, lax and nasal vowels). Finally, the data from Study 1 concerning the speakers' preference in response to the question, "Would you like to have this speaker's pronunciation?" were also included to examine how their desire to adopt QF-specific speech features related to their learning experience, language production, and acculturation.

Method

Participants

Native Speakers of QF

To create the speech stimuli for the repetition task, two female QF speakers with experience in acting were recruited. Born in Québec, both speakers had resided in Montréal for more than 10 years. The first speaker (33 years old) graduated from the *Conservatoire d'art dramatique de Montréal* in 2011, while the second speaker (44 years old) graduated from the *Conservatoire d'art dramatique de Québec* in 1995. As part of their coursework, they had received training in diction and phonetics which covered reading and writing using the International Phonetic Alphabet, although the second speaker had reported having more intensive experience with the FF variety. As for their field-specific expertise, each had an average of 10 years of acting experience in TV shows and advertising in Québec.

L2 French Speakers

The participants in Study 2 were the same individuals participating in Study 1. They included 58 Spanish speakers of L2 French (21 males, 37 females) residing in Montréal (*M* = 5.60 years, *range* = 6 months–22 years). Their country of origin included Colombia (42), Mexico (6), Venezuela (5), Peru (2), Chile, Guatemala, and Cuba (1 each). The participants (*M* = 36.53 years, *range* = 20–66) started learning French on average at the age of 26.53 years (*range* = 12–39) and were required to have an advanced level of proficiency in L2 listening, which was checked using the listening comprehension component of the *Test d'évaluation du français adapté au Québec* (TEFAQ). The participants obtained high scores (from a total of 26 points) on the TEFAQ (*M* = 21.72, *range* = 13–26), despite a relatively low daily exposure to French-speaking media (*M* = 55.86%, *range* = 0–100%). They also used a 9-point scale (1 = "extremely difficult," 9 = "extremely easy") to self-assess their L2 French writing (*M* = 6.26, *range* = 2–9), reading (*M* = 7.83, *range* = 4–9), speaking (*M* = 7.22, *range* = 4–9), and comprehension (*M* = 7.72, *range* = 4–9). The participants cited various reasons for why it was important for them to speak French, namely, to speak Québec's official language (27), to find a (good) job (18), to help integrate into the L2 community (15), to be able to communicate with the locals and make friends (13), and to learn a beautiful language (10).

The participants were assigned to two groups, based on their experience with the francisation program. The group with the experience in this program (*n* = 31) included previous part-time students (8) and full-time students (23) who were registered in the program for a period of 6 months (8), one year (17), or up to two years (6). The group with no experience in the francisation program (*n* = 27) included the participants who mostly learned French in an informal context (upon their arrival in Québec), through work or with a QF-speaking partner in Montréal

(7), a summer exchange program in France (4), and L2 French classes in their home country (16). Although the participants in the francisation group also had various formal and informal language learning experiences before their arrival in Québec and after the completion of their francisation coursework, one important difference between the two groups was their participation in the francisation program offered to newcomers.

Materials

Acculturation Questionnaire

The acculturation questionnaire consisted of 34 items, with 17 targeting the participants' acculturation towards their home culture (*culture d'origine*), and 17 targeting their acculturation towards the Québec culture (*culture québécoise*) (see Appendix D). Using a 9-point Likert scale (1 = "strongly disagree," 9 = "strongly agree"), the participants indicated to what extent each item described them or described what they were thinking in response to that item. Likert scales in the endorsement format were used to allow for a bidimensional measure of cultural identification (Doucerain et al., 2017; Testa et al., 2019), as opposed to the frequency format (e.g., *never/not at all* to *always/very often*), which measures acculturation on a single continuum with the home and the mainstream cultures as the endpoints (Berry et al., 1989; Ryder et al., 2000).

The aim of the questionnaire was to derive a reliable measure of the participants' acculturation process. Marín (1992) distinguished between three measurement levels in acculturation research. The first level, which includes items targeting cultural history (e.g., "I know who founded Montréal") and food habits (e.g., "I frequently eat poutine"), is relatively superficial because such questions allow for potential biases in estimating respondents' knowledge of specific historical facts and personal tastes (Doucerain et al., 2016). The

intermediate measurement level targets media use (e.g., "I like to watch *novelas* from my home culture"), behaviours (e.g., "I often behave like people of my home culture in specific situations"), friendships (e.g., "I like to hang out with people from my home culture"), and ethnic preferences (e.g., "It is important for me to marry a person from my home culture"). To capture people's worldviews at what Marín calls the significant measurement level, it is necessary to use items targeting values, norms, and beliefs (e.g., "It is important for me to maintain values from my home culture"). Thus, following these recommendations, only items relevant to the intermediate and significant measurement levels were included in the questionnaire.

The design of the questionnaire was also inspired by two surveys used in prior research to examine relationship between group membership and L2 pronunciation among L2 speakers in Montréal. From the 95-item questionnaire developed by Gatbonton et al. (Gatbonton & Trofimovich, 2008; Gatbonton et al., 2011), the 15 items examining L2 speakers' behaviours, values, norms, and beliefs towards the Québec culture were included in the final version. Two additional items, originally from Ryder et al.'s (2000) Vancouver Index of Acculturation and adapted to Spanish-speaking learners of L2 French (Bergeron, 2013), were also included to assess the participants' acculturation towards the Québec culture. In parallel, 17 identical items targeting the participants' acculturation towards their home culture were developed, where the only change involved the replacement of the label "Québec culture" with the label "home culture." In sum, the final version contained a total of 34 items (17 items × 2 cultures) targeting six categories: (a) cultural engagement (3 items × 2), (b) feeling of comfort about the group (3 items × 2), (c) preferential view of the group (3 items × 2), (d) contact with members of the group (2 items × 2), (e) pride in the group (4 items × 2), and (f) views about the role of language and identity (2 items × 2).

Delayed Sentence Repetition Task

A delayed sentence repetition task was used to elicit L2 speakers' pronunciation of QF-specific speech features. The task, used in prior research to measure L2 segmental (Darcy, et al., 2014, 2016; Flege et al., 1995; Mora & Darcy, 2017) and suprasegmental (Guion et al., 2000; Trofimovich & Baker, 2006) accuracy, was chosen because it allows for a direct comparison of participants' production of the target features, in the sense that every participant has the opportunity to produce all target features, yielding a full dataset. A more ecologically valid technique, such as a conversational task (e.g., French & Beaulieu, 2016; Lybeck, 2002) or a sociolinguistic interview (e.g., Labov, 1972; Meyerhoff, 2016), may have limited the number of possible occurrences of the target features and may have resulted in variability among participants in the quality and quantity of their output (Thomas, 2002). Unlike reading tasks (e.g., Flege et al., 1995), where the use of orthography, particularly for congruent writing systems across such languages as Spanish and French, may influence pronunciation outcomes (Koda, 2005), repetition tasks also offer the advantage of eliciting fluent speech (Léon, 2007) without relying on participants' reading ability (Trofimovich & Baker, 2006) or decoding skills (Woore, 2018). Finally, in a delayed repetition task, participants' performance does not seem to depend on individual differences such as attention control and phonological short-term memory (Mora & Darcy, 2017).

The four target speech features for this task were selected among those that most clearly characterize QF (Blondeau & Friesner, 2014; Ostiguy & Tousignant, 2008; Reinke & Ostiguy, 2016; Remysen, 2014). Three of these features, all highly frequent and socially unstigmatized among QF speakers, included (a) affrication of /t/ and /d/ (before /i/ and /y/), (b) high lax vowels in closed syllables (except before /r/, /v/, /z/, and /ʒ/), and (c) nasals (the opposition of /œ̃/ and

/ɛ̃/, and the anterior nasal vowel) (see Appendix E). Despite being stigmatized due to their greater use among working class Montréalers, diphthongs are also a typical feature of QF spoken in Montréal (Friesner, 2010). For instance, MacKenzie and Sankoff (2010) explored 12 French speakers' use of diphthongs over a 24-year span (in 1971, 1984, and 1995), highlighting the speakers' stability in the quantity and quality of the diphthongs they produced as they aged. In contrast, in Latin American Spanish, diphthongs are favored by speakers under the age of 35 with university education (Díaz-Campos et al., 2018). Therefore, to examine whether the participants included this informal feature of QF into their L2 French speech, QF diphthongs were added as the final target feature.

The materials for the repetition task included 20 prompt–response utterances (a question and a declarative sentence): four practice items (two with and two without QF target features), eight target sentences (each containing two QF features), and eight distracters (with no target feature) (Appendix E). The sentences featured only frequent lexical items (e.g., *chat*, *parents*, *bananes*, *mercredi*) (see Table 3.1 for sample items) to ensure that the participants knew all target vocabulary (Trofimovich et al., 2007). The eight target sentences (with two QF features in each), included an equal number of occurrences of affrication, high lax vowels, nasal vowels, and diphthongs (four per feature). To avoid mimicry and encourage repetition, a 3-second delay was introduced between the prompt (the question) and the participant's repetition of the response (Trofimovich & Baker, 2006).

Table 3.1 *Sample Stimulus Sentences Used in the Delayed Sentence Repetition Task for Each Speech Feature*

Question (prompt)	Answer (response)	QF feature	Target production
Pourquoi est-elle déçue?	*Parce qu'elle a per**du** son cellu**laire**.*	Affrication	[pɛʁdᶻy]
		Diphthong	[sɛlylaɛʁ]

Est-ce que le bébé peut en manger?	*Oui, elle **mâche** bien les ali**ments**.*	Diphthong	[mawʃ]
		Nasal	[alimã]
Comment as-tu reconnu ce garçon?	*Il est plus gr**and** que ma **fille**.*	Nasal	[gʁã]
		High lax vowel	[fIj]
Où va-t-elle en voyage cet été?	*Cet été, elle va en É**gyp**te ou en É**thi**opie.*	High lax vowel	[eʒIpt]
		Affrication	[et^{s}jopi]

Speech Recording and Preparation

The two speakers who recorded the stimuli for Study 1 also recorded the materials for this study, including the target, distracter, and practice sentences. The researcher, who met each speaker for an individual recording session, first illustrated each set of prompt–response utterances, specifying the target QF features. The speaker then practiced reading all utterances in a formal QF register and then recorded all materials using a digital voice recorder (VN-8100PC), taking as much time as needed between each utterance. The recordings were then spliced into 40 individual audio files (20 prompt–response utterances × 2 speakers), and the final set was then created by choosing 10 unique items (i.e., questions and responses) from each speaker, ensuring that each speaker's voice was heard an equal number of times but that no item occurred more than once. All items included in the final set were judged by the researcher to include clear, unambiguous instances of all target QF features. For each item, the prompt (question) was played first, followed by a 1-second delay, after which the response (answer) was played. Then, three seconds later, the prompt was given again. After a 3-second silence (to minimize participant mimicry), a chime was played as a sign for the participant to start repeating the response.

Procedure

Before administering the target tasks, the procedure was piloted with two highly proficient speakers of L2 French, one from Argentina (40 years old) and the other from Colombia (34 years old), whose feedback was used to ensure that the quality of the speech samples was adequate, that the instructions were clear, and that no major modifications to the study design were needed. The data for this study were collected as part of Study 1, in the same testing session. After the background questionnaire and the phonemic rating task were completed (Study 1), the participants filled out the acculturation questionnaire and then carried out the delayed sentence repetition task. Because the participants were already familiar with the computer interface used in Study 1, the software programmed in MATLAB (Yao et al., 2013) was adapted, once again, to present the audio files. A digital voice recorder (VN-8100PC) was used to record the participants' speech. The four practice items were presented in the first block to familiarize the participants with the task requirements; they then heard the 16 prompt–response items (eight distracters and eight target items) in a unique randomized order. The instructions (originally in French) were presented as follows:

> "For this task, you will listen to 16 short speech samples from two different women. You will first hear a question immediately followed by an answer to that same question. The question will be repeated, but this time, you will have to repeat the response you heard before, to the best of your ability. There will be an audio signal 3 seconds after you hear the question. This is the moment where you will repeat the response, not before. Once you finish repeating the sentence, you will click 'Suivant' and then 'Jouer' to listen to the next set of questions and answers. You will hear each question twice, and each answer once only. Be sure to be attentive because no more repetitions will be possible."

The participants were invited to take as much time as needed to complete the task. The entire testing session took approximately 90 minutes.

Data Analysis

Preference for QF Features

For the participants' choice of their preferred pronunciation model with respect to the three of the four target QF features (affrication, high lax vowels, and nasal vowels),[1] the rated data in response to the question "Would you like to have this speaker's pronunciation?" from Study 1 were used. These scores showed high reliability (Cronbach's alpha) values within each participant group (*range* = .75–.88) for affrication, high lax vowels, and nasal vowels (Larson-Hall, 2016). The participants' preference ratings were then averaged across all individually rated items for the three relevant features (affrication, high lax vowels, and nasal vowels).

Acculturation

The quantitative responses from the acculturation questionnaire were also checked for internal consistency, separately for each participant group. Because the questionnaire was designed to assess two separate orientations, namely, towards the participants' home culture and the Québec culture, four reliability indexes (Cronbach's alpha) were calculated across the two groups. The participants with experience in the francisation program (.97 and .95) and those without this experience (.95 and .91) showed very high internal consistency in their responses targeting their home and the Québec cultures (see Table 3.2 for a descriptive summary of the participants' responses to the acculturation questionnaire).

[1] Diphthongs were not included as the target in Study 1.

Table 3.2 *Mean Values (Standard Deviations) for Participants' Acculturation by Group*

Culture	Francisation	Range	No francisation	Range
Québec	109.74 (19.53)	59—139	115.22 (14.27)	83—141
Home	106.52 (24.91)	30—143	106.04 (23.06)	54—148

Note. Total score = 153

Next, an exploratory Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with Oblimin rotation was carried out separately for each group targeting the participants' answers from the acculturation questionnaire. No specific number of factors to be extracted was indicated to overcome problems related to multicollinearity (Field, 2013). The goal of the PCA was to ensure that the questionnaire items indeed measured what they were intended to capture, in this case, the participants' acculturation towards their home culture versus the Québec culture. Because the purpose of this analysis was to reduce the dataset to a smaller set of variables, the PCA (with Oblimin rotation) was privileged over a confirmatory factor analysis, which would be most suited for testing a theoretical model (Field, 2013). A preliminary analysis confirmed that the data were factorable, with a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value of .67, which exceeded the threshold of .60 (Hutcheson & Sofroniou, 1999), and with a statistically significant Bartlett's test of sphericity, which confirmed the suitability of the data for a PCA, $\chi^2(528) = 1237.12$, $p < .001$. Based on the examination of the scree plot, only the first four dimensions were retained, explaining 52.37% of the total variance (see Table 3.3).

Table 3.3 *Factor Loadings for 34 Items Using Oblimin Rotation*

Item	Factor 1 Home culture	Factor 2 Affiliation to QF speakers	Factor 3 Social participation in QC culture	Factor 4 Language and identity
Proud to be a member of HC	.82			
Proud to tell people I am a member of HC	.80			
Comfortable interacting with members of HC	.75			
Important stay in touch with members of HC	.71			
Comfortable discussing sensitive topics with members of HC	.71			
Proud to be able to speak the language of HC	.71			
Like to participate in social activities with HC	.68			
Comfortable asking help from members HC	.68			
Speaking the language of HC part of identity	.66			
Easy to interact with members of HC	.65			
Safer to live in neighbourhood with HC	.63			
Participate in activities related to HC	.62			
Proud to see symbols of HC in public	.58			

Safer to live in neighbourhood with QC	.54		
Like to wear symbols of HC	.52		
Wish children have partner from HC	.47		
Easy to interact with members of QC		.68	
Proud to tell people I am a member of QC		.66	
Proud to be a member of QC		.61	
Important to stay in touch with members of QC		.61	
Comfortable interacting with members of QC		.57	
Like to participate in social activities with QC		.54	
Wish children have partner from QC		.48	
Comfortable asking help from members of QC		.46	
Teachers of QC understand children's needs		.43	
Teachers of HC understand children's needs			.56
Comfortable discussing sensitive topics with members of QC			–.48
Participate in activities related to QC			.47
Proud to see symbols of QC in public			.45
Like to wear symbols of QC			.42

Need to speak HC language to identify with members of HC	.48
Proud to be able to speak French	.44
Speaking French is part of my identity	.43
Need to speak French to identify with members of QC	.43

Note. All eigenvalues > 1. HC = Home culture, QC = Québec culture

Accounting for 26.25% of the variance, the questions that loaded onto Factor 1, labeled "Home culture," included 16 items: 15 of the 17 items targeting the home culture, plus one item initially designed to focus on the Québec culture. However, it appeared that this item targeting the participants' feeling of security living in a neighbourhood surrounded by the Québécois was rather measuring their affiliation to the home group. With a mean score of 7.03 (on a 9-point scale), the participants expressed the desire not to live among Latin Americans, which is unsurprising given that there is no Latino neighborhood in Montréal (García Lopez, 2003).

Loading onto Factor 2, labeled "Affiliation to Québec French speakers," the nine items that explained an additional 12.95% of the total variance all described the participants' beliefs and feelings about QF speakers, with items targeting desire, comfort, and perceived ease of interaction with QF speakers. The five items loading onto Factor 3, labelled "Social participation in Québec culture," with 7.09% of variance explained, all targeted actions (e.g., wearing symbols, participating in cultural activities, discussing sensitive topics) rather than feelings or beliefs about the Québec culture. It is noteworthy that discussing sensitive topics with QF speakers had a negative association with this factor, suggesting that the participants may have felt reluctant to invest emotionally in their interaction with QF speakers.

Finally, explaining 6.09% of the variance, the four remaining items loaded on Factor 4, labeled "Language and identity." These items focused on the participants' pride in being able to use French and to claim it as part of their identity and on their need to speak the language to claim membership in a cultural group. For all subsequent analyses, a single score per factor was derived using the Anderson-Rubin method suitable for obtaining noncorrelated factor values.

Production of QF Features

Following previous studies employing a delayed repetition task (Darcy et al., 2016), analysis of the participants' production involved perceptual judgments by raters. The raters included two native QF speakers: an L2 French teacher who obtained an MA in linguistics and a PhD candidate specializing in forensic phonetics. The raters were first familiarized with the task and sample productions (using participant recordings of the practice items) and then instructed to listen to each recorded token, focusing on the target QF features only (affrication, lax vowels, nasals vowels, and diphthongs). The raters, who worked independently, scored each participant's productions using a binary scoring method, assigning a score of 0 if they did not detect the presence of a QF feature and a score of 1 if they clearly perceived that feature. In some cases (42 out of 928 productions), the participants repeated the wrong lexical item in place of the word containing the target feature, especially for words containing a diphthong. For example, in the sentence *Lundi, nous irons à la pêche* ("On Monday, we will go fishing"), 11 participants heard (and thus repeated) the word *plage* ("beach") instead of *pêche*. Following a conservative approach to scoring, the participants who made such errors received a score of 0 for the relevant QF feature. The production measure was defined as the frequency with which each participant produced the target QF feature, expressed as a proportion out of the total number of opportunities (4 × 4 features).

An inter-rater reliability analysis (Cohen's kappa) was carried out using the scores provided by Rater 1 (the researcher) and Rater 2, separately for each of the four features: affrication ($\kappa = .36$), lax vowels ($\kappa = .04$), nasal vowels ($\kappa = .20$), and diphthongs ($\kappa = .16$). Because the raters showed high divergence in their ratings (Landis & Koch, 1977), a third rater with a similar linguistic and academic background was recruited. Once again, the strength of

agreement between the third rater and each of the original two raters varied substantially (see Table 3.4). Therefore, to ensure the most rating consistency possible, an average score was calculated per target feature across the two raters (out of the three) that showed the strongest agreement (see the retained values in bold in Table 3.4). The final production scores for each participant included four frequency ratios, one for each of the four QF features.

Table 3.4 *Rater Consistency (Cohen's κ) in the Repetition Task by Rater and Speech Feature*

		Rater 1				Rater 3			
		AFF	LAX	NAS	DIPH	AFF	LAX	NAS	DIPH
Rater 1	AFF	1.00				**.44**			
	LAX		1.00				**.71**		
	NAS			1.00				.30	
	DIPH				1.00				**.75**
Rater 2	AFF	.36				.43			
	LAX		.04				.11		
	NAS			.20				**.45**	
	DIPH				.16				.09

Note. AFF = affrication, LAX = lax vowels, NAS = nasal vowels, DIPH = diphthongs.

Results

Production of QF Features

The participants' production scores were submitted to a two-way ANOVA with group (with vs. without francisation) as a between-participants factor and speech feature (affrication, lax vowels, nasal vowels, and diphthongs) as a within-participants factor (see Table 3.5 for descriptive statistics). These ANOVAs yielded no significant group-based main or interaction

effects for any of the four features ($p > .066$), which suggested that the participants with experience in Québec's francisation program received similar production scores to those with no formal language instruction in Québec. However, there was a significant main effect for speech feature, $F(3, 168) = 15.87$, $p < .001$, $\eta_\rho^2 = .22$, with lax vowels produced more frequently than affrication ($p = .027$), nasals ($p < .001$), and diphthongs ($p < .001$), as well as affrication produced more often than diphthongs ($p = .003$), irrespective of the participant group.

Table 3.5 *Mean (Standard Deviations) Production Rates (Percent) for QF Features by Group*

Phonetic feature	Francisation ($n = 31$)	No francisation ($n = 27$)	Total ($n = 58$)
Affrication	26.61 (37.05)	21.30 (24.71)	24.14 (31.75)
Diphthong	11.29 (20.25)	8.33 (15.50)	9.91 (18.10)
Lax vowel	44.35 (28.66)	31.48 (29.90)	38.36 (29.70)
Nasal vowel	24.19 (30.61)	9.26 (2.50)	17.24 (27.39)

Relationships Between Acculturation and Preference for and Production of QF Features

To explore possible relationships between the three sets of measures, Pearson correlations were performed separately for the participants with experience in the francisation program (Table 3.6) and those without this experience (Table 3.7), in recognition of several nontrivial differences obtained between these groups in Study 1. For the participants with experience in the francisation program, a medium strength relationship (Plonsky & Oswald, 2014) was found between their desire to adopt affrication in their own pronunciation and their actual production of that same feature ($r = .40$). In addition, there was a positive relationship, also medium in strength (Plonsky & Oswald, 2014), between these participants' production of affrication and diphthongs ($r = .51$), suggesting that the use of these two QF features might develop in parallel, rather than independently, for those who experienced the francisation program.

Table 3.6 *Pearson Correlations Between Preference, Production, and Acculturation for Participants with Experience in the Francisation Program*

		Production				Acculturation			
		AFF	LAX	NAS	DIPH	F1	F2	F3	F4
Preference	AFF	.40*	–.01	.30	–.28	.23	.17	–.15	.05
	LAX	–.18	.07	.10	–.13	.12	.11	–.10	.05
	NAS	–.31	.20	.35	–.28	.16	.16	–.10	–.22
	/R/	–.02	–.13	–.06	–.02	–.07	.11	–.24	.01
Production	AFF	1.00	.28	.15	.51**	–.30	.08	–.26	.03
	LAX		1.00	.29	.26	–.07	–.01	–.26	.11
	NAS			1.00	.05	–.21	.07	–.20	.30
	DIPH				1.00	–.20	.21	–.28	.01

Note. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, AFF = affrication, LAX = lax vowels, NAS = nasal vowels, /R/ = apical /r/, DIPH = diphthongs, F1 = Home culture, F2 = Québec culture, F3 = Social participation in Québec culture, F4 = Language and identity.

As for the participants with no francisation experience, there were several notable relationships, largely involving their production of affrication. The production of affrication was associated not only with the participants' preference for this feature ($r = .56$), but also with their preference for lax vowels ($r = .44$) and nasal vowels ($r = .40$), and their production of lax vowels ($r = .40$) and nasal vowels ($r = .44$), with all relationships being moderate in strength (Plonsky & Oswald, 2014). Here again, the preference for a feature and its production frequency appeared to co-depend on each other and to be linked to other features, suggesting that the participants' preference for and their production of specific speech features characterizing a language variety

might develop in parallel. Finally, for the participants with no experience in the francisation program, their production of affrication was related to their social participation in the Québec culture (r = .40), which pertained to using cultural symbols and participating in cultural activities but also feeling less comfortable discussing sensitive topics (Factor 3). Put differently, a more active participation in Québec's culture, but likely without a heavy emotional investment, appeared to be linked to a more frequent use of affrication.

Table 3.7 *Pearson Correlations Between Preference, Production, and Acculturation for Participants Without Experience in the Francisation Program*

		Production				Acculturation			
		AFF	LAX	NAS	DIPH	F1	F2	F3	F4
Preference	AFF	.56**	.10	.26	.04	–.01	.15	.33	.01
	LAX	.44*	.10	.08	.16	.07	.06	–.14	–.01
	NAS	.40*	.07	.12	.13	–.11	.01	–.22	.03
	/R/	–.32	–.04	–.07	–.24	–.21	.01	.36	–.21
Production	AFF	1.00	.40*	.44*	.34	.15	.09	.40*	.23
	LAX		1.00	.51**	.04	.04	.08	.30	–.01
	NAS			1.00	.12	.06	.06	.16	–.18
	DIPH				1.00	–.19	–.01	–.35	.25

Note. *p < .05, **p < .01, AFF = affrication, LAX = lax vowels, NAS = nasal vowels, /R/ = apical /r/, DIPH = diphthongs, F1 = Home culture, F2 = Québec culture, F3 = Social participation in Québec culture, F4 = Language and identity.

Discussion

The present study examined the relationships between L2 speakers' acculturation and their preference for and their use of specific QF features (affrication, diphthongs, lax and nasal vowels), as a function of L2 speakers' learning context (with or without experience in Québec's francisation program). In the repetition task, affrication was produced more often than diphthongs, although lax vowels appeared to be the most frequently produced feature, irrespective of the group. A stronger preference for affrication was associated with its greater use, which was a relationship obtained for all speakers, regardless of their instructional experience. However, further differences emerged between the speakers with and without the francisation experience. For those who attended Québec's francisation program, their production of affrication was related to their production of diphthongs, while for those without experience in this program, their production of affrication was related to their preference for and production of nasal and lax vowels, and was also positively associated with the extent to which they participated in the Québec culture.

Production of QF Features

In this study, L2 speakers produced significantly more lax vowels than any of the other targeted QF features and produced affrication more frequently than diphthongs. These results are unsurprising because lax vowels appear frequently in both formal and informal registers in QF (Bigot & Papen, 2013; Reinke & Ostiguy, 2016). The use of lax vowels is also a strong phonetic cue, after affrication, used by listeners to identity QF speakers (Brasseur, 2009). In addition to their saliency and unstigmatized use, lax vowels may also be perceived as phonetically easier for Spanish speakers because their production implies only a single change in the quality of the vowel (tense vs. lax). In comparison, the realization of affrication may seem more difficult to

Spanish speakers because it involves a complex phonetic configuration, that is, a successive combination of an obstruction (/t/ and /d/) and a constriction (/s/ and /z/) (Martin, 2004). Nevertheless, affrication remains the strongest marker of QF due to its high lexical frequency, neutral social status, and extensive use in formal contexts, such as Québec's French-speaking media (Bigot & Papen, 2013; Brasseur, 2009; Chalier, 2019; Reinke, 2000). It was not surprising, then, to find greater production frequencies of affrication than diphthongs in the repetition task.

Among the speech features targeted in this study, diphthongs are the only one present in Spanish speakers' phonemic repertoire, and its use (mainly by speakers with a higher education level) is associated with prestige among Latin Americans (Díaz-Campos et al., 2018). In French, however, the stigmatization of diphthongs (mostly in Montréal French) has not prevented QF speakers from maintaining the use of diphthongs in their informal speech (MacKenzie & Sankoff, 2010), despite the association of this feature with a speaker's lower socioeconomic standing (Friesner, 2010). Assuming that the L2 speakers only had the opportunity to interact with one homogeneous group of QF speakers, or that they were able to engage in (limited) communication with a variety of speakers from different socioeconomic groups, it can be hypothesized that a lower frequency of diphthongization in their input has reduced their chances of producing it. Another reason for the obtained lower frequency of diphthong production by the L2 speakers—irrespective of their participation in Québec's francisation program—may be related to their pattern of lexical confusions. These included repetitions of unintended lexical items, such as *mange* for *mâche* and *plage* for *pêche*, with the final consonant /ʒ/ affecting vowel length rather than its quality (diphthongization). Barring potential methodological explanations,

the greater production frequency of affrication over diphthongs thus likely mirrors the frequency of the QF features most commonly encountered by L2 speakers in their input.

Effect of the Francisation Experience

The two L2 speaker groups differed in several respects. First, for the speakers with experience in the francisation program, their production of affrication was associated with their production of diphthongs. One explanation for these results may be related to the speech features used by language teachers. While it is well known that teachers of French in Québec tend to prefer FF over QF (French & Beaulieu, 2016; Jebali & Bigot, 2011; Piechowiak, 2009), it is less clear, however, which specific QF features teachers judge negatively and thus avoid using. As a strong marker of QF, affrication might not be used as frequently in the classroom due to teachers' awareness of its *québécitude*. It would be reasonable to assume that diphthongs are also disfavoured by teachers because this feature is stigmatized in QF (Friesner, 2010). As a consequence, the L2 speakers might have regarded both affrication and diphthongs as less prestigious and may have preferred to adopt their teachers' pronunciation (Dalton-Puffer et al., 1997; Ladegaard, 1998; Ladegaard & Sachdev, 2006; Mompeán González, 2004).

The L2 speakers who had not experienced the francisation program, on the other hand, appeared to increase their production frequency of affrication jointly with their production of and preference for lax and nasal vowels. These associations between the three most distinctive and unstigmatized features of QF (Bigot & Papen, 2013; Reinke & Ostiguy, 2016) imply that—at least for these L2 speakers—their awareness of these features develops interdependently, as a reflection of the shared sociolinguistic status of these features in QF. To explain what makes the speakers with and without the francisation experience different from each other, it may be hypothesized that those who did not enroll in Québec's francisation program had been exposed

to a wider range of social contexts and different registers through their L2 French experience outside the classroom, compared to those who received instruction through this program. For example, high input variability, in terms of the speech varieties and contexts of their use, has been shown to benefit the perception skills of L2 English speakers from diverse linguistic backgrounds (Bradlow & Pisoni, 1999; Kang & Ahn, 2019). In L2 French as well, high input variability appears to help L2 speakers finetune their sociolinguistic awareness (Baker & Smith, 2010; Beaulieu et al., 2018; Blondeau et al., 2002). In this sense, the L2 speakers without experience in Québec's francisation program might have benefitted from informal language learning, which enhanced their awareness of QF sociophonetics. It would be important to note, though, that the overall production frequencies of the four speech features by both groups were generally low, implying some reticence, lack of enthusiasm, or outright refusal by the speakers to adopt QF pronunciation as part of their identity (Gatbonton et al., 2005; Geeslin & Gudmestad, 2008).

The Use of QF Features and the Construct of Identity

The current analyses of the L2 speakers' acculturation profiles yielded four dimensions that were comparable to those previously reported by Bergeron (2013) and Gatbonton and Trofimovich (2008), and that also aligned with previous research in social psychology, supporting a two-factor structure in the assessment of acculturation (Berry et al., 1989; Testa et al., 2019). More specifically, the factors focusing on the speakers' home culture and the Québec culture allowed for distinguishing between two separate acculturative orientations. However, compared to prior work, the current analyses produced finer-grained results, in that the acculturation items targeting the speakers' feelings of belonging to the target culture (affiliation to QF speakers) and the items assessing their active participation in this culture (participation in

Québec culture) loaded on two separate dimensions. These dimensions were crucial for a more nuanced interpretation of the speakers' production tendencies, because only one of these dimensions (participation in Québec culture) was associated with the speakers' production of affrication, and only for those without the francisation experience.

Findings also revealed the presence of a fourth factor (language and identity) as a separate acculturative dimension, but this dimension was unrelated to any aspect of the L2 speakers' performance. The absence of any measurable relationships involving this dimension implies that the L2 speakers were able to identify with the Québec culture (to whatever degree they desired) without compromising their home ethnolinguistic identity. Just as Chinese speakers of L2 English in Montréal did not feel any threat to the expression of their identity from English speakers (Gatbonton et al., 2005), Latin Americans in Montréal may have similarly developed their QF identity (if they so wished) without jeopardizing their home language and culture.

Although no associations involving the language and identity factor emerged in this dataset, the L2 speakers in this study were clearly sensitive (at least to some extent) to Québec's sociolinguistic reality (Arsenault Morin & Geloso, 2019). For instance, the speakers did show varying preference for and some use of QF-specific features in their speech, and they expressed (through their responses in the background questionnaire) sentiments of varying degrees of strength about the importance of speaking French. From this vantage point, then, the relatively low frequency of these speakers' production of QF-specific speech features appears to reflect their varying levels of sociolinguistic awareness regarding QF rather than their desire to protect their home culture and identity.

A key finding of this study was that the L2 speakers' acculturation towards the L2 community (in terms of their participation in the target culture) was positively associated with

the rate of their production of affrication. This finding supports Schumann's acculturation model (1976, 1986) and also aligns with previous identity research focusing on L2 speakers' pronunciation using holistic measures such as nativeness judgments (Hansen, 1995) and accuracy ratings (Bergeron, 2013; Lybeck, 2002). On the other hand, Waniek-Klimczak (2009)—who found no link between her participants' acculturation and L2 English voice onset time—used acoustic measurements and focused on L2 speakers in a foreign language context, which makes the comparison with listener-based analyses of pronunciation by L2 speakers immersed in the target language environment less straightforward.

Looking more specifically at the relationship between L2 speakers' acculturation and their production of L2 sociophonetic features, this study revealed that L2 proficiency and language learning experience play important roles in L2 pronunciation outcomes. The Hispanic speakers of L2 French in Bergeron's (2013) study, who all shared the same low-intermediate proficiency and the same learning experience in the francisation program, produced very few instances of QF-specific speech features. However, the advanced-level L2 speakers in this study were more likely to have accumulated a greater amount of L2 experience, particularly when their learning experience did not include a government-sponsored language program, and to have internalized some of the features typical of the QF variety.

Most crucially, this experience-based learning was associated with a sense of participation in the Québec culture, but only for the speakers without the francisation experience. For these speakers, greater contact and engagement with the L2 community was connected with the development of positive attitudes towards the target culture (as shown in Study 1) and also with the production of a QF-specific phonetic feature (affrication). Put differently, these speakers may have reached the stage in their language development where they were not only aware of

some of the social meanings conveyed by specific phonetic features (Schmidt, 2018) but they were also readily adopting these features into their pronunciation, as a way of projecting their QF identity. Thus, a combination of positive attitudes towards a speech variety, its speakers, and culture might encourage L2 speakers to increase their interactions with the target community and put more effort into learning (and using) the target variety (Clark & Schfeel, 2010; Drummond, 2012; Laadegard & Sachdev, 2006; Schleef et al., 2011).

Turning to the behavioral, participatory dimension which emerged here as an important factor in L2 speakers' acculturation, especially with respect to their use of affrication, there appeared to be a clear gradation among various activities that contribute to this dimension. For the L2 speakers in this study, their participation in L2 cultural activities and their desire to see and use L2 cultural symbols were associated positively with this acculturative dimension, whereas their comfort in discussing sensitive topics with members of the L2 community was linked to this dimension negatively. This pattern of associations implies a progression in L2 speakers' active engagement with the L2 culture: from being sensitive to cultural symbols and participating in cultural activities, to being comfortable discussing sensitive (emotional or highly affective) topics with members of the L2-speaking community. Indeed, L2 speakers might not be willing or able to communicate in their L2 on sensitive topics until they develop the needed confidence or skills (e.g., in terms of the use of an appropriate register)—something that might only come about through extensive experience and practice. This interpretation provides a potential explanation for the very few instances of theta encountered in prior research focusing on study-abroad learners of L2 Spanish (Geeslin & Gudmestad, 2008; George, 2014; Knouse, 2013; Ringer-Hilfinger, 2012) and for the lack of a relationship between Chinese students' acculturation and their L2 English pronunciation (Jiang et al., 2009). Despite their generally

positive attitudes towards the L2 community, the L2 speakers surveyed in those studies may have needed more than a few months of residence in the target language community to improve their language skills and to engage with that community.

Implications

This study's findings have shown how L2 speakers may benefit from interacting with target language speakers outside the language classroom, suggesting that informal learning has the potential to compensate for the lack of instruction on L2 variation and enhance L2 speakers' participation in the target culture. Bearing in mind that L2 speakers' attitudes towards a single speech feature may develop very early in the learning process (George, 2014), it becomes essential to expose beginner-level learners to L2 sociolinguistic variation in language classrooms so that they can increase their sensitivity to non-stigmatized features, avoid developing stereotypes, and enhance their social competence. On the basis of previous research that successfully integrated French sociolinguistic variation in language curricula (Beaulieu et al., 2018; van Compernolle & Williams, 2012), it is important for the francisation program to first increase French language teachers' awareness of their attitudes towards QF and about potential consequences that these attitudes may have on learners' linguistic and social development. For example, L2 speakers who wish to adopt QF-specific linguistic features in their pronunciation may be limited in their attempts to do so if they are not exposed to QF inside the classroom and if QF is not presented to them as a legitimate variety to learn and use. Thus, teachers' attitudes may prevent L2 speakers from adopting QF-specific pronunciation patterns and from expressing their feeling of belonging to the QF community.

In the same vein, there is a critical need for language materials to reflect the linguistic and social reality of the target environment. However, most L2 French textbooks omit any

mention of Canada as a French-speaking country (Chapelle, 2009) or present this information briefly or superficially, with Québec mentioned as the only province where French is spoken and only in an informal register (Violin-Wigent et al., 2013). Such outright exclusion or misrepresentation also conveys a negative view of not only QF but also of any other varieties of French encountered around the globe. Therefore, it is the responsibility of local specialists to create sociolinguistically appropriate materials so that teachers can be provided with the tools and resources that they need to address sociolinguistic variation in the language classroom and ultimately, to help learners increase their knowledge of the linguistic features typical of a given language variety.

As L2 French speakers become aware of sociolinguistic variation, it would be up to the speakers themselves to decide whether they wish to express their affiliation with the QF-speaking community or, by contrast, to distinguish themselves from this community by using some of the features characterizing another variety (Auger, 2003; Beaulieu et al., 2018; Harvey, 2016). In this sense, positive as well as negative language attitudes—as integral aspects of the development of L2 speakers' sociolinguistic competence—will have considerable impact on their speech perception and production, communicative competence, social interaction, integration and engagement with the target community and, as a result, the construction and expression of their individual and group identities.

Finally, at a methodological level, the results of this study suggest the need for researchers to include a measure of L2 speakers' social participation focusing on their contact, activities, engagement, and behaviours, if researchers wish to gain a better understanding of how acculturation shapes L2 development. The inclusion of these refined acculturative dimensions may potentially explain L2 speakers' often variable pronunciation outcomes and confirm

whether L2 speakers' "being comfortable with" and "open to" engagement with the L2 culture are equivalent in their impact to L2 speakers' actual participation in the L2 culture insofar as the speakers' pronunciation outcomes and expression of their identity are concerned.

Limitations and Future Research

The current study's limitations must be addressed in future work. First and foremost, attaining high inter-rater reliability in the coding of production data was problematic. One potential reason involves the influence of the phonetic environment in which the target speech features occurred in the materials, particularly the presence of continuant consonants following diphthongs (e.g., *mère* and *cellulaire*), which may have misled the raters in their assessment of the participants' productions. Although all three raters were highly experienced linguists, in future work, it would be essential to consider various potential factors that may lead to a decrease in rating consistency. Besides the phonetic environment, such factors might include raters' expertise and training (both in terms of their prior experience and study-specific rater training and calibration), as well as their sensitivity to sociophonetic variation, and attitudes towards specific ethnic groups, and accented speech.

Also, because the production of affrication in the speech of the L2 speakers without the experience in Québec's francisation program was intertwined with their production of other non-stigmatized QF features such as lax and nasal vowels, in future research, more attention should be paid to the linguistic and social factors that may influence L2 speakers' pronunciation development on the whole, as part of their daily language use and engagement with the target community. For example, following a cohort of L2 French speakers longitudinally would shed light on various developmental stages in the acquisition of QF features so that various aspects of L2 phonetic development can be explored together as function of L2 speakers' social and

linguistic profiles. To better understand the relationship between L2 pronunciation and identity, future research should also examine whether L2 speakers are aware of the sociolinguistic weight of some of L2-specific features and whether their speech production actually reflects the identity they choose to express (Babel, 2016).

Conclusion

This study explored the relationship between L2 speakers' acculturative orientations towards their home culture and the L2 culture, and their production of QF-specific phonetic features. All L2 speakers (with and without experience in Québec's francisation program) produced lax vowels more frequently than affrication, nasal vowels, and diphthongs, and showed a medium-strength, positive relationship between their preference for and production of affrication. For the L2 speakers who did not participate in Québec's francisation program, the production frequency of the three non-stigmatized QF features (affrication, lax and nasal vowels) was associated through medium-strength correlations, which suggested that these speakers were developing sociolinguistic awareness of these three features in an interdependent fashion. For the same speakers, the frequency with which they produced affrication in their L2 speech was associated with their degree of participation in the Québec culture. Taken together, these findings highlight the importance of informal learning experiences involving L2 speaker engagement with L2-speaking communities in the development and refinement of L2 sociolinguistic awareness.

Link Between Study 2 and Study 3

A large body of research has shown that both native QF speakers and L2 French speakers express negative attitudes towards the QF variety (e.g., Harvey, 2016; Lambert et al., 1960; Laur, 2014). While political, historical, and cultural reasons have been suggested to explain these stereotypes among native QF speakers, no clear justifications have been provided to account for the origin of L2 speakers' negative attitudes. The findings from Study 1 shed light on the role of the learning context in the creation and maintenance of negative attitudes towards QF. More specifically, Study 1 revealed that the L2 speakers who participated in Québec's francisation program had a greater sensitivity to at least some QF speech features and showed a preference for a different pronunciation model, compared to the group of speakers without experience in the francisation program. These findings could be explained in relation to different language exposure profiles for the speakers who had attended Québec's francisation program and those who did not.

In addition, Study 2 revealed that L2 speakers' social participation in the Québec culture was related to the degree to which they adopted QF-specific phonetic features in their L2 speech. The advanced-level L2 French speakers, particularly those without the experience in the francisation program, appeared to have greater sociolinguistic awareness, showing higher rates of production of affrication with increased participation in cultural activities involving QF speakers. Thus, L2 French speakers' contact and engagement with the L2 community may have the potential to prevent the development of negative attitudes towards QF and increase the likelihood that the speakers might adopt QF-specific pronunciation features in their speech.

However, it still remains unclear when in the learning process L2 French speakers start developing (negative) attitudes towards QF and whether and how these attitudes change over

time. In Québec's rural areas, for example, a growing number of temporary foreign workers is required every year to help local farmers with agricultural work on farms. With no previous exposure to French, these workers face numerous linguistic challenges that greatly differ from those experienced by L2 speakers in large urban cities such as Montréal. Therefore, as a follow-up to Studies 1 and 2, Study 3 presented a longitudinal investigation targeting a group of foreign temporary workers to examine the development of their language attitudes towards QF and their motivations to learn and use L2 French.

Chapter 4. Study 3

Guatemalan Temporary Workers' Attitudes and Motivations Towards Learning French: A Longitudinal Study

Introduction

In July 2017, *La Presse* reported on a protest organized by temporary foreign workers and activists in front of Montréal's St-Joseph Oratory to express their discontent with "rampant abuse" of temporary foreign workers' rights (*La Presse canadienne*, 2017). The protesters denounced foreign workers' unsafe working conditions, their low salary (which is considerably below the government-mandated minimum wage), and the exclusive use of French in all official documentation such as work permits, which often makes it impossible for workers to understand the conditions of their employment. The protesters also expressed their outrage at the death of four foreign workers during their employment in Québec. Among these individuals were César Ariel García García, a 34-year-old Guatemalan whose body was found in the debris of a collapsed dairy farm (Marceau, 2017) and Benjamín Hernández Escareño, from Mexico, who fell off a lawn tractor and was run over (CSST, 2017).

These tragedies resonate with the death of Ivan Guerrero Reyes three years prior. The 29-year-old Mexican drowned while fixing the valve controlling the supply of water on a farm. As a result of this tragedy, the *Commission de la santé et de la sécurité du travail* (CSST), a government body dealing with health and safety of workers in Québec, obligated the employer of the late Mr. Guerrero Reyes to complete renovations, noting in the report that the farm owner, a native speaker of French, did not speak Spanish. This lack of knowledge of the victim's first language (L1) might have contributed to the tragedy: "La barrière linguistique, combinée au

désir du travailleur d'améliorer ses conditions d'habitation, peut avoir influencé la décision de [Ivan Guerrero Reyes] de terminer lui-même les travaux, malgré le fait que l'employeur ne lui ait pas demandé de le faire" [The linguistic barrier, combined with the worker's desire to improve his housing conditions might have influenced Ivan Guerrero Reyes' decision to finish the work, even though the employer did not ask him to do so] (Zapirain, 2015). More recently, the CSST identified, once again, the lack of knowledge of French as the cause of another temporary worker's death: "[l]a mauvaise compréhension du français a contribué à la mort du travailleur guatémaltèque Josué Saloj Miculax" [A lack of comprehension of French has contributed to the death of Guatemalan worker Josué Saloj Miculax] (Morrissette-Beaulieu, 2020).

A language barrier represents an important reason for temporary workers' vulnerability. According to Dalia Gesualdi-Fecteau, a university researcher and expert on labour standards, workers who do not speak or understand the majority language are at an increased risk of getting injured or dying in the workplace (Porter, 2019). In a survey conducted in Ontario, 71% of the surveyed Mexican workers acknowledged that their lack of language skills (in this case, in English) was detrimental to their health (Hennebry et al., 2016). Also in Ontario, close to 80% of the Mexican workers participating in another survey showed positive attitudes towards learning English as a second language (L2) during their stay (Hennebry, 2012). However, it remains unknown whether this interest in L2 learning is generally related to workers' health and wellbeing or whether the specific living and working conditions of the surveyed workers contributed to their favorable attitudes towards the local language.

Workers' employment conditions tend to vary considerably according to the location and the nature of the work, such as picking fruits and vegetables or working on dairy farms (Perry, 2018). In this sense, it is unclear whether workers' positive attitudes towards L2 learning would

also be found for those employed in Québec, where French is the majority language and often the only language of communication outside Montréal (Bourhis & Sioufi, 2017). Similarly unclear is how the learning of the majority language by temporary workers is related to their living and working conditions. The goal of this longitudinal study was therefore to contribute to a better understanding of these issues by examining foreign workers' attitudes towards L2 learning and use during their stay in rural French-speaking areas of Québec. This study's specific objective was to investigate the development of dairy farm workers' attitudes and motivations to learn and use L2 French, as a function of the social context in which they reside and work.

Development and Change of Language Attitudes

With its origins in sociolinguistics (e.g., Labov, 1972) and social psychology (e.g., Lambert et al., 1960), research on language attitudes has established (among other findings) that people develop attitudes about others through social interaction, relying on a variety of cues (e.g., about a person's age, ethnicity, and perceived nationality), and that language often plays a critical role in attributing (often negative) characteristics to a speaker (e.g., Gallois & Callan, 1981; Rakic et al., 2011). Although one language is not inherently more aesthetically superior to another (Giles et al., 1974), people often hold strong opinions about language learning and use, including which language or language variety has a higher status, who should be speaking a language or its variety, and how a language or a variety should be used. Other reasons for the development and proliferation of language-focused attitudes include colonialism (e.g., imposition of French as the institutional language in North Africa), language policies (e.g., *Charter of the French Language* mandating the use of French in the public domain in Québec), globalization (e.g., use of English as a lingua franca), media (e.g., portrayal of villains as members of specific ethnolinguistic groups), new technologies (e.g., fake news about

ethnolinguistic groups on social media platforms), cultural norms (e.g., French portrayed as a language of prestige), social networks (e.g., friends and family sharing stereotypes), intergroup dynamics (e.g., youth cultures propagating attitudes), work dynamics (e.g., use of the employer's language), and education system (e.g., language ideologies propagated through instructional materials), among others (Giles & Watson, 2013).

As indirect predictors of L2 speakers' behaviours and attainment, language attitudes also appear to be dynamic (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2002). For example, over a 10-month stay in France, American students developed negative attitudes about learning French based on the ideologically divisive discourse surrounding the 2003 war in Iraq (Kinginger, 2008). As a consequence, most felt excluded from the L2 community and lost their motivation to use French after returning home. Another group of American students in France showed a U-shaped attitudinal curve, with a pronounced decrease in their attitudes towards L2 French by the middle of their 13-week sojourn (Diao et al., 2011). Students attributed negative comments to their limited interactions with the host family, their feeling of being excluded from conversations, and their struggle to understand the locals (see also Isabelli-García, 2006). A study conducted among international students in China showed an increase in students' attitudes towards the Chinese culture and towards learning foreign languages over a 9-month stay. These students' attitudinal reactions, loading onto the concept of integrativeness in a statistical analysis, emerged as the best predictor of their L2 proficiency (Yu, 2010). In sum, whether findings from previous studies showed an increase or a decrease in L2 speakers' attitudes (measured over weeks or months in an L2 environment), social factors such as personal ideologies, cultural differences, and social participation appear to be crucial in determining L2 speakers' attitudes, their motivation, and their integration into the L2 community.

Language Attitudes and Motivation in Language Learning

According to Gardner's (1985, 2010) Socioeducational Model (SEM), the role of motivation in language achievement can be understood as a socially embedded interaction between a person's language aptitude and motivation. Social context has a critical role in this model, in that context influences L2 speakers' attitudes and beliefs about the learning situation (e.g., language teachers and coursework) as well as about the target language, culture, and its speakers more generally. In a favourable sociocultural context, L2 speakers would be expected to show positive attitudes towards the learning situation and be receptive to language input from the environment, for example, from teachers or speakers of the target language. In such circumstances, L2 speakers are expected to increase their desire to identify with the L2 culture and eventually to integrate into it, adopting its cultural and linguistic values, which would facilitate L2 achievement. On the other hand, in an unfavourable social environment, L2 speakers would develop negative opinions about the learning situation (e.g., teachers, instructional materials, approaches) and about the target language and the community as a whole. In the absence of the integrativeness component, input would be limited, which would reduce the extent of L2 attainment. In sum, according to the SEM, positive attitudes towards the learning situation, coupled with an integrative orientation towards the target culture, facilitate L2 speakers' cultural contact and ultimately the learning and use of the target language.

In the past 60 years, the SEM has been used extensively to predict and explain linguistic outcomes (e.g., L2 achievement) and various sociocognitive and affective variables (e.g., attitudes, identity, emotions) in various instructed contexts of language learning (Al-Hoorie & MacIntyre, 2020). For instance, the SEM has been used to examine the links between teachers' methods and L2 English students' motivation and language achievement in formal language

classrooms in Spain (Bernaus & Gardner, 2008; Bernaus et al., 2009). The model has also been applied to explain how instructors' positive attitudes towards the host community and their employment context benefit their students' L2 English development (Masgoret, 2006). In immersion programs in the US and Australia, the SEM has also been used to describe relationships between speakers' attitudes and motivation, their L2 anxiety, willingness to communicate, and perceived proficiency in L2 English (Hashimoto, 2002; Yu & Shen, 2012). However, instructed settings represent only some contexts where languages are learned and used. For many L2 speakers, including immigrants, refugees, and temporary workers, the task of L2 learning is coupled with specific situational needs, which most frequently include economic and social challenges of gaining access to the labour market and settling in a new social environment (Norton, 1997; Steinbach et al., 2015).

Temporary Foreign Workers and Their Challenges

Temporary foreign workers represent one group of L2 speakers who experience a specific context of language learning and use due to their temporary residence in a place where the target language is spoken natively. In Canada, foreign agricultural workers have been welcomed since 1966 (Perry, 2018), but the official federal program for foreign workers was created only in 1974 (Bélanger & Candiz, 2014). In Québec, a comparable program was established in 1989, in response to diminishing interest from local workers for manual low-paying jobs (Gravel et al., 2014) and agricultural business owners' frustration with their employees (Bélanger & Candiz, 2014; Castracani, 2018). The program, whose goal is to facilitate the process of hiring temporary workers, has been successful. In 2017, the *Fondation des entreprises en recrutement de main-d'œuvre agricole étrangère* (FERME) reported hiring 12,874 workers, mainly from Mexico (52%) and Guatemala (45%) (FERME, 2019), which represented a 15% increase compared to

the previous year. The Montérégie region typically welcomes over half of the total workforce, with approximately 47% of the workers employed by fruit and vegetable farmers and 20% by dairy farmers. While agricultural farmers hire foreign workers (henceforth, seasonal workers) on a seasonal basis (typically from April to October), dairy farmers hire foreign workers (henceforth, temporary workers) all year long for a sojourn of up to one year.

The conditions of foreign agricultural workers from the fruit and vegetables sector in Canada have been the focus of many studies in sociology and ethnography (e.g., Bélanger & Candiz, 2014; Faraday, 2012; Gordon, 2018), international migration (e.g., Hanley et al., 2015; Hennebry, 2012; Robillard et al., 2018; Weiler & McLaughlin, 2019), as well as law and political science (e.g., Basok, 2004; Gayet, 2010; Gesualdi-Fecteau, 2016; Valarezo & Hugues, 2012). Various media, such as TV shows (*La vie saisonnière*, TV5, 2015), magazines (*Urbania*, 2012), and newspapers (e.g., *La Presse*, *La Terre de chez nous*, *Le Devoir*), have also addressed (to various degrees) foreign workers' reality. Regardless of where the research has been conducted—British Columbia (Caxaj & Cohen, 2019), Alberta (Salami et al., 2020), Manitoba (Bryan, 2019), Ontario (Basok, 2014; Hennebry, 2008, 2012; Perry, 2018), or Québec (Bélanger & Candiz, 2014; Gesualdi-Fecteau, 2014)—the findings are consistent, in that they point to "the extreme precarization of the immigrant workforce" (Hennebry & Preibisch, 2010, p. 4), mostly due to foreign workers' undocumented status, substandard living conditions, and lack of access to healthcare and permanent residency.

Unlike typical immigrants on their way to permanent residency or citizenship, foreign agricultural workers are considered "second-class workers" who are denied access to health, economic, psychological, social, and educational services, including language instruction (Robillard et al., 2018, p. 13). Foreign workers are confined to employment with a single,

designated employer, and are frequently forced to comply with all employer demands. It is unsurprising, then, that workers are reticent to raise any issues related to their health as well as their working and living conditions (Basok, 2004; Robillard et al., 2018). Additionally, workers are frequently perceived by members of the local community negatively, labeled as macho, heavy drinkers, and dangerous to women (Hanley et al., 2015). These negative stereotypes also prohibit workers from speaking out (Perry, 2012). Finally, long work hours, geographic isolation, lack of access to transportation, and the "fundamental language barrier" (Hanley et al., 2015, p. 34) also represent restrictions to workers' rights and freedoms and, as a consequence, create obstacles to both social interaction and integration (Hennebry et al., 2016; Perry, 2012, 2018; Robillard et al., 2018).

With respect to linguistic barriers, in Québec, Gayet (2010) condemned the absence of a common language between foreign workers (who speak Spanish) and their employers (who speak French), which is often a real handicap. After many years of participating in the program, some workers develop better comprehension of spoken French—and even some speaking skills—but very few employers make the effort to learn L2 Spanish, with communication frequently reduced to a minimum of giving work orders (Gayet, 2010). Sadly, linguistic barriers are welcomed by some employers (Robillard et al., 2018) because workers cannot easily complain and interact with the locals, which is perceived as a distraction (Gayet, 2010).

To alleviate these concerns, many recommendations have been put forward for foreign workers, including language and cultural training, translation services, language exchanges, and increased support from members of the local community. Others have suggested making books and media available to workers and providing services in Spanish at a local place of worship (Basok, 2004; Hanley et al., 2015; Hennebry, 2012). Despite all these good ideas—many of

which concern the issues of language learning and use—only a single study has specifically examined workers' interest in language learning. Hennebry (2012) reported that close to 71% of the 600 Mexican workers surveyed in Ontario's agricultural farms were in favour of being offered L2 English classes. However, besides a general interest in language learning, workers' actual attitudes and motivations for learning the local language still remain unknown.

The Current Study

Prior research investigating the development of language attitudes has focused mainly on L2 speakers in formal language classrooms or study abroad programs (Bernaus et al., 2009; Diao et al., 2011). While many linguistic programs benefit L2 speakers (including recent immigrants) in urban centers, those residing in rural areas face unique challenges associated with geographical, sociocultural, and psychological barriers to language learning (Steinbach, 2015). Temporary workers in Québec are a perfect example of speakers immersed in the target language environment with very limited linguistic resources. In light of the media reports highlighting linguistic barriers as contributing to foreign workers' death and injury and given little existing research focusing on Québec-based foreign workers, it is crucial to investigate workers' attitudes and motivations for L2 learning. Most of Hennebry's (2012) Mexican participants reported being motivated to learn L2 English, but nothing is known about Québec foreign workers' motivation and attitudes towards learning and using French. Because prior research has predominantly focused on seasonal workers employed in the agricultural sector (Perry, 2018), there is also lack of research targeting the living and working experiences of dairy farm workers. Moreover, there is no longitudinal work targeting these populations of L2 speakers and little focus on a social context through a close, qualitative analysis. Therefore, to address these shortcomings in prior literature, the current longitudinal study documented individual living and working experiences

of Guatemalan dairy farm workers over the entire duration of their work stay in Québec, with the overall aim of addressing the following questions:

1. What are Guatemalan temporary workers' attitudes and motivations towards learning and using L2 French?
2. Do Guatemalan temporary workers' attitudes and motivations change over the duration of their employment?

Method

Participants

To identify potential participants, first, a list of all dairy farmers working in the researcher's hometown (St-Blaise-sur-Richelieu) in Montérégie was created. Then, in March 2017, 11 farmers were contacted by phone to obtain more information about their foreign employees and to inform them of the research goals. Five farmers were expecting workers in that year, for a total of 12 employees (all from Guatemala). One employer did not consent to having his workers contacted, on the grounds that they would be distracted from work by participating in the research. Therefore, the initial sample of participants included 10 foreign temporary workers employed by four farmers. A few days after their expected arrival in Canada, the workers were contacted individually—over the phone or in person according to the information provided by the employer—and were similarly informed about the purpose of this research. As a result, in St-Blaise-sur-Richelieu, six showed interest in participating.

To obtain the maximum number of participants possible, all dairy farmers in the neighbouring municipalities of L'Acadie (4), St-Valentin (7), and Napierville (4) were contacted. Of the 15 farm owners, only eight were hiring foreign workers, for a total of 14 employees. Three declined the invitation to have their employees participate in the research, resulting in a

total of 11 potential participants. After a series of phone calls and visits, six workers showed interest in participating. Considering previous research targeting foreign workers (e.g., Perry, 2018; Robillard et al., 2018), low participation rates were expected because foreign workers feel fearful of and demonstrate low confidence in local residents. In sum, among the 26 dairy farmers contacted in St-Blaise-sur-Richelieu, L'Acadie, St-Valentin, and Napierville in 2017, 13 employed foreign workers (all from Guatemala). Nine gave the researcher permission to get in touch with their 21 employees of which 12 agreed to participate in the project.

The target participants included 12 Guatemalan temporary workers (see Table 4.1), all recruited with permission from their employers. Approximately half were working with Québec dairy farmers for the first time (5), while the remaining returned for a second (1), third (2), fourth (1), fifth (2), or even sixth year (1) with the same employer. All participants were Guatemalan men, aged between 20 and 40 years (M = 30.5)—an age window where foreign workers are believed to perform the best (Gesualdi-Fecteau, 2014). Unlike seasonal workers employed during the agricultural season, the participants had work contracts ranging between four and 12 months (M = 8), depending on the needs of specific farm owners during that year.

Table 4.1 *Temporary Workers' Background Characteristics*

Name	Age	L1	Home residence	Children (range years)	School years	Years in Canada	Contract length (months)
Joni	20	Spanish & Kaqchikel	Chimaltenango	—	12	1	9
Sender	20	Spanish	El Progreso	—	12	1	6
Hernildo	22	Spanish	Jutiapa	2 (1–3)	6	1	12
Walfren	24	Spanish	Jutiapa	1 (2)	12	1	9

Rubén	36	Spanish	Jutiapa	3 (3–10)	6	1	6
Erick	31	Spanish	Jutiapa	3 (1–7)	6	2	7
Mario	38	Spanish	Jutiapa	4 (5–18)	1	3	13
Byron	40	Spanish	Jutiapa	5 (5–19)	3	3	7
Edy	32	Spanish	Zacapa	2 (5–9)	8	4	9
Emilio	27	Spanish	Escuíntla	1 (1)	8	5	8
Juan José	36	Spanish	Jutiapa	5 (4–12)	2	5	7
Julio	40	Kaqchikel	Chimaltenango	3 (3–13)	6	6	4
M	30.5			2	6.8	2.8	8

In Guatemala, temporary worker recruitment is mainly carried out in rural areas to target people with agricultural experience and minimum school education living in conditions of extreme poverty (Gesualdi-Fecteau, 2014). Temporary workers speaking one of Guatemala's 22 Mayan languages as a mother tongue are not uncommon. This was the case for Joni and Julio who had grown up in Chimaltenango, where Kaqchikel is the majority language; both were schooled in Spanish, the country's official language. Other key criteria for acceptance into the program (though not explicitly mentioned by the agency liaison in Guatemala) are the worker's marital status, number of children, and years of schooling. If applicants declare to be married, to have many children, and to have no completed degree, their file has more chances to be accepted because this provides extra guarantees to the Guatemalan and Canadian governments that foreign workers (and their earnings) will return home. Although single men with a college degree and no children (like Joni and Sender) can also be hired, these individuals are frequently referred to their employer directly by a family member or a friend already working in Canada. Joni was

recommended by his brother, while Sender was referred by his friend, Edy, who had been working on the same farm for over three years.

Materials

The data for this study were collected through three questionnaires. The first questionnaire (see Appendix F) is a language background survey (23 questions) targeting the workers' background information (14 items) and work experience in Canada (9 items). The second questionnaire is an adapted version of the Language Contact Profile (Freed et al., 2004), with 10 questions divided into two parts: L1 use (5 items) and L2 use (5 items) (see Appendix G). Finally, to assess the workers' attitudes and motivation, a third questionnaire (see Appendix H) was adapted for this study from the short version of the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery or mini-AMTB (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993). The mini-AMTB, which targets integrativeness (3 items), attitudes towards the learning situation (2 items), motivation (3 items), instrumental orientation (1 item), and language anxiety (2 items), has been used successfully to test the SEM among different populations of L2 speakers, with a focus on their progress in language learning and their sociocultural adaptation to the L2 environment (Baker & MacIntyre, 2000; Bernaus & Gardner, 2008; Bernaus et al., 2009; Masgoret et al., 2001; Yu & Shen, 2012).

The mini-AMTB was first adapted to the L2 French context of Québec, resulting in 11 items targeting various attitudes towards (a) Québécois, (b) learning French, (c) L2 French instructors, (d) L2 French coursework, (e) interest in foreign languages, (f) desire to learn French, (g) the amount of work dedicated to learning French, (h) the importance of learning French for employment, (i) desire to interact with Québécois, and finally, (j) anxiety about L2 French coursework and about using French. Then, to reflect the realities of the participants' living and work conditions, two items were modified to target their attitudes towards their

employer as the main source of L2 input (instead of a French instructor) and their attitudes towards their work colleagues (instead of L2 French coursework), because eight participants were sharing jobs with other Guatemalans. Also, unlike L2 learners in a classroom setting, the workers were not attending any language classes and were not expected to speak French by the end of their work contract, so their anxiety levels towards their L2 use or French coursework were impossible to assess. Therefore, the two anxiety-specific items were rephrased to target (a) their attitudes towards Québécois using English with them (an occasional phenomenon attested by the former Guatemalan worker who helped develop the questionnaire) and (b) their desire to learn French to interact with their employer. Because it was hard to make a clear distinction between the participants' attitudes towards learning French and their desire to learn French, the former item was modified to focus on their opinions about their roommates, on the assumption that the people in the participants' immediate living environment would have an influence on their attitudes. The final adapted version of the mini-AMTB included 11 items (see Table 4.2) targeting (a) attitudes towards the learning situation (3 items), (b) integrativeness (5 items), (c) instrumental orientation (1 item), and (d) motivation (2 items). To obtain finer-grained responses from the participants, each item was presented orally in the form of a question.

Table 4.2 *Adapted Mini-AMTB*

Category	Item
Attitudes towards the learning situation	What opinion do you have of your employer?
	What opinion do you have of your work colleagues?
	What opinion do you have of your roommates?
Integrativeness	What opinion do you have of French-speaking Québécois?

	Is it important for you to learn French to interact with Québécois?
	What opinion do you have of English-speaking Québécois?
	Are you interested in learning foreign languages? Why?
	Is it important for you to learn French to interact with your employer?
Instrumental orientation	Is it important for you to learn French for employment?
Motivation	Are you interested in learning French?
	Do you feel that you are putting efforts in communicating in French?

All study materials, including the consent form, were first translated into Spanish by the researcher (a near-native speaker of Spanish) using simple, non-academic language. Then, materials were verified by a French–Spanish bilingual linguist from Colombia, currently living in Montréal. The verified translations of all materials were later presented to a 44-year-old former Guatemalan temporary worker for feedback, to ensure that the language of the materials, including that of the consent form, was clear and appropriate. After his three-year work experience with the researcher's family in St-Blaise-sur-Richelieu (2012–2015), this individual married a native Québec French speaker and settled in Napierville. Based on the feedback, some terms were adapted to fit Guatemalans' speech variety, as used in rural areas. For example, *jefe* was changed to *patrón* ("boss"), *establo* and *granja* became *finca* ("farm"), and colleagues (*colegas*) and roommates (*compañeros de piso*) were translated as *compañeros de trabajo* and *compañeros de casa*, respectively. Additional adaptations of the materials included wording changes for some questions so that they corresponded more closely to the sociodemographic

questionnaires filled out by temporary workers to obtain or renew their work visa. In addition, information about Guatemala's geography, education system, and ethnic and cultural background was provided to help the researcher in the interpretation of the participants' interview and questionnaire responses. A rich conversation about the pronominal address and verb forms, as used in Guatemala, allowed the researcher to increase her L2 Spanish sociolinguistic awareness and thus to adapt her Spanish to the participants' language variety. After her one-year sojourn in Argentina, the researcher had adopted the use of *vos* (instead of *tú*, "you") for the second person singular; however, the Guatemalan variety of Spanish includes a tri-level address system opposing *vos*, *tú*, and *usted*, whose use is determined by factors such as both the speaker's and the interlocutor's sex, socioeconomic status, education level, age, geographic locale, ethnic affiliation, as well as the nature of their relationship, the context, and the setting (Pinkerton, 1986). Because *vos* is most commonly used among men (mainly of Indigenous origins) with low education level to convey feelings of trust, equality, and solidarity, the researcher was encouraged to maintain its use in the questionnaires and during the interviews.

Procedure

The researcher (a near-native speaker of Spanish with extensive experience as an interpreter among Spanish-speaking workers in rural areas) first contacted each participant over the phone or in person to set an individual appointment outside work hours. All communication between the researcher and each participant was in Spanish. In the absence of public spaces in rural communities, participants were invited to meet the researcher in a work office at her farm home, which was a quiet and safe space. The 12 participants were initially intended to be met three times during their work contract in Québec, according to their availabilities: a few days

after their arrival (Time 1), about halfway through their stay (Time 2), and a few days prior to their departure (Time 3).

As part of the first meeting (Time 1), the researcher explained the purpose of the study, administered the consent form, reviewing the purpose, procedures, risks, and benefits of the project, and answered clarification questions. Taking into consideration issues of trust, accessibility, and literacy, the researcher ensured to the extent possible that each participant understood all details of the consent procedure by going over the form orally, providing examples and ample opportunities for the participant to ask questions. The researcher informed each participant (orally and in writing in the consent form) that his employer would not be told about any information communicated in private and that participation was voluntary.

Individual interviews were structured around the questions from the three target questionnaires: 23 questions in the language background questionnaire, 10 questions in the Language Contact Profile, and 11 questions in the adapted mini-AMTB. Each participant's answers were given orally, with the researcher taking written notes and using a digital recorder (VN-8100PC) to record the interview, which allowed for collecting detailed information about the participant's experiences, attitudes, and perspectives (Duff et al., 2002; Turner, 2010) and facilitated interaction with those who were likely not fully literate and therefore uneasy with filling out written forms. At each meeting, only the researcher and the participant were present to maintain the privacy of the information communicated.

During the second and third meetings (Time 2 and 3), only the 10 questions regarding the participants' L1 and L2 use were asked from the Language Contact Profile but the mini-AMTB was administered in full. The average duration of each interview was 1.5 hours, even though some participants extended the meetings for up to 3–5 hours, unsurprisingly taking advantage of

the opportunity to interact in their native language with a local resident, who served as a source of information for various local issues.

Of the 36 meetings originally planned (12 participants × 3 times), only 28 actually occurred: 12 at Time 1, seven at Time 2, and nine at Time 3. First, two participants (Byron and Hernildo) withdrew from the study (by contacting the researcher over the phone and through a text message, respectively) by the time of the second interview; however, they allowed the researcher to use their initial data for the study. Also, Edy and Sender (who both worked with the same employer) were unable to meet halfway through their stay (early spring for Edy, end of spring for Sender) because they had no days off during several weeks. Similarly, Mario participated only in the first and final interviews due to his extended hospital stay after a surgery, which also reduced his work contract from 24 to 13 months. Finally, three workers left the country before their original departure date. While Erick fell ill, Sender was apprehended by the police while driving during a snowstorm and then appeared before a judge, which resulted in termination of his work opportunities in Canada. Rubén was dismissed by his employer on the grounds that the employer disliked their relationship, which included his communication with Rubén. Sender's and Rubén's third interviews were thus conducted over the phone from Guatemala, not without technical issues. It was impossible to reach Erick for his final interview.

Data Analysis

With the aim of examining Guatemalan temporary workers' personal experiences and potential changes in their attitudes and motivation towards L2 learning and use over time, a qualitative analysis was performed. First, all 28 interviews were transcribed while also documenting participant-specific contextual information relevant to each comment (e.g., hesitations, silences, perceived emotions, use of different tones). The transcriptions were verified

by a female trilingual (Spanish–French–English) translator (originally from Peru), a graduate student in applied linguistics. The information collected from the linguistic background questionnaire during the first meeting was then used to create a profile of the participants' living and work conditions and work experiences in Québec (Time 1), which provided baseline data (Saldaña, 2011). The participants' language use—determined through self-reports on the Language Contact Profile—was tabulated to allow for comparisons between the participants and within each individual across time.

The analysis of the participants' responses to the interview questions involved a thematic coding of individual comments, separately at each testing time, using the main categories targeted by the mini-AMTB. Following Saldaña's (2011) guidelines, both apparent and latent themes were categorized as one or more of the following coding categories, separately at each testing time (T1, T2, and T3): Instrumental Orientation (INS), Integrativeness (INT), Motivation (MOT), Attitudes towards the learning situation (ATT_LS), and Other Comments (OTHER), with an added designation of whether the comment was positive (+) or negative (–).

Several months after verifying the transcripts, the same trilingual translator was first trained on the coding materials, which included examples of each category, and was then asked to recode all interview responses. Inter-coder agreement (simple correlation) reached .82 for INS, .46 for INT, .70 for MOT, .76 for ATT_LS, and .48 for OTHER categories, with all relationships being moderate to large in strength (Plonsky & Oswald, 2014). Most cases of disagreement were due to the second coder's unclear understanding of what the construct of integrativeness entailed (i.e., a person's interest in learning foreign languages may not encompass the desire to learn French and would thus not suggest an orientation towards the L2 French culture). All cases of disagreement were discussed, with both coders reaching full

agreement in each case. The data were then grouped into categories and transferred into a matrix, organized by interview time. Finally, at the interpretation step, the data were thematically consolidated to yield insights into the participants' motivational orientations, attitudes, and language use over time, which were compared and contrasted both within and across the participants to determine the presence of commonalities and variations over time.

Results

Language Use Across Time

The participants' responses to the Language Contact Profile revealed that, for all participants, Spanish was the sole language used at home because they all shared an apartment, a basement, or a house with two or three fellow Guatemalans (see Appendices I and J for summaries of the participants' Spanish and French use). In contrast, the participants' sources of French input appeared to be limited. Rubén, Byron, Juan José, Emilio, and Julio mainly used Spanish to communicate with their employers. Two employers, in particular, had developed sufficient knowledge of Spanish over several years, after taking basic Spanish classes; another relied on his L1 (Italian) to communicate with his employee. Sender, Hernildo, Erick, and Edy were mostly exposed to French at their farms, although Spanish was still used for greetings (e.g., *hola*, "hi") or to refer to work-specific objects or tasks, typically through cognates (e.g., *bebé* to refer to a calf, *alimentación* to describe feeding). Joni reported using a combination of both French and Spanish with his employer. To make himself understood, he tended to use simplified syntax, as in *Joni parla hier por problème vaca* (*Joni parle hier pour problème vache*, "Joni speaks yesterday for problem cow"), along with gestures. Joni's work colleague Walfren described their work language as "[s]omething like a made-up Spanish… improvised… simpler" (Walfren, 24, Year 1, Time 1). All participants were also, to some extent, exposed to French

through (limited) interactions with farm visitors and the employer's family members, except Julio because his employer's family spoke Italian.

During their limited free time, the participants predominantly used Spanish. Half of the workers had access to the internet in their place of residence, so they were able to watch videos and movies in Spanish. The remaining workers watched Guatemalan TV shows and movies via a cable TV network. Although those having access to cable TV were sometimes interested in watching local French-language shows or movies, for most participants, exposure to French in the media involved listening to the radio in a car or in a tractor. Emilio was an exception in that, during his short daily breaks, he enjoyed reading local French-language agriculture magazines left at the farm. One activity that all participants had in common was their daily listening to Spanish-language music.

During their previous work contracts, more experienced workers (Byron, Edy, Emilio, Juan José, and Julio) had made acquaintances with Guatemalan temporary workers in surrounding areas, such as Saint-Rémi, where 80% of Québec's foreign workers are recruited (Halin, 2019). The city offers various Spanish-language services provided by Latin Americans (e.g., at a bank, a restaurant, and a small market). However, because most participants did not have much free time or access to independent transportation or because their employer controlled their mileage, the workers' visits to banks, grocery stores, and restaurants were restricted to the closest facilities in Saint-Jean-sur-Richelieu, where communication was limited to French.

Across time, some changes emerged in the participants' language use, particularly for those staying in Canada during their first work contract. For example, Rubén indicated at Time 2 that some French was necessary when going to a grocery store, mainly at the cash register. Because he was sharing a house with a fellow Guatemalan, it is possible that he had acted as an

observer early in his stay or had not had multiple opportunities to visit grocery stores before his first interview. Similarly, Sender did not use any French outside work because his more experienced housemate Edy was tasked with communication while at a grocery store or a bank. Changes in language use were apparent for Joni, who did not appear to use any French at Time 1 but started interacting in (limited) French at Time 2 with his employer's family and at a local restaurant on Sundays. Both Joni (at Times 2 and 3) and Walfren (at Time 3) increased their use of Spanish, after being introduced to the friends of Joni's brother. They also travelled to St-Rémi monthly to wire money home and eat Latin American food, where Walfren developed a relationship with a local Latin American woman also working in agriculture (Time 2), which provided him with an additional context to use Spanish.

Motivational Orientations Towards Learning and Using French

Attitudes Towards the Learning Situation

At Time 1, all 12 participants responded positively to the three questions targeting their opinion about their employer, their work colleagues, and their roommates. However, they acknowledged some frustration or misunderstanding experienced early on, especially in relation to their employer who (from Rubén's point of view) treated them a bit impatiently, as illustrated in the following quotes:

- "[My boss] seems not to understand. Overall… he has to… he should take more time to explain because he explains things and fffffiu, he is gone. […] I have to be… well… obedient, you know. Age or height, it doesn't matter, right?" (Rubén, 36, Year 1, Time 1)
- "He gets mad when we don't understand things. The first year, yes. Now… Well, [it's] normal since we are new, it's a little difficult." (Julio, 40, Year 6, Time 1)

Instrumental and Integrative Orientations

With the exception of Julio, who admitted to having tried to learn French in his first years but abandoned it because it was too difficult, all participants showed some degree of enthusiasm about learning French at Time 1, for several reasons, both instrumental and integrative in nature. In terms of the usefulness of French for employment, the participants commented without hesitation that speaking French would be a great asset for their work—except Julio, Byron, and Emilio, who had several years of work experience and whose employers had become proficient in Spanish:

- "Yes! Yes! Because that way you can understand the person, what they… what they say to you, you know. Yes, therefore… because that way when someone only speaks French and nothing else, no Spanish, you can't understand the other one." (Rubén, 36, Year 1, Time 1)
- "You try to do the job well. I would do it better if I really knew what he actually wants because there are words that you… you make it, but maybe not the right way." (Edy, 32, Year 4, Time 1)

Regarding the participants' desire to learn French for reasons other than employment, two patterns emerged at Time 1. First, three participants who routinely interacted at work with fellow Guatemalans (Emilio, Joni, and Walfren) mentioned that learning French to socialize with their employer was not a priority:

- "No… only the relationship with my boss, no. It would be for work mostly." (Walfren, 24, Year 1, Time 1)

In contrast, the participants with longer work experience with employers in Québec provided either vague (Byron) or very short and uncertain answers without further elaborating on the topic

(Juan José, Edy, and Rubén). Only Hernildo showed great interest in developing a relationship with his employer to potentially improve his sojourn:

- "Yes! [The job] would be more interesting because I trust him [my boss], we could talk about Canada, the landscapes. Well, get to know things in French… the culture. I would ask him a lot about here!" (Hernildo, 22, Year 1, Time 1)

These responses about learning French should be considered against the backdrop of the participants' general attitudes, which were very positive. At Time 1, all expressed a strong desire to interact with French-speaking Québécois, while commenting (like Mario) that they had not experienced any discrimination or negativity, contrary to their original expectations.

Another important reason for the participants to learn French was to understand law enforcement and medical professionals (e.g., doctors, nurses, police officers, judges)—as expressed by Mario, Rubén, and Sender—for their own safety and that of others:

- "If you're driving and the car breaks down, you can ask for help, talk to someone. In Lacolle, I don't understand anything. How can they help me? Yes it's important but I don't know where to start." (Mario, 38, Year 3, Time 1)

The participants also acknowledged the need to speak French to communicate outside work (e.g., at a grocery store or a restaurant), which they believed could allow them to interact with the locals and strike relationships with people:

- "In my case, my boss speaks Spanish, it's not important. To do the groceries, yes it's important." (Byron, 40, Year 3, Time 1)
- "[If you speak French] you can go to a restaurant. We do so but it's hard. We go to Burger King… it's pretty difficult." (Juan José, 36, Year 5, Time 1)

- "For communication and for the purchases you need, yes, because you need to ask for a price, right? How much is this? Well, there is no way to say it, you know." (Rubén, 36, Year 1, Time 1)
- "We don't go out and we don't interact with anyone. If we could go to Walmart and I could ask questions, and they talk to us, and we get to know people, and it would be important to talk to them. That way, I would force myself to use French with them. Speaking French would be easier to make friends… and having friends would help me learn French." (Hernildo, 22, Year 1, Time 1)

Mental health issues were also addressed by some participants, including Mario, who shared his experience with depression during the first interview:

- "In 2012, I was traumatized because my boss would only drop me home and bye! Yes, and I was desperate there, in my mind… I'm far away. And I suffered from bouts of depression. […] You only go from the *ferma* to home, *ferma* to home, even today it's tough; you feel like you're not important, you feel like the world is lost, your mind is shutting down […] you feel like you were not human." (Mario, 38, Year 3, Time 1)

Similarly, Edy talked about the depression experienced by one of his Guatemalan roommates during the previous year. The depression was brought on by social isolation and lack of language skills. Aware of the dangers of social isolation, Edy took advantage of every opportunity to improve his French—mostly by learning new words from his French-speaking colleagues—because his Mexican colleague (Juan), on whom Edy relied heavily for communication in French, was about to return home:

- "I want to start to make the effort because Juan comes with me and translates it all to me and he doesn't know if he will come back [to Canada]. I have to be prepared for the future if I want to keep travelling; I want to feel better." (Edy, 32, Year 4, Time 1)

Efforts to Learn and Use L2 French

Although the participants generally demonstrated positive attitudes towards their employer, work colleagues (both locals and Guatemalans), and roommates, and reported a favorable opinion about French speakers, their efforts to learn the majority language appeared to be limited. The seven participants with previous work experience in Québec appeared particularly disillusioned and unmotivated to learn French at Time 1, likely because they were aware that their workload, schedule, and employer did not easily allow for the study of French:

- "I went to school, here in St-Jean and Julio [Edy's roommate] was like: 'Did you learn a lot in the two classes you attended?' […] But no… because I saw their face and Mario's [Edy's boss] [when I told them] that I was going to school on Tuesdays and Wednesdays at night, from 7 to 9, or 10… uf! It's like… they look at you like you are only here to work: You have to work, go home, and that's it. Do your job, and I'll do mine." (Edy, 32, Year 4, Time 1)
- "Yes, I'm… I like it and I want to learn, but we work a lot. Since the beginning, I noticed it was important for me, right, being able to learn the language." (Juan José, 36, Year 5, Time 1)

Also, the majority of the experienced workers felt that it was rather their employer's responsibility to learn L2 Spanish, as illustrated here by Erick:

- "It's easier for them to speak Spanish than it is for us to speak French… On one side, yes, there are things that you don't understand […] You can learn it, but they have to explain

it first. You need to be smart, but they also need to explain it." (Erick, 31, Year 2, Time 1)

With respect to their preferred method for learning French, the participants' opinions were split by age—between the four younger workers (20–24 years old) in their first year (except Rubén, 36) and the seven experienced participants (all over 27). The older workers lamented the absence of formal instruction and materials, whereas the younger participants preferred online learning apps:

- "Yes, I downloaded apps where I can translate, but I don't know the pronunciation. As time goes by, I want to learn more. When I have free time or when I want to know a word, or I read something, and I want to know what it is. But I don't understand everything, and I don't know how to write the word." (Walfren, 24, Year 1, Time 1)
- "Yes, I have tried to make the effort, get an objective for every day, an hour or 15 minutes, every day I'm off, sometimes watch let's say… not to watch jokes but to understand them. French seems difficult to me for now." (Hernildo, 22, Year 1, Time 1)

The participants' low motivation to learn L2 French may have also stemmed from their confusion around various registers of spoken French, some of which they may have labeled as "incorrect" because they compared those instances with carefully articulated French as heard outside the workplace (e.g., at the grocery store, at the airport) which seemed more appropriate to them:

- "Some people don't pronounce it correctly. At least I could hear some people, to say 'yes', say 'oui', while others say 'wa.' Some people say it correctly and others who say it like… just like in Spanish, some people speak it correctly and other people don't say the

words correctly, not correctly pronounced. But when it's pronounced correctly, when they pronounce correctly, yes, I like it a lot." (Juan José, 36, Year 5, Time 1)

- "People there [at the airport] speak with a different accent for you, it's much slower when they're talking to you, simple words, at a slow pace, but when they [Edy's bosses and colleagues] start talking… so fast… no way! […] When they're talking among themselves, they speak so fast. I would like to join the conversation, but it's very hard." (Edy, 32, Year 4, Time 1)

Finally, local residents' use of English was an additional reason for the participants' lack of effort to learn French. At Time 1, only those with previous work experience in Québec were able to comment about their exposure to English, mainly at *dépanneurs*, grocery stores, or boutiques in St-Jean-sur-Richelieu (the closest urban area). After several years in Québec, the participants seemed to have realized that English was used by the local residents when communication broke down in French or Spanish. As a result, they tended to consider those who spoke French and English as one homogeneous group of bilinguals representing the local community:

- "Here in Canada they speak English quite a lot because they always ask me: '¿*Parlar* English? ¿French?' A little. Here they're fluent in English and in French; people here are very smart because they have made the effort in learning." (Mario, 38, Year 3, Time 1)

Although no participant felt proficient enough to answer greetings or engage in a conversation in English, 10 workers expressed interest at Time 1 to learn foreign languages, especially English. Their reasons were generally related to enhanced work opportunities in their home country, and learning English was nearly always described in opposition to learning

French, especially by the four youngest participants (Joni, Sender, Hernildo, and Walfren), who also happened to have the least work experience in Québec:

- "I have always been interested in English. It's the language you can hear the most there. Well French is not useful in Guatemala. If I could learn English, you know, it would be… well more job opportunities in foreign companies, traveling… French is not useful in Guatemala." (Joni, 20, Year 1, Time 1)
- "Well… for the area here where I am, French would be better, but it would be great English as well because it's a language that is, like spoken everywhere. Like it's easier with English everywhere than with French. French would be like it's only spoken here where I am while English is spoken where…? In many places where it would be more useful than French […] In Guatemala it would be like easier… like… I would say even better because in many places they ask [for English]." (Sender, 20, Year 1, Time 1)
- "Perfectly, English! For job opportunities in the United States if it happens… and work in the United States and know about the country as well. It would be quite useful in Guatemala. You get better jobs, it pays more. Some companies hire people who speak English in call centers." (Walfren, 24, Year 1, Time 1)

Changes in Attitudes and Motivational Orientations

To examine potential changes in the participants' attitudes and motivation to learn and use L2 French, their responses were examined across the three interview times (except for Byron and Hernildo). Generally speaking, there was a decline in the participants' motivation to learn French, accompanied by an increase in their interest in learning English. As for their stated reasons, two response profiles emerged: one for the participants working with Québec dairy farmers for the first time (n = 4) and the other for those who were repeating their Québec work

experience (n = 6). Because no discernible change was observed for the participants' attitudes towards the learning situation (i.e., their employer, their work colleagues, and their roommates), the following discussion focuses exclusively on their motivational orientations towards learning and using French.

Instrumental and Integrative Orientations

Although all four first-year workers initially considered learning French beneficial for their employment, Joni and Rubén (at Time 2) and Sender and Walfren (at Time 3) later conceded that it was no longer necessary. As they gained work experience, they appeared to have developed their own way of communicating with their employers:

- "If the boss speaks [Spanish] well, it's not necessary. As for us, we learn while listening to Martin's language." (Joni, 20, Year 1, Time 2)
- "Yes, actually… I was able to manage by myself. After Edy was gone, I was already trying… sometimes I struggled because I still didn't know that much but after I learned my job well and I caught the rhythm and everything, I didn't need it anymore." (Sender, 20, Year 1, Time 3)

As for the participants' attitudes towards French and English speakers and their interest in interacting with Québécois and their employer outside the workplace, only the four first-time workers demonstrated change over time. After a few months of getting used to their work routine (Time 2), Joni, Walfren, Sender, and Rubén provided reasons for learning French that were similar to those expressed by the more experienced workers (from Time 1 to 3): to socialize with the locals, make friends, interact with a girlfriend's family and various people in public spaces. In addition, for Sender, learning French was a way of asserting his labour rights and a means to understanding his work conditions and compensation. Finally, at Time 3 (nine months into his

contract), Joni expressed a desire to interact more frequently with his employer outside work; unfortunately for him, he was not invited to come back the following year.

Efforts to Learn and Use L2 French

Despite their generally positive disposition towards French, the participants' stated efforts to learn French appeared to decrease across their stay in Québec. The more experienced workers provided similar reasons across Times 1 through 3, with the majority citing heavy workload and absence of free time, lack of learning materials and formal education opportunities, as well as some negative attitudes towards French:

- "Marcus [Juan José's boss] had a dictionary that I used only during my first two years; I would look anything in the dictionary and he would show me or teach me, but it was difficult because the dictionary was from French to Spanish and not Spanish to French. (Juan José, 36, Year 5, Time 2)
- "French is only spoken here, it's not useful there [in Guatemala]." (Erick, 31, Year 2, Time 2)

Relatively early in their stay (at Time 2), all four first-year participants stated that it was their employer's responsibility to acquire Spanish, not the other way around:

- "We both need to learn the language of the other one, but more the boss because he's the one who is hiring, and he knows we speak Spanish. He needs to try; I won't understand what he's going to tell me. It would rather be him because he's the one who is hiring." (Walfren, 24, Year 1, Time 2)

Just a few months into their contract (three months for Joni, nine months for Walfren), the first-time workers also commented on how limited they felt by using only online apps to learn French. One reason for this (negative) change may be related to the first-year participants' growing

sensitivity to sociolinguistic variation, such that they likely became overwhelmed by the complexity of French as spoken by different speakers, in different registers, and across various genres (e.g., music, news reporting, television programming, interpersonal communication):

- "When I listen to music in French, I notice there are words that change; French, there is different ways to speak it. It's different the way they speak it, they use another accent to say things. The "r", they pronounce it… I don't know, something like deeper." (Joni, 20, Year 1, Time 2)
- "I've tried with YouTube and with apps; they say the alphabet and they say how to pronounce each letter, then you repeat. Yes, I've tried doing it, but after an hour I got bored." (Joni, 20, Year 1, Time 3)
- "Recently, yes, I got motivated, but on Internet you can only hear the French accent. The accent is not the same." (Walfren, 24, Year 1, Time 3)

Finally, the participants' efforts to learn and use French decreased as their interest in learning L2 English improved. Approximately 2–4 months into their work stay (at Time 2), the first-year workers expressed strong opinions about Québec French being different from French from France, and having a more complex phonology than English, the language of future economic opportunities. Based on their limited social interaction with the local community, the participants also misconstrued the local community as being bilingual. These perceptions, which were expressed unhesitatingly, appeared to be robust:

- "Yes! English! They say English is spoken everywhere. […] But I understand if it's French or English. I understand if it's French from here or from France, well it's very different how they say the words. You can hear women who speak French differently, you hear it's not the same." (Joni, 20, Year 1, Time 2)

- "You know, [French] is very complicated for the accent you are doing (imitates the French "r"). You get tangled up like that. Also, it's complicated because you need to speak with that "r" and things like that. […] To know the language helps getting a job… there. If you know English, yes, because it's like… it's like a universal language that is spoken everywhere." (Sender, 20, Year 1, Time 3)

In sum, although early on in their stay the participants were motivated to learn French, often through online apps, their motivation declined as they faced long work hours, got accustomed to communicating with their employer, and experienced few opportunities to use French outside work. Similar to their more experienced counterparts, the less experienced workers showed increased interest in learning English while expressing some negative attitudes about French.

Discussion

This study sought to examine longitudinal development in temporary dairy farm workers' attitudes and motivations towards learning and using L2 French. The participants appeared to express consistent and positive attitudes towards their employer, work colleagues, and roommates. They also showed stable positive interest in socializing with French and English speakers, whom they imagined to be bilingual, and with their employer outside work hours, except those who worked with other temporary workers. The participants' interest in L2 learning, especially learning English, was most apparent among the four youngest workers, and this desire appeared to strengthen with time, to the detriment of learning French. Regarding their orientation towards learning French for employment purposes, most participants were convinced that speaking French would be an asset, except for Julio, Byron, and Emilio. The younger participants, however, became increasingly less convinced over time in the value of learning French. Finally, the motivation to learn and use French was particularly high among the first-

time workers at Time 1, though their motivation decreased by Time 3. Similarly, the participants' stated efforts to learn and use French appeared to diminish by Time 2, mainly due to lack of time, perceived inadequacy of online materials, and perceived discrepancy between the French variety heard inside and outside their work environment.

Attitudes Towards L2 French

Attitudes Towards the Learning Context

An optimal L2 sociocultural environment is said to first enhance L2 speakers' positive attitudes towards the learning situation and openness to L2 input which are followed by increased desire to identify as members of the target community (Gardner, 1985, 2010). The Guatemalan workers who participated in this study indeed showed positive attitudes towards their employer, work colleagues, and roommates across all observation times. Because attitudes towards a learning context are an important factor in determining L2 speakers' eventual achievement (e.g., Bernaus et al., 2009), it appears that the workers perceived their learning environment as generally pleasant and potentially conducive to L2 learning. This finding extends previous work on attitudes (carried out within Gardner's SEM) in instructed contexts, where L2 speakers' attitudes were explored in relation to language teachers' instructional approaches (Bernaus & Gardner, 2008; Bernaus et al., 2009; Masgoret, 2006). However, it is important to acknowledge that the workers may not have shared their actual feelings about their work and living environments or any potentially conflictual situations, knowing that the project also included communication with their employers and interviews with other Guatemalan participants such as their roommates and work colleagues.

Attitudes Towards Language and Language Learning

The workers also appeared open to interacting with both French and English speakers, a finding which was consistent across time. Their overall limited contact with the locals may explain why they tended to perceive local residents as French–English bilinguals. This lack of full awareness of the local sociolinguistic context may have contributed to the workers' interest in enhancing their links with the local community. However, it is unclear to what degree the workers actually engaged in social interaction locally. The workers did not seem to socialize with their employers outside work hours; instead, the workers tended to interact exclusively with fellow Guatemalans, especially if they lived or worked in close proximity to them. After a certain amount of work experience in Québec, the workers may have accepted that their relationships with employers were strictly professional and that opportunities to socialize or to develop social relationships were to be found exclusively outside work. Because there are thousands of Latin American men placed on wait lists for work opportunities in Québec, the workers likely appreciated the unique opportunity they had been offered, aware that any negative information (however small) may have provided their employers with a motive to interrupt their contract and limit their access to future job opportunities outside Guatemala. Forced to attend to their employer's demands, temporary workers find themselves in a relationship of "slave-like labour" (Gayet, 2010, p. 137). In that sense, developing friendship with employers was not one of temporary workers' objectives during their work stay.

The temporary workers in this study also shared their desire to learn foreign languages, especially English. Similar to Mexican seasonal workers in Ontario (Hennebry, 2012), Guatemalan temporary workers in Québec appeared to be familiar with the status of English as a lingua franca and aware of the job opportunities that knowing English might afford in Guatemala (e.g., in the tourist industry or in a call centre). Thus, English likely represented a key to a better

life for themselves and their extended families. Although the workers' interest in learning English generally did not change across time, the younger workers (i.e., aged 20 to 24) tended to display growing enthusiasm for English. One explanation for this change over time might be related to the misconception held by the workers that Québécois speak both French and English. This belief in societal bilingualism was shared by both more and less experienced Guatemalans and may have persisted over time due to their limited social interaction with the local community. This belief also likely led to the idea, again expressed by many workers, that learning French was unnecessary because English—in addition to being a language with important economic consequences—would be sufficient for communication with the locals.

An additional reason for the workers' desire to learn English may have been related to the use of new technologies, especially among the younger participants who appeared to be familiar with mobile apps which they used to stay connected with their friends and families (e.g., Facebook, Messenger, WhatsApp).The younger participants in particular also had decades of active employment in front of them and a future full of possibilities. Joni, Sender, and Walfren may have been the most inclined to imagine themselves in the long run in a career that requires the knowledge of another language such as English. For Joni, whose father had worked in St-Rémi picking vegetables for over 20 years, being separated from his children in Guatemala for months was likely not an option, and learning English was a ticket for better job opportunities in Guatemala. Representing a new generation of temporary workers, Joni is not the first child to have suffered from his father's absence. Indeed, many workers, of whom 98% are married with children, work for up to 40 years in Canada (McLaughlin et al., 2017), with the negative impact of such work experiences on workers' families well documented in the literature (Mostoway, 2020; Nakache, 2018; Perry, 2018). Workers' families are more vulnerable socially because

absent fathers do not provide moral and physical support to their families, contributing to the feeling of abandonment experienced by spouses. Workers' spouses also suffer from psychological violence from their partners, while their children often experience behavioural and mental health issues with fathers being absent for long periods of time.

Motivational Orientations

At Time 1, learning French for employment was perceived as an asset by the majority of temporary workers, except by the youngest participants for whom learning English appeared more relevant. Because the workers' main communicative goal was not related to any form of socialization with their employer, they quickly developed a common language (based on a mixture of Spanish and French) that was specific to their work situation, in as little as three months in the case of the first-time workers. Thus, an instrumental orientation to learn L2 French did not appear to extend beyond the minimal language needed by the workers to perform their duties.

Responses from Julio, Byron, and Emilio, who had 3–6 years of experience with the same employer, implied that the workers perceived their employer's Spanish skills as being useful, which contributed to a decrease in their desire to speak French. For instance, in order to communicate with their employees, three different employers appeared to resort to neologisms adapted to Spanish morphology, using such words as *achetar* (a combination of French *acheter* and Spanish *comprar* "to buy") or *parlar* (*parler* and *hablar* "to speak"), *ferma* (*ferme* and *finca* "farm"), and *descender* (*descendre* with "er," using the most common verbal suffix in Spanish, instead of *bajar*). The term *saco* also corresponds to the French word *sac* ("bag") but with a Spanish morpheme (*–o*) to express the masculine form of the word in French, although the Spanish word (*bolsa*) is actually feminine. Borrowings from English were also used by

employers, such as "up" to indicate the need to climb into the hayloft, called *grenier* in French and *pajar* or *desván* in Spanish. It is possible that many other English words may have been used; however, because the workers were unfamiliar with English, determining the language origin of what they identified as French expressions was not an easy task. The use of such lexical creations and borrowings from English and French may have led the workers to believe that they were actively learning French vocabulary.

Despite the apparent success of the (limited) job-specific communication system developed by the workers, it may have led to potential obstacles to their interaction with members of the local community, which is an important determinant of foreign workers' overall wellbeing (Hennebry et al., 2016; Robillard et al., 2018). Issues of social exclusion are not specific to Québec dairy farm workers. In Ontario, farm workers have reported having suffered from mental health issues, mainly in relation to culture shock, repeated family separations, cultural misunderstandings, racialized stereotypes, and social exclusion (Hennebry et al., 2016; McLaughlin et al., 2017; Perry, 2018). This study's findings revealed an important difference between more and less experienced workers' reactions to marginalization. At their first interview, the experienced workers appeared to be aware of the benefits of social interaction for their mental health, which matched the experience documented for Ontario's Mexican workers (McLaughlin et al., 2017). In contrast, the first-year workers mentioned their interest in learning French to communicate with the locals only about six months into their stay (at Time 2), reasoning that this could enhance their overall wellbeing and improve work performance.

Lack of access to health and medical services due to linguistic barriers, as documented for Mexican and Jamaican workers in Ontario (Hennebry et al., 2016), was also raised by the Guatemalan dairy farm workers in this study. Knowing French would enable the workers to

communicate with medical professionals and the authorities, particularly when it comes to public safety. Because temporary workers cannot benefit from public transportation in rural areas, they are left to interpret the local authority system on their own. For instance, the cars driven by Sender and Rubén got stuck in snow during a winter storm, and they had to deal with French-speaking police and firemen. Thus, temporary workers are in a particular position of vulnerability when it comes to the law. In Québec, agricultural enterprises with fewer than three workers are denied unionization and collective bargaining rights (Gesualdi-Fecteau, 2016), which means that they are denied common job protections extended to most employees.

Getting a better understanding of the merchandize and especially groceries in local shops also appeared to be an important reason for the workers' stated motivations to learn French. Agricultural field workers picking fruits and vegetables face numerous obstacles in their daily lives, for example, as residents of crowded dormitories (Perry, 2018). However, their fixed work schedule allows them to get transportation to and from grocery stores, which they attend in big groups, typically on Sundays, in a major city where the locals are accustomed to diversity (McLaughlin et al., 2017). In contrast, dairy farm workers are often isolated, work on a tight and changeable schedule, lack transportation, and have little language knowledge, which makes shopping particularly difficult. Therefore, it is unsurprising that the workers in this study expressed motivation to learn specific French words related to local produce. As described by Rubén, knowing at least some French could help them avoid buying pizza flour when looking for tortilla flour. Most workers confessed to having faced such challenges when buying food, describing them as expected and unavoidable.

Despite numerous comments about the importance of learning French, the workers' stated efforts to learn and use the language of the community diminished over time. At least one reason

for this is lack of time, which is unsurprising considering that, similar to Ontario's workers (McLaughlin et al., 2017), dairy farm workers engage in heavy physical labour during weekdays and have very limited free time, especially because they also need to do shopping and laundry, cook, clean, and communicate with their family. For farm employees, it is not unusual during the harvest season (May to September) to work seven days per week, from 5 am to 11 pm, which leaves them with almost no energy or time to dedicate to learning French. Although early in their stay the workers showed great enthusiasm for learning French, the work reality made them reconsider their plans within the next few months.

Awareness of Sociolinguistic Variation

One salient reason for the workers' lack of effort to engage in learning French might be related to their negative attitudes towards the local Québec French variety. For instance, the workers commented on their struggle to learn French due to perceived differences between the speech registers and varieties used locally (e.g., at a grocery store) and in the media. Thus, in less than three months and with no previous exposure to and knowledge of French, the workers were able to detect some variation, mainly phonological, between the registers used in informal contexts (e.g., at work by their employer) and in more formal settings (e.g., in major cities by the cashiers at a grocery store). Similarly, the workers pointed out problems with online learning materials, commenting on the phonological and lexical variation used in pedagogical videos on YouTube (potentially by French speakers from France) and in the local speech variety. This early awareness of sociolinguistic variation was not without consequences, however. In line with previous research on folk perception of variation (Boughton, 2006), the workers appeared to ascribe more prestige to the speech variety heard on YouTube than to the language they heard around them, thus leading to the development of negative attitudes towards the local variety.

A second potential source of negative attitudes towards the local French variety pertains to the workers' exposure to French-language movies in Québec. Half of the Guatemalans expressed an interest in watching movies on local TV channels, and reported, on average, watching at least one movie per month—mostly foreign films dubbed in French. However, the actors performing movie voice overs in Québec are trained to use "International French," which prohibits the use of *québécismes* and any linguistic "deviations" from the European French variety (Reinke & Ostiguy, 2012). Therefore, if the workers were exposed to Québec French in the local community but to European French in the media, which they likely considered to be the "standard" or "official" language, it is unsurprising that the workers developed negative attitudes towards Québec French rather quickly, leading to a decrease in their efforts to learn and use French.

More Versus Less Experienced Workers

The amount of time that temporary agricultural workers experience abroad is a variable that has been scarcely addressed in previous literature. In one rare study examining seasonal workers' familiarity with the local Ontario healthcare system, Hennebry et al. (2016) reported stronger and more homogeneous beliefs expressed by the workers with more than 11 seasons of work experience compared to those with 1–10 years of experience. This study's findings provide additional support to the claim that changes in worker attitudes are more likely to be observed during the first work season. More specifically, the more experienced workers demonstrated consistent, stable attitudes throughout the years. Although Julio (six years of experience) reluctantly admitted that French may be useful for interacting with local French speakers, in all three interviews, he did not hesitate to mention his lack of interest in learning French. Similarly, Juan José (five years of experience) expressed strong, negative attitudes towards French.

As temporary workers increase their sociolinguistic awareness and develop ways of communicating with their employers, especially in their first year, they also quickly solidify their (often negative) attitudes towards language learning. In the absence of strong external incentives to change attitudes (e.g., through instruction), temporary workers' beliefs are unlikely to shift (Giles & Billings, 2004). Thus, specific interventions, such as short-term orientations, language courses, or awareness-raising activities, might be necessary—especially during temporary workers' first few months in Québec—in order to minimize or otherwise prevent the development and maintenance of negative, stereotypical attitudes.

Implications

Immigration has become one of the most common sociolinguistic contexts for learning a language. Driven by the desire to integrate into a new labour force, most newcomers will face linguistic challenges in real-life communication. One example of local initiatives, in this case funded by Québec's Ministry of Immigration, is access given to Québec and Trois-Rivières immigrant owners of convenience stores (*dépanneurs*) to free French classes, twice per week, with classes adapted to their work reality (Porter, 2017). However, despite the best financial and social incentives by governments, many immigrants (including temporary farm workers) may face geographical, sociocultural, and psychological challenges which create obstacles to language learning. This study's findings call for several actions focused on the linguistic development and social inclusion of Québec's foreign workers.

In light of the numerous issues raised by researchers regarding foreign workers' work and life conditions in Canada, Binford (2019) suggested abolishing the federal foreign worker programs altogether, whereas others proposed alternative solutions, including awarding foreign workers permanent residency upon arrival (Weiler & McLaughlin, 2019). Even after decades of

continuous work, Québec's temporary workers are only entitled to a permanent temporary status. Without any possibility of obtaining an immigrant status, Québec's temporary workers are unmotivated to seek social inclusion and dedicate time to learning the local language. Providing foreign agricultural workers permanent residency would increase their social security, enable them to access the local healthcare system, and ensure their legal rights (Hennebry, 2012; Hennebry et al., 2016; McLaughlin & Tew, 2018).

Another concrete way to help temporary workers cope with their individual circumstances (e.g., work schedule, geographic isolation), while also addressing issues of motivation and attitudes towards language learning, is to use technology. Mobile-assisted learning environments provide promising avenues for promoting self-directed learning of L2 English (e.g., Ahmad, 2019) and L2 French (e.g., Sundberg & Cardoso, 2019; Sydorenko et al., 2019) outside the classroom. A good example would be a language learning app tailored to the reality of Guatemalan dairy farm workers with low literacy and technology skills and without prior knowledge of French. Key considerations would include ease of use, aural and visual (rather than textual) input, authenticity, and appropriate vocabulary (e.g., farm, cow, pitchfork, bag, plow, snow). Assuming that all temporary workers have access to a mobile device, they could then be exposed to brief instructional vignettes focusing on pragmatic strategies and Québec's cultural reality. In this sense, the app's goal would be to increase workers' exposure to Québec French as used in different social (e.g., grocery store, farm) and cultural (e.g., traditions, music, television) contexts. This app (or an online portal) would also provide temporary workers information (in their L1) about the local legal and healthcare systems as well as about social and professional services. Likewise, an online platform that would allow temporary workers to become acquainted not only with fellow workers employed in the same area but also with local

residents interested in linguistic exchanges can help break temporary workers out of isolation. With these tools at their disposal, workers may feel more confident about interacting with members of the majority group, thus increasing their exposure to L2 French and improving the quality of their lives.

Increasing dairy farm employers' awareness regarding the linguistic and social challenges faced by temporary workers is another way to improve workers' precarious status. Although most temporary workers prefer not to mention any negative issues they experience because they lack job security, employers should be concerned about their employees' wellbeing and its impact on their attitudes and work performance. For example, training sessions should be provided for employers to learn about workers' culture, and social support services such as Spanish–French interpreters should be made available. Insights into temporary workers' home culture, traditions, and speech varieties may prevent the creation of stereotypes and increase employers' awareness of their employees' needs. Because many employers also deal with geographic isolation, financial, and mental health issues, an adapted mobile app targeting employers could similarly provide them with the resources they need. Farm owners, who have recently embraced the use of technology in agriculture, with robots milking cows and cameras connected to cellphones, will likely be open to navigating a mobile app developed specifically with them in mind.

Broadly speaking, local communities should also be informed about temporary workers' work and living conditions. One common myth to debunk is that temporary workers are taking jobs away from the local population (Weiler & McLaughlin, 2019). In fact, temporary workers promote Québec's economic and social development, ensuring the survival of its agricultural industry, particularly among local family businesses. In rural areas, temporary workers also have

a positive economic impact on the local industry, including grocery stores, banks, hardware stores, building material suppliers, and restaurants (Bauder et al., 2003). Thus, local communities should also be concerned about temporary workers' wellbeing. For instance, local residents' preference to address immigrants in a different language than the one spoken by the majority (e.g., English instead of French) appears to contribute to workers' feeling of exclusion from the community (Diao et al., 2011). Therefore, to make temporary workers feel valued, the locals should consider using French (instead of English) with them while making necessary adjustments for beginner-level speakers and, whenever possible, taking advantage of such opportunities to practice Spanish skills themselves. In this sense, language exchanges could provide members of local communities with opportunities to practice Spanish and could allow temporary workers to deepen their knowledge about the local speech variety, culture, and traditions. In sum, it is critical for everyone to become aware that behind every essential grocery product there are men (and women) who—in addition to various other challenges—often struggle to be seen and heard.

Limitations and Future Research

The main limitation of this research relates to the researcher's background as a member of the majority French-speaking community. Despite all efforts to win the participants' trust throughout data collection (up to 13 months), temporary workers represent a vulnerable population who may not have revealed their actual opinions, afraid that interview recordings or transcripts may be shared with their employers or recruiting agencies. To refine some of the themes that have emerged here, future research should be conducted in partnership with a former (dairy) farm worker acting as an interviewer who would share the same country of origin, the same speech variety, and the same work experience with participants. The Guatemalan-born

individual who reviewed this study's research instruments is a good example of such an interviewer. Recent and ongoing research (e.g., Salami et al., 2020) continues to add to a growing body of research documenting various sources of foreign temporary workers' distress in Canada, including mental health issues, lack of access to healthcare, and social and geographic isolation (Bryan, 2019; Hennebry, 2012; McLaughlin et al., 2017). The findings of this study underscore the need to investigate additional language-related factors in order to provide a more comprehensive profile of temporary workers' lived reality in Canada and to develop ways of improving their experiences.

Conclusion

It is unlikely that the demand for foreign workforce in industrialized western nations would subside any time soon. In fact, more than ever, the survival of Canada's agricultural industry now relies entirely on temporary workers who collectively provide a partial solution to labor shortages in Québec (e.g., Gesualdi-Fecteau, 2014), Ontario (e.g., Perry, 2018), Alberta (e.g., Salami et al., 2020), Manitoba (e.g., Bryan, 2019), and British Columbia (e.g., Caxaj & Cohen, 2019). However, besides various initiatives to recruit foreign workers, government agencies should prioritize workers' wellbeing, which appears to be linked to their linguistic integration. Linguistic isolation may be a crucial factor which exacerbates various documented challenges faced by foreign temporary workers. Providing temporary workers (early in their work experience) with the resources they need to cope with their work realities is fundamental, and linguistic integration of temporary workers is an important part of this solution.

Chapter 5. General Discussion and Conclusion

The three studies included in this dissertation collectively provide insights into the attitudes that second language (L2) French speakers from urban and rural areas hold towards Québec French (QF) in a French-as-a-lingua-franca context. The present studies were motivated by prior work on language attitudes which showed that both native and L2 speakers of French express negative attitudes towards QF (e.g., Harvey, 2016; Kircher, 2012), and that L2 speakers of French often fail to clearly distinguish speakers of different French varieties and to identify the phonetic features associated with each variety (e.g., Calinon, 2009; Guertin, 2017), and that teachers of L2 French tend to promote French from France (FF) as the target variety through classroom instruction (e.g., French & Beaulieu, 2016; Jebali & Bigot, 2011). Moreover, with its nearly exclusive focus on L2 speakers residing in urban centers and studying the L2 in formal instructed settings, prior work has also failed to provide a clear link between L2 speakers' orientation towards a language community and their ability to produce speech features typical of that language community (e.g., Bergeron, 2013; Jiang et al., 2009). Thus, set against this conceptual backdrop, the three studies included in this dissertation targeted various gaps in previous research by investigating:

1. L2 French speakers' attitudes towards the QF and FF varieties through their ratings of pleasantness, extent of their exposure to these varieties, and their preference to choose them as a pronunciation model to follow, as a function of their participation in Québec's francisation program (Study 1);

2. L2 French speakers' degree of acculturation to the Québec and their home cultures and their preference for and production of QF-specific speech features, again as a function of their participation in Québec's francisation program (Study 2); and
3. Guatemalan temporary workers' attitudes and motivations towards learning and using L2 French longitudinally, in relation to their living and work conditions (Study 3).

Three Studies: Main Results

The findings from the three studies first indicated that L2 French speakers residing in Montréal reported greater exposure to some QF speech features (affrication, lax and nasal vowels) than to the FF variants of these same features, thus confirming that L2 speakers had developed at least some awareness of the variability in how various phonemic contrasts are realized across different varieties of French. Among the features investigated, the QF apical /r/ was the feature that L2 speakers had encountered significantly less frequently, which could explain why it was downgraded in pleasantness. As for L2 speakers' production, QF affrication was produced more often than QF diphthongs, but lax vowels appeared to be the most frequently produced QF feature, irrespective of whether the speakers participated in Québec's francisation program. These results mirror the sociolinguistic status of each feature, with affrication and lax vowels being unstigmatized and commonly used in formal contexts, compared to diphthongs which remain to be downgraded as perceived as less standard.

Significant between-group differences were also found as a function of L2 speakers' experience in Québec's francisation program. First, L2 speakers who benefited from Québec's francisation program appeared to be significantly less willing to integrate QF affrication into their speech, a preference which was correlated with their tendency to avoid diphthongs (a stigmatized feature) in their speech. Their negative attitudes towards affrication and diphthongs

may reflect these speakers' limited exposure to these specific QF features. On the other hand, the production of QF affrication by L2 speakers without the francisation experience was correlated with their preference for and production of nasal and lax vowels, but also with the extent of their reported active participation in the Québec culture. Taken together, these relationships indicate that L2 speakers who had learned French informally appeared to have better awareness of the social meanings of QF-specific features and that the adoption of one of the strongest markers of QF (affrication) may have been a way for these speakers to identify as a member of the QF-speaking community.

As for the Guatemalan temporary workers, they expressed consistent and positive attitudes towards their employer, work colleagues, and roommates, as well as a stable positive interest in socializing with French and English speakers, whom they portrayed as bilinguals. This misconception may explain, in part, why the motivation to learn and use French was particularly high among the first-time workers at Time 1, although it diminished by Time 3, in parallel with their increased interest in learning English (a language they defined as more useful for future job opportunities). Overall, the workers' stated efforts to learn and use French appeared to decrease by Time 2, mainly due to lack of time, perceived inadequacy of online materials, and perceived discrepancy between the French varieties that they heard inside and outside their work environment.

Origins of L2 Speakers' Attitudes Towards Québec French

In line with prior research targeting L2 speakers' attitudes towards various English varieties from the Inner, Outer, and Expanding circle countries, the findings from this dissertation showed that living in the target language environment was no indicator of L2 speakers' positive attitudes towards the local speech variety or higher sensitivity to its phonetic

features. That is, L2 French speakers residing in Montréal—regardless of their participation in Québec's francisation program—expressed negative attitudes towards at least one of the targeted QF features (apical /r/), which they tended to associate with Spanish-accented speech. It thus seems that a minimum amount of exposure may be necessary to make it less likely that L2 speakers develop negative attitudes towards a variety-specific speech feature. Furthermore, whereas exposure to QF may have helped L2 speakers to distinguish some of the pronunciation differences between the QF and FF varieties, the low rates with which they identified speaker origin were indicative of their limited sociolinguistic awareness of the specific differences between QF and FF. Therefore, it appears that a greater exposure to a feature might not necessarily translate into the development of positive attitudes either. Put differently, despite several years of residence in Québec (an Inner circle context), L2 French speakers still showed a preference for what they perceived to be the variety from a more typical or a more prestigious Inner circle environment (France).

As shown in prior research on L2 English, a nation's historical, cultural, and educational legacy is another factor contributing to the development of L2 speakers' (often negative) attitudes. Throughout centuries, France has had a strong linguistic influence on Latin America, as shown through borrowings from French into Spanish across several domains such as prestige (*chic*, *champagne*, *glamour*), cuisine (*baguette*, *crêpe*, *croissant*, *mousse*), and beauty (*rouge* [*à lèvres*], *corset*, *eau de toilette*). Also, since 1893, the Alliance française—an organization tasked with the promotion of the French language and culture—has expanded its reach in Latin America, with 227 centers currently operating across the continent, promoting FF as the reference variety taught as a foreign language. Different universities across Latin America also appear to exclusively focus on the FF variety through their offerings of French-language courses.

This (socio)linguistic experience of L2 French speakers, prior to their arrival in Québec, may thus have contributed to their beliefs about QF as a "deviant" variety, compared to the one they had first encountered in their home country.

An additional reason for L2 French speakers' negative attitudes towards QF pertains to the pedagogical model adopted by the teachers and the instructional materials used in their L2 French coursework. Whereas in countries such as Mexico, Colombia, and the US, the target speech variety promoted by French language educators is traditionally FF (Auger, 2003; Chapelle, 2009), it is surprising to observe a similar trend among local educators working within Québec's francisation sector (French & Beaulieu, 2016). The current findings have clarified the impact of such educational experiences on L2 speakers' attitudes towards QF. More specifically, both the L2 speakers with prior experience in the francisation program and the Guatemalan temporary workers (who had no prior classroom L2 learning experience) seemed to have developed negative attitudes towards the speech variety that they heard in the community. This finding implies that L2 speakers might develop negative attitudes through different experiences and that formal (classroom) learning contexts might leave L2 speakers with solidified or otherwise entrenched attitudes. This finding also suggests that at least some knowledge of sociolinguistic variation is crucial in minimizing the likelihood that L2 speakers would attribute negative attitudes to a speech variety (or even a speech register) and ultimately to speakers of that variety or register.

Finally, as identified in prior work, (digital) media are yet another source of L2 speakers' attitudes about a language variety. For L2 French speakers who consume local media, watching the news on Radio-Canada or foreign films on television, in movie theatres, or online may be counterproductive, at least sociolinguistically speaking, because these cultural experiences might

expose L2 speakers to the "standard" French variety (FF), as stipulated by the pronunciation guidelines provided to Québec's newscasters and voice-over actors (Reinke & Ostiguy, 2012). Similarly, several Guatemalan workers in this dissertation appeared to give more legitimacy to the variety they heard in YouTube videos, which for the most part involved FF. Whereas the media have shown to positively influence L2 speakers' attitudes as well as their comprehension and production of various speech patterns, in this particular case, a reduced use of QF in the media, coupled with prescriptive guidelines favouring FF, may actually contribute to the creation and maintenance of negative attitudes towards QF by L2 French speakers.

Overall Implications

The findings from this dissertation have several practical implications. First, there is a crucial need for French teachers to address sociolinguistic variation and to integrate classroom activities focusing on World Frenches, using newspaper articles, TV shows, podcasts, blogs, posts on Twitter, and so on. In Québec, more specifically, educators should find ways to make QF socially attractive, for example, by encouraging L2 speakers to do voluntary work in the community, to discover QF performers, to attend local cultural shows and activities, to seek opportunities outside the classroom to practice the structures covered in class, or to wear a badge advising interlocutors that L2 speakers are French speakers "in training." Promoting intergroup contact outside the classroom is the key to preventing the development of negative attitudes towards the local speech variety, to enhancing language learning and use, and to facilitating L2 speaker participation in the majority culture. Intergroup contact is essential because many L2 speakers tend to be restricted to working irregular or night shifts where no French ability is required (Paquet & Levasseur, 2019). In brief, a language classroom—whether in L2 speakers' home country or in the L2 environment—should not be used as a shelter preventing them from

hearing local, informal, colloquial speech. Instead, the classroom should be a safe environment for L2 speakers to enhance their L2 exposure, develop awareness of language variation, and foster their social competence. By avoiding the use of the local variety, language teachers contribute to the stigmatization of QF.

In addition to teaching practices that should ideally target sociolinguistic variation across different varieties of French (native and non-native), pedagogical materials used in French-language classrooms should also reflect the local sociolinguistic reality and provide language resources that address real-life challenges. The familiarity of many L2 speakers with FF should serve as a starting point to build on and expand their prior knowledge to clarify and deconstruct stereotypes they might hold. The main outcome of this dissertation work points to a sobering conclusion that L2 speakers' limited exposure to the local speech variety and to adequate pedagogical materials may cause them to develop robust negative attitudes and that these attitudes might impact not only L2 speakers' pronunciation, but also determine the extent of their participation in the majority culture and their choice of an L2 to learn.

In sum, language educators and language teaching materials should incorporate age- and level-appropriate instruction on French sociolinguistics to prevent the development of L2 speakers' negative attitudes as early as possible in the learning process. With a focus on World Frenches, educators and materials developers would then confer legitimacy to all French varieties, as spoken in the Inner, Outer, and Expanding circle environments, thereby shifting the learning and teaching goal from nativelikeness (in a single, preferred variety from an Inner circle context) to intelligibility and comprehensibility across different varieties, both native and non-native (as spoken in Outer and Expanding circle contexts).

Limitations and Future Research

Among various sociopsychological variables involved in language learning, language attitudes are said to be among some of the most difficult constructs to measure (Moyer, 2013). For this reason, researchers have developed different instruments to assess and operationalize speakers' attitudes, either directly (e.g., via questionnaires and attitudinal scales) or indirectly (e.g., through a matched-guise technique and implicit association tests). Although the research instruments used in this dissertation captured at least some of the attitudes that L2 French speakers hold towards QF, it is possible that the use of more direct elicitation techniques (such as interviews in Studies 1–2) would have revealed other facets of L2 speaker attitudes. Similarly, in addition to assessing L2 speakers' phonetic repertoire in perception and production, a more complete picture of their feelings of belonging to a speech community could be obtained through evaluating their use of lexical (e.g., *auto*, *chandail*, *chum*, *soulier*) and grammatical (e.g., double marking for *–tu* questions) forms specific to this community.

Generally speaking, there is room for a lot more research investigating both native and L2 speakers' attitudes towards various French varieties as a way of understanding the relationship between speakers' attitudes and their language development, and clarifying the role of teachers in shaping learner beliefs regarding World Frenches. The goal of this future research would be to ascertain, with more precision, the origins of L2 speakers' negative attitudes so that tangible recommendations can be made to enhance existing teacher-training programs for teachers of L2 French. Also, an examination of the beliefs held by QF speakers themselves towards their own speech variety and towards L2 speakers wishing to adopt it—across various professions and occupations (e.g., employers, daycare educators, nurses)—would provide further details regarding the origins of L2 speakers' attitudes. Last but not least, future qualitative studies that

gather more information about L2 French speakers' linguistic needs (in urban or rural areas) would provide the necessary knowledge base for the development of relevant apps and online learning materials that would help L2 speakers discover, appreciate, and adopt the QF variety.

Conclusion

Language attitudes are tightly intertwined with various aspects of L2 development, in that L2 speakers' beliefs about a target language or speech variety appear to have a major impact on how they approach language learning and use. In this sense, being able to perceive differences between one's own pronunciation and that of a target language speaker, or to distinguish between different patterns in the speech of target language speakers might help L2 speakers make an informed decision as to whether they want to adopt or reject the pronunciation features that correspond to the identity they wish to convey. Most importantly, L2 speakers' language attitudes have a strong connection with their sense of ethnic belonging and the degree to which they would like to communicate with members of either or both of their home and target language groups. For many immigrants to Québec, learning French (and becoming aware of its local features) would enable them to enter into and succeed on the job market, develop and foster personal and professional relationships, and learn about the local culture and traditions. This, in turn, would allow immigrants to contribute positively to the local economy and social life, to re-negotiate their identity, and most importantly, to enhance their overall wellbeing.

References

Ahmad, K. S. (2019). *Integrating Mobile Assisted Language Learning (MALL) into a non-formal learning environment to support migrant women learners' vocabulary acquisition* [Doctoral dissertation, Murdoch University] Research Repository. https://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/id/eprint/43153/1/Ahmad2019.pdf

Al-Hoorie, A. H., & MacIntyre, P. (2020). *Contemporary language motivation theory: 60 years since Gardner and Lambert (1959)*. Multilingual Matters.

Al-Qahtani, A. A. (2016). Acculturation and perceived social distance among Arabs and Saudi Arabians in an ESL situation. *English Language Teaching, 9*, 188-198.

Amireault, V., Collin, S., & Michaud, A. S. (2019). Perception d'utilité du cours FEL (francisation en ligne) au Québec. In F. Lafleur & G. Samson (Eds.), *Formation et apprentissage en ligne* (pp. 67-86). Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Archambault, A., & Corbeil, J.-C. (1982). *L'enseignement du français langue seconde, aux adultes.* Québec: Conseil supérieur de la langue française. http://www.cslf.gouv.qc.ca/bibliotheque-virtuelle/publication-html/?tx_iggcpplus_pi4%5Bfile%5D=publications/pubc122/c122ch1a.html

Arsenault Morin, A., & Geloso, V. (2020). Multilingualism and the decline of French in Quebec. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *41*(5), 420-431.

Auger, J. (2003). Le français au Québec à l'aube du vingt et unième siècle. *The French Review*, *77*(1), 86-100.

Babel, A. M. (2016). Affective motivations for borrowing: Performing local identity through loan phonology. *Language & Communication*, *49*, 70-83.

Baker, S. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2000). The role of gender and immersion in communication and second language orientations. *Language Learning*, *50*, 311-341.

Baker, W., Eddington, D., & Nay, L. (2009). Dialect identification: The effects of region of origin and amount of experience. *American Speech*, *84*(1), 48-71.

Baker, W., & Smith, L. C. (2010). The impact of L2 dialect on learning French vowels: Native English speakers learning Quebecois and European French. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *66*(5), 711-738.

Basok, T. (2004). Post-national citizenship, social exclusion and migrants' rights:

Mexican seasonal workers in Canada. *Citizenship studies, 8*, 47-64.

Bauder, H. (2003). Cultural representations of immigrant workers by service providers and employers. *Journal of International Migration and Integration/Revue de l'intégration et de la migration internationale*, *4*(3), 415-438.

Bayliss, D., & Vignola, M. J. (2007). Training non-native second language teachers: The case of anglophone FSL teacher candidates. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *63*(3), 371-398.

Beaudoin, D. (2019, October 11). « Ils m'ont donné une chance et ils m'ont engagé ». *ICI Radio-Canada*. https://ici.radio-canada.ca/recit-numerique/218/immigration-granby-recette-integration-retention-immigrants-sery

Beaudoin-Bégin, A-M. (2017). *La langue affranchie. Se raccommoder avec l'évolution linguistique.* Somme toute.

Beaudoin-Bégin, A-M. (2019). *La langue racontée. S'approprier l'histoire du français*. Somme toute.

Beaulieu, S., Woll, N., French, L. M., & Duchemin, M. (2018). Language learners' metasociolinguistic reflections: A window into developing sociolinguistic repertoires. *System*, *76*, 210-218.

Beaulieu-Poulin, R., & Champagne, D. (2012, September 26). San Remi. *Urbania*. https://urbania.ca/article/san-remi/

Bélanger, M. È. (2017). Pour une intégration efficace de l'oral dans l'enseignement du français aux élèves allophones. *Correspondance*, *22*(7), https://correspo.ccdmd.qc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/correspondance-pour-une-integration-efficace-de-loral-dans-lenseignement-du-francais-aux-eleves-allophones-.pdf

Bélanger, D., & Candiz, G. (2014). Essentiels, fiables et invisibles: Les travailleurs agricoles migrants latino-américains au Québec vus par la population locale. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 46*, 45-66.

Bergeron, A. (2013). *Niveau d'acculturation d'hispanophones à Montréal: quel est le lien avec leur compétence langagière à l'oral et leur prononciation en français langue seconde?* [Master's thesis, Université du Québec à Montréal]. Archipel. https://archipel.uqam.ca/5867/

Bergeron, A., & Trofimovich, P. (2017). Linguistic dimensions of accentedness and

comprehensibility: Exploring task and listener effects in second language French. *Foreign Language Annals*, *50*(3), 547-566.

Bernaus, M., & Gardner, R.C. (2008). Teacher motivation strategies, student perceptions, student motivation, and English achievement. *The Modern Language Journal, 92*, 387-401.

Bernaus, M., Wilson, A., & Gardner, R. C. (2009). Teachers' motivation, classroom strategy use, students' motivation and second language achievement. *Porta Linguarum, 12*, 25-36.

Berry, J. W. (1980). Social and cultural change. In H. C. Triandis & R. Brislin (Eds.), *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, (pp. 211-279). Allyn & Bacon.

Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied psychology*, *46*, 5-34.

Berry, J. W. (2005). Acculturation: living successfully in two cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29*, 697-712.

Berry, J. W., & Hou, F. (2016). Immigrant acculturation and wellbeing in Canada. *Canadian Psychology*, *57,* 254-264.

Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., & Bujaki, M. (1989). Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. *Applied Psychology, 38*, 185-206.

Bigot, D., & Papen, R. A. (2013). Sur la « norme » du français oral au Québec (et au Canada en général). *Langage et société*, *146*(4), 115-132.

Binford, A. L. (2019). Assessing temporary foreign worker programs through the prism of Canada's seasonal agricultural worker program: can they be reformed or should they be eliminated? *Dialectical Anthropology*, *43*(4), 347-366.

Blackledge, A., & Pavlenko, A. (2001). Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 5*, 243-257.

Blondeau, H., & Friesner, M. (2014). Manifestations phonétiques de la dynamique des attributions ethnolinguistiques à Montréal. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics, 59*, 83-105.

Blondeau, H., Nagy, N., Sankoff, G., & Thibault, P. (2002). La couleur locale du français L2 des Anglo-Montréalais. *Acquisition et interaction en langue étrangère, 17*, 73-100.

Blondeau, H., Sankoff, G., & Charity, A. (2002). Parcours individuels dans deux changements linguistiques en cours en français montréalais. *Revue québécoise de*

linguistique, 31, 13-38.

Boughton, Z. (2006). When perception isn't reality: Accent identification and perceptual dialectology in French. *Journal of French Language Studies*, *16*(3), 277-304.

Boulé, J. J. (2002). *Attitudes of young Quebecers towards English and French* [Master's thesis, Concordia University]. Spectrum. http://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/1900/1/MQ72834.pdf

Bourhis, R. Y. (2001). Reversing language shift in Quebec. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Can threatened language be saved? Reversing language shift, revisited: A 21st century perspective* (pp. 101-141). Multilingual Matters.

Bourhis, R. Y., & Lepicq, D. (1993). Québécois French and language issues in Quebec. *Trends in Romance linguistics and philology*, *5*, 345-381.

Bourhis, R. Y., & Sioufi, R. (2017). Assessing forty years of language planning on the vitality of the Francophone and Anglophone communities of Quebec. *Multilingua*, *36*(5), 627-661.

Bradlow, A. R., & Pisoni, D. B. (1999). Recognition of spoken words by native and non-native listeners: Talker-, listener-, and item-related factors. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *106*(4), 2074-2085.

Brasseur, A. (2009). *Les marqueurs phonétiques de la perception de l 'accent québécois* [Master's thesis, Université du Québec à Montréal]. http://phonetique.uqam.ca/upload/files/anniebrasseur/brasseur%202009.pdf

Bryan, C. (2019). Labour, population, and precarity: temporary foreign workers transition to permanent residency in rural Manitoba. *Studies in Political Economy*, *100*(3), 252-269.

Calinon, A. S. (2009). *Facteurs linguistiques et sociolinguistiques de l 'intégration en milieu multilingue: Le cas des immigrants à Montréal* [Doctoral dissertation, Université de Montréal, Université de Franche-Comté, France). Papyrus. https://papyrus.bib.umontreal.ca/xmlui/handle/1866/9122.

Canale, M., & Swain. M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, *1*, 1-47.

Carrie, E. (2017). "British is professional, American is urban": attitudes towards English reference accents in Spain. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *27*(2), 427-447.

Castellotti, V., & Moore, D. (2002). *Représentations sociales des langues et*

enseignements. Conseil de 1' Europe.

Castracani, L. (2018). Importar el trabajo sin las personas: la racialización de la mano de obra agrícola temporal en Canadá. *Revista THEOMAI*, *38*, 54-68.

Caxaj, C. S., & Cohen, A. (2019). "I will not leave my body here": migrant farmworkers' health and safety amidst a climate of coercion. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *16*(15), 26-43.

CCI Paris Ile-de-France-Direction de l'Enseignement. (2013). *Test d'évaluation de français adapté au Québec.* http://www.lefrancaisdesaffaires.fr/wp-content/uploads/fichiers-clf/Tutoriel-de-Comprehension-orale-TEF--Storyline-output/story_html5.html

Chalier, M. (2018). Quelle norme de prononciation au Québec? Attitudes, représentations et perceptions. *Langage et société*, *163*(1), 121-144.

Chalier, M. (2019). La norme de prononciation québécoise en changement (1970–2008)? L'affrication de/t, d/et l'antériorisation de/ɑ̃/chez les présentateurs des journaux télévisés de Radio-Canada. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique*, *64*(3), 407-443.

Chapelle, C. A. (2009). A hidden curriculum in language textbooks: are beginning learners of French at US universities taught about Canada? *The Modern Language Journal*, *93*(2), 139-152.

Chiba, R., Matsuura, H., & Yamamoto, A. (1995). Japanese attitudes toward English accents. *World Englishes, 14*, 77-86.

Clark, L., & Schleef, E. (2010). The acquisition of sociolinguistic evaluations among Polish-born adolescents learning English: evidence from perception. *Language Awareness*, *19*(4), 299-322.

Collin, S., & Michaud, A. S. (2017). Les enjeux de formation initiale à l'enseignement au Québec. *Le Réseau EdCan*, *57*(4). https://www.edcan.ca/articles/les-enjeux-de-formation-initiale-lenseignement-au-quebec/?lang=fr

Commission de la santé et de la sécurité du travail (CSST) (2017, March 31). *Un travailleur agricole saisonnier reste coincé dans un trou d'homme et se noie : la CSST rend publiques les conclusions de son enquête*. http://www.csst.qc.ca/actualites/2015/Pages/31_mars_valleyfield.aspx

Côté, M-H. (2016). French in Quebec: a speaker from Montreal. In S. Detey, J. Durand, B. Lacks, & C. Lyche (Eds.), *Varieties of Spoken French* (pp. 268-278). Oxford University.

Cox, T. (1998). Vers une norme pour un cours de phonétique française au Canada. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *54*(2), 172-197.

Crowther, D., Trofimovich, P., Saito, K., & Isaacs, T. (2018). Linguistic dimensions of L2 accentedness and comprehensibility vary across speaking tasks. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *40*(2), 443-457.

Cuéllar, I., Arnold, B., & Maldonado, R. (1995). Acculturation rating scale for Mexican Americans-II: a revision of the original ARSMA scale. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 17,* 275-304.

d'Anglejan, A., & Tucker, R. (1973). Sociolinguistic correlates of speech style in Quebec. In R. W. Shuy, & R.W. Fasold (Eds.), *Language attitudes: Current trends and prospects* (pp. 1-27). Georgetown University.

Dalton-Puffer, C., Kaltenboeck, G., & Smit, U. (1997). Learner attitudes and L2 pronunciation in Austria. *World Englishes, 16*, 115-128.

Darcy, I., Mora, J. C., & Daidone, D. (2014). Attention control and inhibition influence phonological development in a second language. *Concordia Working Papers in Applied Linguistics, 5*, 115-129.

Darcy, I., Mora, J. C., & Daidone, D. (2016). The role of inhibitory control in second language phonological processing. *Language Learning, 66,* 741-773.

Dere, J., Ryder, A. G., & Kirmayer, L. J. (2010). Bidimensional measurement of acculturation in a multiethnic community sample of first-generation immigrants. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement, 42*(2), 134-138.

Dewaele, J. M., Witney, J., Saito, K., & Dewaele, L. (2018). Foreign language enjoyment and anxiety: the effect of teacher and learner variables. *Language Teaching Research*, *22*(6), 676-697.

Diao, W., Freed, B., & Smith, L. (2011). Confirmed beliefs or false assumptions? A study of home stay experiences in the French study abroad context. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, *21*(1), 109-142.

Díaz-Campos, M., Geeslin, K. L., & Gurzynski-Weiss, L. (2017). *Introducción y aplicaciones*

contextualizadas a la lingüística hispánica. John Wiley & Sons.

Dolbec, J., & Ouellon, C. (1999). Peut-on distinguer des variétés phonétiques en français québécois? *Dialangue, 10*, 17-28.

Dolbec, J., & Paradis, C. (1998). *Phonétique du français québécois*. ciral.ulaval.ca/phonetique/phono/debutph.htm

Donà, G., & Berry, J. W. (1994). Acculturation attitudes and acculturative stress of central American refugees. *International Journal of Psychology*, *29*, 57-70.

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (2002). Some dynamics of language attitudes and motivation: Results of a longitudinal nationwide survey. *Applied Linguistics*, *23*, 421-462.

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (2005). The effects of intercultural contact and tourism on language attitudes and language learning motivation. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *24*(4), 327-357.

Doucerain, M. M., Deschênes, S. S., Gouin, J. P., Amiot, C. E., & Ryder, A. G. (2017). Initial mainstream cultural orientations predict early social participation in the mainstream cultural group. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 43*, 245-258.

Doucerain, M. M., Segalowitz, N., & Ryder, A. G. (2016). Acculturation measurement: from simple proxies to sophisticated toolkit. In S. J. Schwartz, & J. Unger (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Acculturation and Health* (pp. 97-117). Oxford University.

Dragojevic, M., Berglund, C., & Blauvelt, T. K. (2018). Figuring out who's who: the role of social categorization in the language attitudes process. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *37*(1), 28-50.

Dragojevic, M., Giles, H., & Watson, B. M. (2013). Language ideologies and language attitudes: a foundational framework. In H. Giles, & B. M. Watson (Eds.), *The Social Meanings of Language, Dialect and Accent: International Perspectives on Speech Styles* (pp. 1-25). Peter Lang Publishing.

Drummond, R. (2012). Aspects of identity in a second language: ING variation in the speech of Polish migrants living in Manchester, UK. *Language Variation and Change*, *24*(1), 107-133.

Duff, P. A., Wong, P., & Early, M. (2002). Learning language for work and life: the linguistic socialization of immigrant Canadians seeking careers in healthcare. *The Modern Language Journal, 86*, 397-422.

Eisenstein, M. (1982). A study of social variation in adult second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, *32*, 367-391.

Evans, B. E. (2002). Attitudes of Montreal students towards varieties of French. In D. Long, & D. R. Preston (Eds.), *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology*. John Benjamins.

Faraday, F. (2012). *Made in Canada: how the law constructs migrant workers insecurity*. http://metcalffoundation.com/publications-resources/view/made-in-canada

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics.* Sage Publications Ltd.

Flege, J. E., Munro, M. J., & MacKay, I. R. (1995). Effects of age of second-language learning on the production of English consonants. *Speech Communication*, *16*(1), 1-26.

Fondation des entreprises en recrutement de main-d'œuvre agricole étrangère (FERME). (2019). *Bilan statistique*. http://www.fermequebec.ca/programme-de-travailleurs-etrangers-temporaires/#bilan

Freed, B. F., Dewey, D. P., Segalowitz, N., & Halter, R. (2004). The language contact profile. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*, 349-356.

French, L. M., & Beaulieu, S. (2016). Effects of sociolinguistic awareness on French L2 learners' planned and unplanned oral production of stylistic variation. *Language Awareness, 25*(1-2), 55-71.

Friesner, M. (2010). Une prononciation «tsipéquement» québécoise? : La diffusion de deux aspects stéréotypés du français canadien. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique*, *55*, 27-53.

Gallois, C., & Callan, V. J. (1981). Personality impressions elicited by accented English speech. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *12*(3), 347-359.

Gan, Z., Humphreys, G., & Hamp-Lyons, L. (2004). Understanding successful and unsuccessful EFL students in Chinese universities. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(2), 229-244.

García Lopez, M. (2003). L'insertion urbaine des immigrants latino-américains à Montréal: trajectoires résidentielles, fréquentation des commerces et lieux de culte ethnique et définition identitaire [Doctoral dissertation, Université du Québec, Institut national de la recherche scientifique]. Espace INRS. http://espace.inrs.ca/id/eprint/76/

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The role of Attitudes and Motivation.* Edward Arnold Publishers.

Gardner, R. C. (2010). *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition: The*

Socioeducational Model. Peter Lang.

Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993). On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning. *Language Learning, 43*, 157-194.

Gatbonton, E., & Trofimovich, P. (2008). The ethnic group affiliation and L2 proficiency link: Empirical evidence. *Language Awareness, 17*, 229-248.

Gatbonton, E., Trofimovich, P., & Magid, M. (2005). Learners' ethnic group affiliation and L2 pronunciation accuracy: a sociolinguistic investigation. *TESOL Quarterly*, *39*(3), 489-511.

Gatbonton, E., Trofimovich, P., & Segalowitz, N. (2011). Ethnic group affiliation and patterns of development of a phonological variable. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*, 188-204.

Gayet, A. C. (2010). Conformité des conditions de travail des travailleurs agricoles migrants au Québec avec l'Article 46 de la Charte des droits et libertés de la personne interprété à la lumière du droit international. *La Revue québécoise de droit international*, *23*, 125-186.

Geeslin, K. L., & Gudmestad, A. (2008). The acquisition of variation in second language Spanish: an agenda for integrating studies of the L2 sound system. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *5*(2), 137-157.

Geeslin, K. L., & Long, A. Y. (2014). *Sociolinguistics and Second Language Acquisition: Learning to Use Language in Context*. Routledge.

Genesee, F., & Holobow N. E. (1989). Change and stability in intergroup perception. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 8*, 17-38.

George, A. (2014). Study abroad in central Spain: The development of regional phonological features. *Foreign Language Annals*, *47*(1), 97-114.

Gesualdi-Fecteau, D. (2014). The recruitment of Guatemalan agricultural workers by Canadian employers: mapping the web of a transnational network. *International Journal of Migration and Border Studies, 1*, 291-302.

Gesualdi-Fecteau, D. (2016). Le système d'emploi des travailleurs agricoles saisonniers: portrait d'un rapport salarial multipartite. *Industrial Relations/Relations industrielles*, *71*(4), 611-638.

Giles, H., & Billings, A. C. (2004). Assessing language attitudes: speaker evaluation studies. In

A. Davies, & C. Elder (Eds.), *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 187-209). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Giles, H., Bourhis, R. Y., Lewis, A., & Trudgill, P. (1974). The imposed norm hypothesis: a validation. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *60*(4), 405-410.

Giles, H., Bourhis, R. Y., & Taylor, D. M. (1977). Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language, Ethnicity, and Intergroup Relations* (pp. 307-348). Academic Press.

Giles, H., & Watson, B. M. (2013). *The Social Meanings of Language, Dialect and Accent: International Perspectives on Speech Styles*. Peter Lang Publishing.

Gordon, T. (2018). Capitalism, neoliberalism, and unfree labour. *Critical Sociology*, *45*(6), 921-939.

Gravel, S., Villanueva, F., Bernstein, S., Hanley, J., Crespo, D., & Ostiguy, E. (2014). Les mesures de santé et sécurité au travail auprès des travailleurs étrangers temporaires dans les entreprises saisonnières. *Perspectives interdisciplinaires sur le travail et la santé, 16*, 1-26.

Guertin, M. (2017). Variation sociophonétique dialectale et stylistique: quelle est la langue cible en français langue seconde à Montréal? *Arborescences: revue d'études françaises*, *7*, 67-89.

Guion, S. G., Flege, J. E., Liu, S. H., & Yeni-Komshian, G. H. (2000). Age of learning effects on the duration of sentences produced in a second language. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 21*, 205-228.

Halin, F. (2019, August 10). Notre agriculture survit grâce aux travailleurs latinos. *Journal de Montréal*. https://www.journaldemontreal.com/2019/08/10/notre-agriculture-survit-grace-a-eux

Hammer, K., & Dewaele, J.-M. (2015). Acculturation as the key to the ultimate attainment? The case of Poles in the UK. In F. Forsberg Lundell, & I. Bartning (Eds.), *Cultural Migrants and Optimal Language Acquisition* (pp. 178-202). Multilingual Matters.

Hanley, J., Gravel, S., Bernstein, S., Villanueva, F., & Crespo Villareal, D. (2015). Central American temporary foreign workers in Québec smalltowns: a portrait of community response. *The Journal of Rural and Community Development, 10*, 23-50.

Hansen, A. B. (2012). A study of young Parisian speech: some trends in pronunciation. In R. Gess, C. Lyche, & T. Meisenburg (Eds.), *Phonological Variation in French: Illustrations from Three Continents* (pp. 151-172). John Benjamins.

Hansen, D. (1995). A study of the effect of the acculturation model on second language acquisition. In F. R. Eckman, D. Highland, P. W. Lee, J. Milcham, & R. Rutkowski Weber (Eds.), *Second Language Acquisition Theory and Pedagogy* (pp. 305-316). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Harvey, M.-H. (2016). *Enseignement du français québécois et exposition à ses différents usages: représentations d'apprenants immigrants adultes à Montréal* [Master's thesis, Université du Québec à Montréal]. Archipel. http://www.archipel.uqam.ca/9482/

Hashimoto, Y. (2002). Motivation and willingness to communicate as predictors of reported L2 use: the Japanese ESL context. *Second Language Studies, 20,* 29-70.

Hay, J., Drager, K., & Warren, P. (2010). Short-term exposure to one dialect affects processing of another. *Language and Speech*, *53*(4), 447-471.

Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford University Press.

Hennebry, J. L. (2008). Bienvenidos a Canadá? Globalization and the migration industry surrounding temporary agricultural migration in Canada. *Canadian Studies in Population, 35*, 339-356.

Hennebry, J. L. (2012, February). Permanently temporary? Agricultural migrant workers and their integration in Canada. *Institute for Research on Public Policy.* http://www.irpp.org.

Hennebry, J. L., & Preibisch, K. (2010). A model for managed migration? Re-examining best practices in Canada's seasonal agricultural worker program. *International Migration, 50*, 19-40.

Hennebry, J., McLaughlin, J., & Preibisch, K. (2016). Out of the loop:(In) access to health care for migrant workers in Canada. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, *17*(2), 521-538.

Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal*, *72*(3), 283-294.

Hou, F., Schellenberg, G., & Berry, J. (2017). Patterns and determinants of immigrants' sense of belonging to Canada and their source country. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *41*(9), 1612-1631.

Howard, M., Mougeon, R., & Dewaele, J. M. (2013). Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition. In R. Bayley, R. Cameron, & C. Lucas (Eds.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (pp. 340-359). Oxford University Press.

Hu, G., & Lindemann, S. (2009). Stereotypes of Cantonese English, apparent native/non-native status, and their effect on non-native English speakers' perception. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *30*(3), 253-269.

Hutcheson, G. D., & Sofroniou, N. (1999). *The Multivariate Social Scientist: Introductory Statistics Using Generalized Linear Models*. Sage.

Isabelli-García, C. (2006). Study abroad social networks, motivation and attitudes: implications for second language acquisition. *Language Learners in Study Abroad Contexts*, *15*, 231-258.

Jebali A., & Bigot D. (2011). *Du français standard au vernaculaire en classe de FLS au Québec*, Colloque du Centre canadien d'études et de recherche en bilinguisme et aménagement linguistique, Ottawa, University of Ottawa.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity.* Oxford University.

Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes, 28,* 200-207.

Jia, F., Gottardo, A., Chen, X., Koh, P., & Pasquarella, A. (2016). English proficiency and acculturation among Chinese immigrant youth in Canada: a reciprocal relationship. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 37*, 774-782.

Jiang, M., Green, R. J., Henley, T. B., & Masten, W. G. (2009). Acculturation in relation to the acquisition of a second language. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 30*, 481-492.

Kachru, B. B. (1992). *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures.* University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. B. (2006). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the Outer circle. In K. Bolton, & B. B. Kachru (Eds.), *World English: Critical concepts in linguistics* (pp. 241–269). Routledge.

Kang, H. S., & Ahn, S. Y. (2019). Broadening learners' perspectives on World Englishes: a classroom-based study. *Language Awareness*, *28*(4), 268-290.

Keating, M. C. (2005). The person in the doing: negotiating the experience of self. In D. Barton, & K. Tusting (Eds.), *Beyond Communities of Practice: Language, Power and Social Context* (pp. 105-138). Cambridge University Press.

Kennedy, S., & Blanchet, J. (2014). Language awareness and perception of connected speech in a second language. *Language Awareness, 23*(1-2), 92-106.

Kennedy, S., & Trofimovich, P. (2010). Language awareness and second language pronunciation: a classroom study. *Language Awareness, 19,* 171–185.

Kennedy, S., Blanchet, J., & Trofimovich, P. (2014). Learner pronunciation, awareness, and instruction in French as a second language. *Foreign Language Annals, 47*, 79-96.

Kinginger, C. (2008). Language learning in study abroad: case studies of Americans in France. *The Modern Language Journal*, *92*, 1-124.

Kircher, R. (2009). *Language attitudes in Quebec: a contemporary perspective* [Doctoral dissertation, University of London]. https://qmro.qmul.ac.uk/xmlui/handle/123456789/497

Kircher, R. (2012). How pluricentric is the French language? An investigation of attitudes towards Quebec French compared to European French. *Journal of French Language Studies, 22*, 345-370.

Kircher, R. (2014). Thirty years after Bill 101: a contemporary perspective on attitudes towards English and French in Montreal. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 17*, 20-50.

Kircher, R. (2016). Language attitudes among adolescents in Montreal: potential lessons for language planning in Quebec. *French Studies*, *55*(2), 239-259.

Knouse, S. M. (2013). The acquisition of dialectal phonemes in a study abroad context: the case of the Castilian theta. *Foreign Language Annals*, *45*, 512–542

Koda, K. (2005). Learning to read across writing systems: transfer, metalinguistic awareness and second-language reading development. In V. Cook, & B. Bassetti (Eds.), *Second Language Writing Systems* (pp. 311–334). Multilingual Matters.

La Presse canadienne (2017, July 23). Des travailleurs étrangers temporaires manifestent

à Montréal. *La Presse*. http://www.lapresse.ca/actualites/ 201707/23/01-5118586-des-travailleurs-etrangers-temporaires-manifestent-a-montreal.php

Labov, W. (1963). The social motivation of a sound change. *Word, 19*, 273-309.

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Labov, W. (2006). A sociolinguistic perspective on sociophonetic research. *Journal of Phonetics, 34*, 500-515.

Ladegaard, H. J. (1998). Assessing national stereotypes in language attitude studies: the case of class-consciousness in Denmark. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *19*, 182-198.

Ladegaard, H. J., & Sachdev, I. (2006). "I like the Americans... but I certainly don't aim for an American accent": language attitudes, vitality and foreign language learning in Denmark. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 27*, 91-108.

Lamarre, P., & Lamarre, S. (2006). Nouvelle économie et nouvelle technologie à Montréal: entre protection et ouverture linguistique. *Langage et société*, *118*(4), 65-84.

Lambert, W. E., Hodgson, R. C., Gardner, R. C., & Fillenbaum, S. (1960). Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 60*, 44-51.

Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 159-174.

Lappin, K. (1982). Évaluation de la prononciation du français montréalais: étude sociolinguistique. *Revue québécoise de linguistique, 11*, 93-112.

Larson-Hall, J. (2016). *A Guide to Doing Statistics in Second Language Research Using SPSS and R.* Routledge.

Lasagabaster, D., (2006). Les attitudes linguistiques: un état des lieux. *Études de linguistique appliquée, 4,* 393-406.

Laur, E. (2001). *Perceptions linguistiques à Montréal* [Doctoral dissertation, Université de Montréal]. http://www.collectionscanada.ca/obj/s4/f2/dsk3/ftp05/NQ65360.pdf

Laur, E. (2008). *Contribution à l'étude des perceptions linguistiques. La méthodologie des faux-couples revisitée.* Québec: Gouvernement du Québec. https://www.oqlf.gouv.qc.ca/ressources/sociolinguistique/2008/notemetho_laur.pdf

Laur, E. (2014). Evaluational reactions to spoken French and English in Montreal: does

mother tongue really matter? *The Canadian Journal of Linguistics, 59*, 3-23.

Lebrun, M., & Lacelle, N. (2012). Les usages linguistiques des adolescents québécois sur les médias sociaux, *Apprentissage des langues et systèmes d'information et de communication*, *15*(1). http://alsic.revues.org/2462

Léon, P. R. (2007). *Phonétisme et prononciations du français.* Armand Colin.

Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States*. Routledge.

López-Soto, T., & Barrera-Pardo, D. (2007). *Perceptions of accents by L2 students of English: subjective preference vs. objective intelligibility*. ICPhS XVI, Saarbrücken.

Lybeck, K. (2002). Cultural identification and second language pronunciation of Americans in Norway. *The Modern Language Journal, 86*, 174-191.

MacIntyre, P. D., Dörnyei, Z., Clément, R., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: a situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, *82*, 545-562.

MacKenzie, L., & Sankoff, G. (2010). A quantitative analysis of diphthongization in Montreal French. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, *15*, 90-100.

Macmillan, N. A., & Creelman, C. D. (1991). *Detection Theory: A User's Guide*. Cambridge University Press.

Marceau, M. (2017, February 23). Effondrement à Saint-Tite: le travailleur retrouvé mort. *ICI Radio-Canada.* http://ici.radio-canada.ca/nouvelle/1018645/ effondrement-toiture-ferme-st-tite-pompiers-survie-vaches-travailleur

Marín, G. (1992). Issues in the measurement of acculturation among Hispanics. In K. F. Geisinger (Ed.), *Psychological Testing of Hispanics* (pp. 235-251). American Psychological Association.

Martin, P. (2004*). Éléments de phonétique avec application au français*. Presses de l'Université Laval.

Masgoret, A. M. (2006). Examining the role of language attitudes and motivation on the sociocultural adjustment and the job performance of sojourners in Spain. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30*, 311-331.

Masgoret, A. M., Bernaus, M., & Gardner, R. C. (2001). Examining the role of attitudes and motivation outside of the formal classroom: a test of the mini-AMTB for

children. In Z. Dörnyei, & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 281-296). University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Maurais, J. (2008). *Les Québécois et la norme: l'évaluation par les Québécois de leurs usages linguistiques.* Québec: Office québécois de la langue française, Gouvernement du Québec. https://www.oqlf.gouv.qc.ca/ressources/sociolinguistique/2008/etude_07.pdf

Mazurkewich, I., Fister-Stoga, F., Mawle, D., Somers, M., & Thibaudeau, S. (1986). A new look at language attitudes in Montreal. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 112*, 203-217.

McInerney, E. (2020). Àlles wàs glanzt ìch nìt umbadingt Guld: reference accents, inner circle Englishes and language attitudes in Alsace. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *42*, 1-21.

McKenzie, R. (2010). *The Social Psychology of English as a Global Language: Attitudes, Awareness and Identity in the Japanese Context.* Springer.

McLaughlin, J., & Tew, M. (2018). Migrant farm worker health care: unique strategies for a unique population. In A. N. Arya, & T. Piggot (Eds.), *Under-Served: Health Determinants of Indigenous, Inner-City, and Migrant Populations in Canada* (pp. 253-263). Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.

McLaughlin, J., Wells, D., Mendiburo, A., Lyn, A., & Vasilevska, B. (2017). Temporary workers, temporary fathers: transnational family impacts of Canada's seasonal agricultural worker program. *Industrial Relations/Relations industrielles*, *72*(4), 682-709.

Ménard, L. (1998). *Perception et reconnaissance des « accents » québécois et français: identification de marqueurs prosodiques*. [Master's thesis, Université Laval].

Meyerhoff, M. (2016). Methods, innovations and extensions: reflections on half a century of methodology in social dialectology. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *20*, 431-452.

Miller, M. J. (2007). A bilinear multidimensional measurement model of Asian American acculturation and enculturation: implications for counseling interventions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*, 118-131.

Mompeán González, J. A. (2004). Options and criteria for the choice of an English

pronunciation model in Spain. In J. Anderson, J. M. Oro, & J. Varela Zapata (Eds.), *Linguistic Perspectives from the Classroom: Language Teaching in a Multicultural Europe* (pp. 243-259). Universidad de Santiago de Compostela.

Montreuil, A., Bourhis, R. Y., & Vanbeselaere, N. (2004). Perceived threat and host community acculturation orientations towards immigrants: Comparing Flemings in Belgium and Francophones in Québec. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, *36*(3), 113-135.

Mora, J. C., & Darcy, I. (2017). The relationship between cognitive control and pronunciation in a second language. In T. Isaacs, & P. Trofimovich (Eds.), *Second Language Pronunciation Assessment: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 95-120). Multilingual Matters.

Mora, J. C, Rochdi, Y., & Kivistö-de Souza, H. (2014). Mimicking accented speech as L2 phonological awareness, *Language Awareness, 23*(1-2), 57-75.

Morrissette-Beaulieu, F. (2020, September 20). La méconnaissance du français a contribué au décès d'un travailleur agricole. *ICI Radio-Canada*. https://ici.radio-canada.ca/nouvelle/1735145/meconnaissance-francais-beauce-deces--travailleur-agricole

Mostoway, K. (2020). The effects of immigration on families. *Canadian Journal of Family and Youth/Le Journal Canadien de Famille et de la Jeunesse*, *12*(2), 60-68.

Moyer, A. (2007). Do language attitudes determine accent? A study of bilinguals in the USA. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *28*, 502-518.

Moyer, A. (2013). *Foreign accent: The phenomenon of non-native speech.* Cambridge University Press.

Munro, M. J., Derwing, T. M., & Morton, S. L. (2006). The mutual intelligibility of L2 speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *28*(1), 111-131.

Nakache, D. (2018). La réforme du système d'octroi de l'asile au Canada: où en sommes-nous? *La Revue des droits de l'homme*, *14*. https://journals.openedition.org/revdh/4031

Nielsen, P. M. (2003). English in Argentina: a sociolinguistic profile. *World Englishes*, *22*, 199-209.

Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*, 409-429.

O'Brien, M. G. (2016). Methodological choices in rating speech samples. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *38*(3), 587-605.

Olivencia, R. (2008). Conceptions professionnelles des enseignants à l'égard du développement de la compétence interculturelle en classe de français langue seconde à Montréal [Master's Thesis, Université du Québec à Montréal]. Archipel. https://archipel.uqam.ca/1525/

Ostiguy, L., & Tousignant, C. (2008). *Les prononciations du français québécois: normes et usages.* Guérin.

Paquet, R. G., & Levasseur, C. (2019). When bilingualism isn't enough: perspectives of new speakers of French on multilingualism in Montreal. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *40*(5), 375-391.

Paradis, C., & Dolbec, J. (2008). *Les principales caractéristiques phonétiques du français parlé au Québec*. http://phono.uqac.ca/

Perry, J. A. (2012). Barely legal: racism and migrant farm labour in the context of Canadian multiculturalism. *Citizenship Studies, 16*, 189-201.

Perry, J. A. (2018). Living at work and intra-worker sociality among migrant farm workers in Canada. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, *19*(4), 1021-1036.

Piechowiak, A. (2009). *What is "good" quality oral French? Language attitudes towards "differently" accented French in Quebec* [Doctoral dissertation, McGill University]. http://digitool.library.mcgill.ca/R/?func= dbin-jump full&object_id=86785&local_base=GEN01-MCG02

Pinkerton, A. (1986). Observations on the tú/vos option in Guatemalan Ladino Spanish. *Hispania*, *69*(3), 690-698.

Plonsky, L., & Oswald, F. L. (2014). How big is "big"? Interpreting effect sizes in L2 research. *Language Learning*, *64*(4), 878-912.

Porter, I. (2017, March 11). Les dépanneurs chinois se mettent au français. *Le Devoir.* http://www.ledevoir.com/politique/quebec/493725/les-depanneurs-chinois-se-francisent

Porter, I. (2019, May 1). Les travailleurs temporaires étrangers ont plus d'accidents que les autres. *Le Devoir*. https://www.ledevoir.com/politique/quebec/ 553286/titre-deux-fois-plus-de-travailleurs-etrangers-morts-au-travail

Preston, M. S. (1963). *Evaluational Reactions to English, Canadian French and European French Voices* [Master's thesis, McGill University]. http://digitool.Library. McGill.CA:80/R/-?func=dbin-jumpfull&object_id=115218&silo_library=GEN01

Provencher, M.-A. (2019, July 15). En francisation, immigration contre éducation. *Le Devoir*. https://www.ledevoir.com/opinion/idees/558690/la-francisation-des-immigrants-immigration-vs-education

Rakic, T., Steffens, M. C., & Mummendey, A. (2011). Blinded by the accent! The minor role of looks in ethnic categorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *100*(1), 16-29.

Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. J. (1936). Memorandum for the study of acculturation. *American Anthropologist, 38*, 149-152.

Reinke, K. (2000). *La norme phonétique du français québécois: les attitudes des Québécois par rapport à leur français*. Actes des XIIIes Journées de linguistique, sous la direction d'Éric Kavanagh, 185-195.

Reinke, K. (2005). *La langue à la télévision québécoise: aspects sociophonétiques.* Gouvernement du Québec. https://www.oqlf.gouv.qc.ca/ressources/sociolinguistique/2005-2006/etude6_compl.pdf

Reinke, K., & Ostiguy, L. (2012). Doublage et sociolinguistique: une étude comparative du doublage québécois et français. *Zeitschrift für Kanada-Studien*, *32*(1), 26-48.

Reinke, K., & Ostiguy, L. (2016). *Le français québécois d'aujourd'hui.* Walter de Gruyter.

Remysen, W. (2004). La variation linguistique et l'insécurité linguistique: le cas du français québécois. In P. Bouchard (Ed.), *La variation dans la langue standard.* Proceedings of the 70th ACFAS Conference on Language and Society at Université Laval, Québec (pp. 23-36). Office québécois de la langue française.

Remysen, W. (2014). Les Québécois perçoivent-ils le français montréalais comme une variété topolectale distincte? Résultats d'une analyse perceptuelle exploratoire. *The Canadian Journal of Linguistics, 59*, 109-135.

Rindal, U. (2010). Constructing identity with L2: Pronunciation and attitudes among Norwegian learners of English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *14*, 240-261.

Rindal, U., & Piercy, C. (2013). Being "neutral"? English pronunciation among Norwegian learners. *World Englishes, 32*, 211-229.

Rinfret, R. (1896). *Dictionnaire de nos fautes contre la langue française.* Cadieux et Derome Éditeurs. http://numerique.banq.qc.ca/patrimoine/details/52327/2022149

Ringer-Hilfinger, K. (2012). Learner acquisition of dialect variation in a study abroad context:

The case of the Spanish [θ]. *Foreign Language Annals*, *45*(3), 430-446.

Robillard, C., McLaughlin, J., Cole, D. C., Vasilevska, B., & Gendron, R. (2018). "Caught in the same webs": service providers' insights on gender-based and structural violence among female temporary foreign workers in Canada. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, *19*, 583-606.

Ryan, E. B., Giles, H., & Sebastian, R. J. (1982). An integrative perspective for the study of attitudes toward language variation. In E. B. Ryan, & H. Giles (Eds.), *Attitudes Towards Language Variation: Social and Applied Contexts* (pp. 1-19). Edward Arnold.

Ryder, A. G., Alden, L. E., & Paulhus, D. L. (2000). Is acculturation unidimensional or bidimensional? A head-to-head comparison in the prediction of personality, self-identity, and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 49-65.

Saint-Laurent, N. (2008). *Le français et les jeunes.* Québec: Conseil supérieur de la langue française. http://www.cslf.gouv.gc.ca/publications/ pubf223/f223.pdf

Saito, K., Trofimovich, P., & Isaacs, T. (2017). Using listener judgments to investigate linguistic influences on L2 comprehensibility and accentedness: a validation and generalization study. *Applied Linguistics*, *38*(4), 439-462.

Salami, B., Hervieux, E., Dorow, S., & Okeke-Ihejirika, P. (2020). Intensified exploitation and mental stress as impacts of changes to the temporary foreign worker program in Alberta, Canada. *Global Social Welfare*, *7*(1), 57-67.

Saldaña, J. (2011). *Fundamentals of Qualitative Research*. Oxford University Press.

Sankoff, G., & Blondeau H. (2007). Language change across the lifespan: /r/ in Montreal French. *Language*, *83*, 560-588.

Santerre, L. (1979). Les /r/ montréalais en régression rapide. *Protée*, *7*, 117-131.

Sayahi, L. (2005). Language and identity among speakers of Spanish in northern Morocco: between ethnolinguistic vitality and acculturation. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 9*, 95-107.

Scales, J., A. Wennerstrom, D. Richard, & S. H. Wu. (2006). Language learners' perceptions of accent. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*, 715-738.

Schleef, E., Meyerhoff, M., & Clark, L. (2011). Teenagers' acquisition of variation: a comparison of locally-born and migrant teens' realisation of English (ing) in Edinburgh and London. *English Worldwide*, *32*(2), 206-236.

Schmidt, L. B. (2018). L2 development of perceptual categorization of dialectal sounds: a study in Spanish. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *40*(4), 857-882.

Schumann, J. H. (1976). Social distance as a factor in second language acquisition. *Language Learning, 26*, 135-143.

Schumann, J. H. (1986). Research on the acculturation model for second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 7*, 379-392.

Sebkova, A., Reinke, K., & Beaulieu, S. (2020). *À la rencontre des voix francophones dans la ville de Québec: les attitudes des Québécois à l'égard de diverses variétés de français*. SHS Web of Conferences, *72*, EDP Sciences.

Serafini, E. J. (2017). Exploring the dynamic long-term interaction between cognitive and psychosocial resources in adult second language development at varying proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, *101*(2), 369-390.

Siegel, J. (2010). *Second Dialect Acquisition.* Cambridge University Press.

Starks, D., & Paltridge, B. (1996). A note on using sociolingustic methods to study non native attitudes towards English. *World Englishes*, *15*, 217-224.

Statistics Canada (2011). *Census Profile of Quebec*. http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/dp-pd/prof/search-recherche/lst/page.cfm?Lang=E&TABID=1&G=1&Geo1=PR&Code1=01&Geo2=PR&Code2=01&GEOCODE=24

Steinbach, M. (2015). Les défis de l'intégration sociale des jeunes immigrants à l'extérieur de la métropole québécoise. *Diversité urbaine*, *15*(1), 69-85.

Steinbach, M., Vatz-Laaroussi, M., & Potvin, M. (2015). Accueillir des jeunes réfugiés en région: la formation générale aux adultes comme alternative scolaire? *International Journal of Intercultural Research*, *5*(2), 99-108.

Stephenson, M. (2000). Development and validation of the Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale (SMAS). *Psychological Assessment, 12*, 77-88.

Strevens, P. (1992). English as an international language: directions in the 1990s. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures* (pp. 7-47). University of Illinois Press.

Sundberg, R., & Cardoso, W. (2019). Learning French through music: the development of the Bande à Part app. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *32*(1-2), 49-70.

Sung, C. C. M. (2014). Accent and identity: Exploring the perceptions among bilingual speakers of English as a lingua franca in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *17*, 544-557.

Sydorenko, T., Smits, T. F., Evanini, K., & Ramanarayanan, V. (2019). Simulated speaking environments for language learning: insights from three cases. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *32*(1-2), 17-48.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 33-47). Brooks-Cole.

Tarone, E., & Swain, M. (1995). A sociolinguistic perspective on second language use in immersion classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal*, *79*(2), 166-178.

Taylor Reid, K., Trofimovich, P., & O'Brien, M. G. (2019). Social attitudes and speech ratings: effects of positive and negative bias on multiage listeners'judgments of second language speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *41*(2), 419-442.

Testa, S., Doucerain, M. M., Miglietta, A., Jurcik, T., Ryder, A. G., & Gattino, S. (2019). The Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA): new evidence on dimensionality and measurement invariance across two cultural settings. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *71*, 60-71.

Thomas, E. R. (2002). Sociophonetic applications of speech perception experiments. *American Speech, 77*, 115-147.

Timmis, I. (2002). Native-speaker norms and international English: a classroom view. *ELT Journal, 56*, 240-249.

Trofimovich, P., & Baker, W. (2006). Learning second language suprasegmentals: effect of L2 experience on prosody and fluency characteristics of L2 speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*, 1-30.

Trofimovich, P., Gatbonton, E., & Segalowitz, N. (2007). A dynamic look at L2 phonological learning: Seeking processing explanations for implicational phenomena. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 29*, 407-448.

Tucker, G. R., & Corson, D. (1997). Introduction. In G. R. Tucker & D. Corson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Volume 4: Second language education* (pp. xi-xv). Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Turner, D. W. (2010). Qualitative interview design: a practical guide for novice investigators. *The Qualitative Report, 15*, 754-760.

Ushioda, E., & Dörnyei, Z. (2017). Beyond global English: motivation to learn languages in a multicultural world. Introduction to the special issue. *The Modern Language Journal*, *101*, 451-454.

Valarezo, G., & Hughes, C. (2012). Pushed to the edge: political activism of Guatemalan migrant farmworkers. *Global Justice: Theory Practice Rhetoric, 5*, 94-119.

van Compernolle, R. A., & Williams, L. (2012). Teaching, learning, and developing L2 French sociolinguistic competence: a sociocultural perspective. *Applied linguistics*, *33*(2), 184-205.

Ville de Montréal (2017). *Montréal en statistiques*. http://ville.montreal. qc.ca/portal/page? pageid=6897,67885704&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL

Vinay, J.- P. (1950). Bout de la langue ou fond de la gorge? *The French Review, 23*, 489-498.

Violin-Wigent, A., Miller, J., & Grim, F. (2013). *Sons et sens: la prononciation du français en contexte*. Georgetown University Press.

Waniek-Klimczak, E. (2009). Sociolinguistic conditioning of phonetic category realisation in non-native speech. *Research in Language, 7*, 149-166.

Weiler, A. M., & McLaughlin, J. (2019). Listening to migrant workers: should Canada's seasonal agricultural worker program be abolished? *Dialectical Anthropology*, *43*(4), 381-388.

Wernicke, M. (2016). Hierarchies of authenticity in study abroad: French from Canada versus French from France? *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *19*(2), 1-21.

Widdowson, H. G. (1997). EIL, ESL, EFL: global issues and local interests. *World Englishes, 16*, 135-146.

Willis, E., Geeslin, K., & Henriksen, N. (2009, October). *The acquisition of /θ/ by study abroad learners in León, Spain*. 13th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Woore, R. (2018). Learners' pronunciations of familiar and unfamiliar French words: what can they tell us about phonological decoding in an L2? *The Language Learning Journal*, *46*(4), 456-469.

Yano, Y. (2001). World Englishes in 2000 and beyond. *World Englishes, 20*, 119-131.

Yao, Z., Saito, K., Trofimovich, P., & Isaacs, T. (2013). *Z-Lab* [Computer software]. https://github.com/ZeshanYao/Z-Lab

Yook, C., & Lindemann, S. (2013). The role of speaker identification in Korean university students' attitudes towards five varieties of English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *34*, 279-296.

Yu, B. (2010). Learning Chinese abroad: the role of language attitudes and motivation in the adaptation of international students in China. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *31*(3), 301-321.

Yu, B., & Shen, H. (2012). Predicting roles of linguistic confidence, integrative motivation and second language proficiency on cross-cultural adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *36*(1), 72-82.

Zapirain, B. (2015, April 5). Une ferme épinglée pour la noyade d'un employé mexicain. *Le Journal de Montréal.* http://www.journaldemontreal.com/ 2015/04/05/une-ferme-epinglee-pour-la-noyade-dun-employe-mexicain

Zhang, W., & Hu, G. (2008). Second language learners' attitudes towards English varieties. *Language Awareness*, *17*, 342-347.

Appendix A. Background questionnaire

1. Nom : _____

2. Âge: _____

3. Sexe : FEMME HOMME

4. À votre connaissance, avez-vous des problèmes d'audition? OUI NON

5. Lieu de naissance (ville et pays) : _____

6. Lieu où vous avez grandi (ville et pays) : _____

7. Où habitez-vous aujourd'hui (ville et quartier)? _____

8. Quand êtes-vous arrivé au Canada (*veuillez indiquer aussi la date de votre arrivée au Québec si cette date est différente*)? _____

9. Quel est le dernier diplôme que vous avez obtenu?

_____

10. Dans quel programme d'études êtes-vous présentement inscrit(e)?

_____

a) Date du début de vos études dans ce programme : _____

b) Date de fin prévue dans ce programme: _____

c) Établissement scolaire : _____

11. Avez-vous un emploi? OUI NON

a) À temps plein ou à temps partiel? _____

b) Pour quelle compagnie travaillez-vous?_____

c) Dans quel ville (et quartier)?_____

d) Quel poste occupez-vous? _____

12. Quelle langue considérez-vous comme votre langue maternelle? _____

13. Quelle est la langue maternelle de votre mère? _____

De votre père? _____

14. Quelle(s) autre(s) langue(s) avez-vous apprise(s)? À partir de quel âge? À quel niveau de maîtrise (p. ex., débutant, intermédiaire, avancé) vous situez-vous aujourd'hui?

Langue(s)	Âge	Niveau
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

15. Quelle langue parlez-vous à la maison en ce moment? _____

16. Avec qui parlez-vous cette langue à la maison?

_____

17. Dans quelle(s) langue(s) avez-vous fait vos études (que ce soit dans votre pays ou au Canada)?

a) Primaire: _____
b) Secondaire: _____
c) Cégep : _____
d) Université: _____

18. Veuillez évaluer votre habileté à parler, comprendre, lire et écrire dans votre **langue maternelle** en utilisant l'échelle ci-dessous.

	1 = Extrêmement difficile								***9 = Extrêmement facile***
Parler (langue maternelle)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Comprendre (langue mat.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Lire (langue maternelle)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Écrire (langue maternelle)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

19. Veuillez évaluer votre habileté à parler, comprendre, lire et écrire en **anglais** en utilisant l'échelle ci-dessous.

	1 = Extrêmement difficile								***9 = Extrêmement facile***
Parler (anglais)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Comprendre (anglais)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Lire (anglais)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Écrire (anglais)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

20. Veuillez évaluer votre habileté à parler, comprendre, lire et écrire en **français** en utilisant l'échelle ci-dessous.

	1 = Extrêmement difficile								***9 = Extrêmement facile***
Parler (français)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Comprendre (français)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Lire (français)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Écrire (français)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

21. À quel âge avez-vous commencé à apprendre le français? _____

22. Veuillez écrire le nombre d'heures que vous avez consacré par semaine à apprendre le français pendant votre cheminement scolaire :

a) Primaire (temps) _____ pendant (nb d'années) _____

b) Secondaire (temps) _____ pendant (nb d'années) _____

c) Université (temps) _____ pendant (nb d'années) _____

23. Avez-vous déjà vécu une expérience d'apprentissage du français en dehors du système scolaire (école de langues ou immersion, par exemple) ? Si oui, merci d'indiquer le pays (et ville) et la durée.

_____

_____

24. Avez-vous déjà vécu dans un pays autre que votre pays d'origine et le Canada? Si oui, merci d'indiquer le pays (et ville) et la durée de votre séjour.

_____

_____

_____

a) Dans quel but? _____

25. Avez-vous déjà travaillé dans un endroit où **seul le français** était utilisé? OUI NON

Si oui, merci d'indiquer la compagnie, la ville et la durée.

_____

_____

26. Au cours d'une journée typique, dans quelle proportion utilisez-vous chacune de ces langues?

a) Français

0% 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100%

b) Anglais

0% 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100%

c) Votre langue maternelle

0% 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100%

d) Autre langue (veuillez spécifier) : _____

0% 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100%

27. De façon approximative, dans quelle proportion parlez-vous **français** au cours d'une même journée (comparativement à d'autres langues)?

a) À l'école

0% 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100%

b) Au travail

0% 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100%

c) À la maison

0% 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100%

d) Dans la vie de tous les jours

0% 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100%

28. Au cours d'une journée typique, dans quelle proportion consommez-vous des médias (p. ex., radio, télévision, cinéma, etc.) dont la langue de communication est le français au cours d'une même journée (comparativement à des médias d'autres langues)?

0% 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100%

29. Au cours d'une journée typique, parmi le temps que vous passez en français, dans quelle proportion interagissez-vous avec des locuteurs natifs du français au cours d'une même journée (comparativement à des interactions avec des locuteurs natifs)?

0% 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100%

30. Quelles variantes du français (p.ex., québécois, haïtien, belge, sénégalais, marocain, parisien, etc.) avez-vous le plus l'habitude d'entendre?

a) À l'école : _____

b) Au travail : _____

c) À la maison : _____

d) Dans la vie de tous les jours : _____

31. Est-ce important pour vous de parler français? OUI NON

a) Pourquoi?

_____

_____

32. À votre avis, quelle prononciation devrait être utilisée dans les cours de français langue seconde? Veuillez encercler une réponse.

QUÉBÉCOISE FRANÇAISE QUÉBÉCOISE ET FRANÇAISE AUTRE

33. Quelle pronunciation voudriez-vous avoir quand vous parlez français? Veuillez encercler une réponse.

QUÉBÉCOISE FRANÇAISE AUTRE PEU IMPORTE

a) Pourquoi?

_____

_____

_____

34. Est-ce qu'une de ces prononciations vous semble plus difficile à parler qu'une autre? Veuillez encercler une réponse.

OUI NON

a) Si oui, laquelle? _____
b) Pourquoi?

_____

_____

_____

Appendix B. Phoneme rating task

1) À quelle fréquence entendez-vous cette prononciation?

1 ⬭----------⬭ 1000

« Jamais » « Plusieurs fois par jour »

2) Aimeriez-vous avoir la même prononciation que ce locuteur?

1 ⬭----------⬭ 1000

« Pas du tout » « J'adorerais »

3) Cette prononciation est-elle agréable à écouter?

1 ⬭----------⬭ 1000

« Pas du tout » « Très plaisante »

De quelle origine est ce locuteur? *Veuillez sélectionner UNE seule réponse.*

O France
O Québec
O Autre

Appendix C. Speech stimuli

Nb of items	Speech stimuli	Speech patterns	Phono. environment	Pronunciation	Variety
1	**Tu** lis le poème.	Affrication	/CV/	[tˢy]	Québec
2				[ty]	French
3	Le pe**tit** bébé.	Affrication	/CV/	[tˢi]	Québec
4				[ti]	French
5	Je te donne **du** lait.	Affrication	/CV/	[dᶻy]	Québec
6				[dy]	French
7	Elle lui a **dit** oui.	Affrication	/CV/	[dᶻi]	Québec
8				[di]	French
9	Elle est repar**tie**.	Affrication	/CV/	[tˢi]	Québec
10				[ti]	French
11	Jeu**di**, c'est fini.	Affrication	/CV/	[dᶻi]	Québec
12				[di]	French
13	Son nez est poin**tu**.	Affrication	/CV/	[tˢy]	Québec
14				[ty]	French
15	J'ai **dû** oublier.	Affrication	/CV/	[dᶻy]	Québec
16				[dy]	French
17	Il est le **tu**eur.	Affrication	/CV/	[tˢy]	Québec
18				[ty]	French

19	A**dieu**, mon ami.	Affrication	/CV/	[dᶻi]	Québec
20				[di]	French
21	Il est beau, le **parc**.	Apical /r/	/CVCC/	[park]	Québec
22				[paʁk]	French (and Qc)
23	Il fait **froid** chez moi.	Apical /r/	/CCCV/	[frwa]	Québec
24				[fʁwa]	French (and Qc)
25	J'aime beaucoup Pa**ris**.	Apical /r/	/CV/	[ri]	Québec
26				[ʁi]	French (and Qc)
27	Ce sont des o**reilles**.	Apical /r/	/CVC/	[rɛj]	Québec
28				[ʁɛj]	French (and Qc)
29	Ils se sont ma**riés**.	Apical /r/	/CCV/	[rje]	Québec
30				[ʁje]	French (and Qc)
31	C'est mi**ra**culeux.	Apical /r/	/CV/	[ra]	Québec
32				[ʁa]	French (and Qc)
33	Une panne de mé**tro**.	Apical /r/	/CCV/	[tro]	Québec
34				[tʁo]	French (and Qc)
35	Nous allons tout **droit**.	Apical /r/	/CCCV/	[drwa]	Québec
36				[dʁwa]	French (and Qc)
37	**Ra**ppelle-toi de nous.	Apical /r/	/CV/	[ra]	Québec
38				[ʁa]	French (and Qc)
39	C'est à Mont**ré**al.	Apical /r/	/CV/	[re]	Québec
40				[ʁe]	French (and Qc)

41	La **fille** était là.	High lax vowel	/CVC/	[fIj]	Québec
42				[fij]	French
43	Il faut qu'elle **goûte**.	High lax vowel	/CVC/	[gUt]	Québec
44				[gut]	French
45	Ça fait deux **milles** sept.	High lax vowel	/CVC/	[mIl]	Québec
46				[mil]	French
47	Oui, je veux cette **jupe**.	High lax vowel	/CVC/	[ʒYp]	Québec
48				[ʒyp]	French
49	La **foule** est immense.	High lax vowel	/CVC/	[fUl]	Québec
50				[ful]	French
51	La **lune** est si belle.	High lax vowel	/CVC/	[lYn]	Québec
52				[lun]	French
53	Non, ce n'est pas **juste**.	High lax vowel	/CVCC/	[ʒYst]	Québec
54				[ʒust]	French
55	Appelle la po**lice**.	High lax vowel	/CVC/	[lIs]	Québec
56				[lis]	French
57	Elles sont **toutes** là-haut.	High lax vowel	/CVC/	[tUt]	Québec
58				[tut]	French
59	À **l'île** Sainte-Hélène.	High lax vowel	/CVC/	[lIl]	Québec
60				[lil]	French
61	Allons-y a**vant**.	Nasals	/CV/	[vã]	Québec
62				[vɑ̃]	French

63	Achète-le, ma**man**.	Nasals	/CV/	[mã]	Québec
64				[mɑ̃]	French
65	Il n'en voit au**cun**.	Nasals	/CCV/	[kœ̃]	Québec
66				[kɛ̃]	French
67	Oui, elle en veut **un**.	Nasals	/V/	[œ̃]	Québec
68				[ɛ̃]	French
69	J'ai lu **cent** messages.	Nasals	/CV/	[sã]	Québec
70				[sɑ̃]	French
71	Elle a de belles **dents.**	Nasals	/CV/	[dã]	Québec
72				[dɑ̃]	French
73	Je sais qu'elle me **ment**.	Nasals	/CV/	[mã]	Québec
74				[mɑ̃]	French
75	Il y a quel**qu'un**.	Nasals	/CV/	[kœ̃]	Québec
76				[kɛ̃]	French
77	Ce n'est pas com**mun**.	Nasals	/CV/	[mœ̃]	Québec
78				[mɛ̃]	French
79	À cha**cun** de vous.	Nasals	/CV/	[kœ̃]	Québec
80				[kɛ̃]	French

Appendix D. Acculturation questionnaire

1. À quel(s) groupe(s) ethnique(s) vous identifiez-vous en lien avec votre origine ou par choix (p. ex., chinois, iranien, québécois, mohawk, latino, ukrainien, britannique, canadien, argentin, maghrébin, catalan, etc.)? Plusieurs réponses possibles

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

2. À quel point les appellations suivantes vous décrivent-elles ?

	1 = Pas du tout								***9 = Parfaitement***
Québécois(e)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Canadien(ne)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Canadien(ne)-anglais(e)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Canadien(ne)-français(e)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Le groupe en lien avec votre culture d'origine : _____									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Autre(s) (groupes mentionnés plus haut) :									
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Dans quelle mesure les affirmations suivantes vous décrivent-elles ou représentent-elles ce que vous ressentez ou pensez?

Veuillez indiquer le numéro correspondant à votre réponse sur la ligne à la fin de chaque phrase en vous référant à l'échelle suivante.

1 = Complètement en désaccord ***9 = Complètement d'accord***

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

CULTURAL ENGAGEMENT

1. Je participe activement aux activités culturelles et/ou aux fêtes nationales ou politiques en lien avec ma culture d'origine. _____
2. Je participe activement aux activités culturelles et/ou aux fêtes nationales ou politiques en lien avec la culture québécoise. _____
3. J'aime afficher des symboles en lien avec ma culture d'origine (p. ex. vêtements, drapeaux, broches. etc.). _____
4. J'aime afficher des symboles en lien avec la culture québécoise (p. ex. vêtements, drapeaux, broches, etc.). _____

FEELING OF COMFORT IN GROUP

5. Je suis à l'aise quand j'interagis avec des membres de ma culture d'origine. _____
6. Je suis à l'aise quand j'interagis avec des membres de la culture québécoise. _____
7. Je suis à l'aise de discuter de sujets personnels (par ex.: séparation, mort d'un proche, échec personnel, etc.) avec des membres de ma culture d'origine. _____
8. Je suis à l'aise de discuter de sujets personnels (par ex.: séparation, mort d'un proche, échec personnel, etc.) avec des membres de la culture québécoise. _____
9. Je suis à l'aise de demander de l'aide à des membres de ma culture d'origine. _____
10. Je suis à l'aise de demander de l'aide à des membres de la culture québécoise. _____

L2 SPEAKERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS FRENCH

PREFERENTIAL VIEW FOR THE ETHNIC COMMUNITY

11. J'aimerais que mes enfants soient en couple ou se marient avec des membres de ma culture d'origine. _____
12. J'aimerais que mes enfants soient en couple ou se marient avec des membres de la culture québécoise. _____
13. Je pense que les enseignants appartenant à ma culture d'origine peuvent bien comprendre les besoins de mes enfants. _____
14. Je pense que les enseignants appartenant à la culture québécoise peuvent bien comprendre les besoins de mes enfants. _____
15. Je me sens en sécurité si j'habite dans un quartier composé de membres de ma culture d'origine. _____
16. Je me sens en sécurité si j'habite dans un quartier composé de membres de la culture québécoise. _____

CONTACT WITH MEMBERS OF THE ETHNIC GROUP

17. J'aime participer à des activités sociales avec des membres de ma culture d'origine._____
18. J'aime participer à des activités sociales avec des membres de la culture québécoise._____
19. Il est important pour moi de rester en contact avec des membres de ma culture d'origine. _____
20. Il est important pour moi de rester en contact avec des membres de la culture québécoise. _____
21. Il est facile pour moi d'entrer en contact avec des membres de ma culture d'origine._____
22. Il est facile pour moi d'entrer en contact avec des membres de la culture québécoise._____

PRIDE IN THE GROUP

23. Je suis fier(e) de faire partie des membres ma culture d'origine. _____
24. Je suis fier(e) de faire partie des membres la culture québécoise. _____
25. Je suis fier(e) de dire aux gens que je suis membre de ma culture d'origine. _____
26. Je suis fier(e) de dire aux gens que je suis membre de la culture québécoise. _____

27. Je suis fier(e) de voir des symboles de ma culture d'origine (par ex.: un drapeau) affichés autour de moi. _____
28. Je suis fier(e) de voir des symboles de la culture québécoise (par ex.: un drapeau) affichés autour de moi. _____
29. Je suis fier(e) de pouvoir parler la langue reliée à ma culture d'origine. _____
30. Je suis fier(e) de pouvoir parler français. _____

VIEWS ABOUT THE ROLE OF LANGUAGE AND IDENTITY

31. La capacité de parler la langue reliée à ma culture d'origine est un aspect important dans la définition de mon identité. _____
32. La capacité de parler français est un aspect important dans la définition de mon identité. _____
33. Une personne qui ne parle plus la langue reliée à sa culture d'origine n'a pas le droit de s'identifier comme membre de sa culture native. _____
34. Une personne qui ne parle pas français n'a pas le droit de s'identifier comme membre de la culture québécoise. _____

Appendix E. Delayed sentence repetition task

Practice items

Nb of items	Question (prompt)	Answer (response)	QF speech patterns	Target pronunciation
1	Est-ce que tout va bien?	Oui, tout va bien, merci.	--	--
2	Puis-je prendre ce crayon?	Non, je l'u**tilise** déjà.	Affrication	[tˢi]
			High lax vowel	[lIz]
3	Où vas-t-on après les cours?	Moi, je vais à la bibliothèque.	--	--
4	Comment s'appelle le professeur?	Je ne m'en rappelle plus malheureuse**ment**.	Nasal	[mã]

Distracter sentences

Nb of items	Question (prompt)	Answer (response)	QF speech patterns	Target pronunciation
1	Est-ce que son appel était important?	Oui, parce qu'elle voulait te parler.	--	--
2	Est-ce que ton chat aime jouer la nuit?	Non, il préfère se reposer.	--	--
3	Que fait-elle?	Elle cherche les bananes.	--	--
4	Où trouve-t-elle tous ces fruits?	Elle les achète au marché.	--	--
5	A-t-elle salué les voisins?	Oui, elle a parlé avec la vieille dame.	--	--
6	Où était caché le ballon?	On l'a retrouvé dans le panier.	--	--
7	Voulez-vous le donner?	Non, je veux le garder chez moi.	--	--
8	Avez-vous deux dollars?	Non, je n'ai pas de monnaie sur moi.	--	--

Target sentences

Nb of items	Question (prompt)	Answer (response)	QF speech patterns	Target pronunciation
1	Est-ce que je la connais?	Oui, bien **sûr**, c'est ma **mère**.	High lax vowel Diphthong	[sYʁ] [maɛʁ]
2	Pourquoi est-elle déçue?	Parce qu'elle a per**du** son cellu**laire**.	Affrication Diphthong	[dᶻY] [laɛʁ]
3	Qu'est-ce que je dois faire ensuite?	**Tu** dois aller chercher les **en**fants.	Affrication Nasal	[tˢY] [ã]
4	Est-ce que le bébé peut en manger?	Oui, elle **mâche** bien les ali**ments**.	Diphthong Nasal	[mawʃ] [mã]
5	Où va-t-elle en voyage cet été?	Cet été, elle va en É**gypte** ou en É**thi**opie.	High lax vowel Affrication	[ʒIpt] [tˢjo]
6	Quand reviendra-t-elle?	Elle reviendra mercre**di** avec ses pa**rents**.	Affrication Nasal	[dᶻi] [ʁã]
7	Comment as-tu reconnu ce garçon?	Il est plus **grand** que ma **fille.**	Nasal High lax vowel	[gʁã] [fIj]
8	Qu'allons-nous faire la semaine prochaine?	Le premier **jour**, nous irons à la **pêche**.	High lax vowel Diphthong	[ʒUʁ] [paɛʃ]

Appendix F. Linguistic background questionnaire to Guatemalan workers

Part 1: Background information

1. Age:
2. Country and city of birth:
3. What is your marital status?
4. Do you have children? How old are they?
5. What is the last degree you obtained in Guatemala?
6. What was your occupation in Guatemala?
7. What is your native language?
8. What languages were commonly spoken in your home when you were growing up?
9. If more than one, with whom did you speak each of these languages?
10. Do you speak other languages?
11. Have you lived in any countries for more than six months?
12. Have you ever lived in a situation where you were exposed to a language other than your native language (e.g, by living in a multilingual community; visiting a community for purposes of study abroad or work; exposure through family members, etc.?)

    Country:

    Language:

    Purpose:

    From when to when:

13. Rate your language ability in each of the languages that you know.

    0) Poor, 1) Good, 2) Very Good, 3) Native/nativelike

    Language:

    Listening:

    Speaking:

    Reading:

    Writing:

    Nb of years of study (in a formal school setting):

Part 2: Work experience in Canada

14. When did you arrive in Canada?
15. When will you be leaving Canada?
16. Is it your first work experience in Canada?
17. Why did you seek for a job with a dairy farmer in Canada?
18. What are your living arrangements?
19. Are you provided with any mode of transportation?
20. What is your weekly routine?

Appendix G. The language contact profile questionnaire to Guatemalan workers

Part 1: L1 use

1. Do you have communication in Spanish?
2. On average, how often do you communicate with native or fluent speakers of Spanish in Spanish?
3. With whom do you speak Spanish? (e.g., your employer, your colleagues, your roommate, visitors at the farm, at the supermarket, at the bank)
4. Do you do these activities in Spanish? How often?
    a. Watching Spanish language television
    b. Reading Spanish language newspapers and magazines
    c. Reading novels in Spanish
    d. Listening to songs in Spanish
    e. Watching movies or videos in Spanish
    f. Doing the grocery
    g. Going to the bank
5. Do you do any other activities using Spanish?

Part 2: L2 use

6. Do you have communication in French?
7. On average, how often do you communicate with native or fluent speakers of French in French?
8. With whom do you try to speak French? (e.g., your employer, your colleagues, your roommate, visitors at the farm, at the supermarket, at the bank)
9. Do you do these activities in French? How often?
    a. Watching French language television
    b. Reading French language newspapers and magazines
    c. Reading novels in French
    d. Listening to songs in French
    e. Watching movies or videos in French
    f. Doing the grocery
    g. Going to the bank
10. Do you do any other activities using French?

Appendix H. The attitudinal motivation questionnaire to Guatemalan workers

1. Are you interested in learning foreign languages? Why? (integrativeness)
2. What opinion do you have of French-speaking Québécois? (integrativeness)
3. Is it important for you to learn French to interact with Québécois? (integrativeness)
4. Is it important for you to learn French to interact with your employer? (integrativeness)
5. What opinion do you have of English-speaking Québécois? (integrativeness)
6. What opinion do you have of your employer? (attitudes towards the learning situation)
7. What opinion do you have of your work colleagues? (attitudes towards the learning situation)
8. What opinion do you have of your roommates? (attitudes towards the learning situation)
9. Are you in interested in learning French? (motivation)
10. Do you feel that you are putting efforts in communicating in French? (motivation)
11. Is it important for you to learn French for employment? (instrumental orientation)

Appendix I. Guatemalan workers' use of Spanish across time

Name	Time 1		Time 2		Time 3	
	Where (with whom)	Activities	Where (with whom)	Activities	Where (with whom)	Activities
Joni	Home (roommates)	Listen to music Internet Watch movies	Home (roommates) Bank (cashier) Friends in Napierville	Listen to music Internet Watch movies	Home (roommates) Bank (cashier) Friends in Napierville	Listen to music Internet Watch movies
Sender	Home (roommates)	Listen to music Watch movies	N/A	N/A	Home (roommates) Grocery store (cashier)	Listen to music Watch movies
Hernildo	Home (brother)	Watch TV Watch movies Internet	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Walfren	Home (roommates) Farm (boss)	Listen to music Internet Watch movies	Home (roommates) Local girlfriend	Listen to music Internet Watch movies	Home (roommates) Local girlfriend Friends in Napierville	Listen to music Internet Watch movies
Rubén	Home (roommates)	Watch TV	Home (roommates)	Watch TV	Home (roommates)	Watch TV

	Farm (boss)	Watch movies Listen to music	Farm (boss)	Watch movies Listen to music	Farm (boss)	Watch movies Listen to music
Erick	Home (roommates)	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music	Home (roommates)	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music	N/A	N/A
Mario	Home (roommates)	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music	N/A	N/A	Home (roommates)	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music
Byron	Home (roommates) Farm (boss) Friends in St-Rémi	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Edy	Home (roommates) Restaurants (cashier) Bank (cashier) Friends in St-Rémi	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music Internet	N/A	N/A	Home (roommates) Restaurants (cashier) Bank (cashier) Friends in St-Rémi	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music Internet

Emilio	Home (roommates) Farm (boss, veterinary) Friends in Napierville	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music Internet	Home (roommates) Farm (boss, veterinary) Friends in Napierville	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music Internet	Home (roommates) Farm (boss, veterinary) Friends in Napierville	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music Internet
Juan José	Home (roommates) Farm (boss, colleague) Bank (cashier) Friends in St-Rémi	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music	Home (roommates) Farm (boss, colleague) Bank (cashier) Friends in St-Rémi	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music	Home (roommates) Farm (boss, colleague) Bank (cashier) Friends in St-Rémi	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music
Julio	Home (roommates) Farm (boss and son) Bank (cashier) Friends in Sherrington	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music	Home (roommates) Farm (boss and son) Bank (cashier) Friends in Sherrington	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music	Home (roommates) Farm (boss and son) Bank (cashier) Friends in Sherrington	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music

Appendix J. Guatemalan workers' use of French across time

Name	Time 1		Time 2		Time 3	
	Where (with whom)	Activities	Where (with whom)	Activities	Where (with whom)	Activities
Joni	—	Listen to the radio	Farm (boss' family) Restaurant (waitress)	Listen to the radio	Farm (boss' family) Restaurant (waitress)	Listen to the radio
Sender	Farm (boss, colleagues)	Watch videos on Facebook	N/A	N/A	Farm (boss, colleagues)	Watch videos on Facebook
Hernildo	Farm (boss and family)	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Walfren	Farm (boss)	Listen to music	—	Listen to music	—	Listen to music
Rubén	Farm (boss' family)	—	Farm (boss' family) Grocery store (cashier)	—	Farm (boss' family) Grocery store (cashier)	—
Erick	Farm (boss)	Watch TV	Farm (boss)	Watch TV	N/A	N/A

	Bank (cashier)	Watch movies	Grocery store (cashier) Bank (cashier)	Watch movies		
Mario	Farm (boss) Grocery store (cashier)	Listen to music	N/A	N/A	Farm (boss) Grocery store (cashier)	Listen to music
Byron	Grocery store (cashier)	Watch TV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Edy	Farm (boss and family, colleagues) Restaurant (waitress) Grocery store (cashier)	—	N/A	N/A	Farm (boss and family, colleagues) Restaurant (waitress) Grocery store (cashier)	—
Emilio	Farm (boss' family) Grocery store (cashier) Bank (cashier)	Listen to music Read magazines about agriculture	Farm (boss' family) Grocery store (cashier) Bank (cashier)	Listen to music Read magazines about agriculture	Farm (boss' family) Grocery store (cashier) Bank (cashier)	Listen to music Read magazines about agriculture
Juan José	Farm (boss' family)	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music	Farm (boss' family)	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music	Farm (boss' family)	Watch TV Watch movies Listen to music

Julio	Bank (cashier)	Listen to music	Bank (cashier)	Listen to music in tractor	Bank (cashier)	Listen to music